

# Young Socialist Discussion Bulletin

Vol. XVIII, No. 4

December 1974

\$ . 60

## CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<u>THE SPLIT OF THE INTERNATIONALIST TENDENCY: AN ASSESSMENT IN LIGHT OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL PRINCIPLES OF THE YOUNG SOCIALIST ALLIANCE</u> , Adopted by the National Executive Committee--November 26, 1974	3
<u>Appendix I: Report of the Control Commission of the Socialist Workers Party, Submitted to the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party--July 2, 1974</u>	14
<u>Appendix II: Letter Sent from the National Executive Committee of the Young Socialist Alliance to All Members--July 4, 1974</u>	24
<u>Appendix III: Letter Sent from the National Executive Committee of the Young Socialist Alliance to All Known Members of the Internationalist Tendency Party--July 4, 1974</u>	24
<u>Appendix IV: Motion Adopted by the National Committee of the Young Socialist Alliance--July 5, 1974</u>	24
<u>Appendix V: Declaration of the YSA Majority Faction--May 31, 1974</u>	25
<u>Appendix VI: In Reply to the Call for a YSA Majority Faction--June 10, 1974</u>	28
<u>LETTER TO THE YSA NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE</u> , by Mike Leibman and Laura Kreis, Knoxville, Tenn., At-Large	30
<u>MOTION PRESENTED FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF THE YSA NATIONAL CONVENTION</u> , by Mike Leibman and Laura Kreis, Knoxville, Tenn., At-Large	31
<u>A BRIEF REPLY TO LAURA KREIS AND MIKE LEIBMAN'S REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL MATERIAL RELATING TO THE INTERNATIONALIST TENDENCY SPLIT FROM THE YOUNG SOCIALIST ALLIANCE</u> , by Steve Clark, Lower Manhattan, N. Y. local	31
<u>A REPLY TO THE DEMOCRATIC CENTRALIST TENDENCY</u> , by Steve Clark and Jose G. Perez, Lower Manhattan, N. Y. local	32

(Table of Contents continued on next page)

Appendix I: Letter from Cathy Matson of the Internationalist Tendency Party to the YSA  
National Executive Committee--November 10, 1974

38

Appendix II: The Case of John Zanellotti, by the National Executive Committee--  
October 26, 1972

41

Appendix III: National Executive Committee Statement on the Case of John Zanellotti--  
Adopted August 7, 1972

42

THE SPLIT OF THE INTERNATIONALIST TENDENCY: AN ASSESSMENT IN LIGHT OF  
THE ORGANIZATIONAL PRINCIPLES OF THE YOUNG SOCIALIST ALLIANCE--  
ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, November 26, 1974

On July 4-5 the Young Socialist Alliance National Executive Committee and National Committee adopted motions recognizing the split of the Internationalist Tendency from the YSA. The purpose of this NEC statement is to assess and draw the lessons of the IT split in light of the YSA's Leninist organizational principles.

Secret IT Documents

On June 20, 1974, the Socialist Workers Party National Committee requested the SWP Control Commission to conduct an investigation of the circumstances leading to infractions of SWP discipline by the IT during the May 11 Chile demonstrations. The Control Commission, a constitutionally-established SWP fact-finding commission, presented its report to the SWP Political Committee on July 2, 1974. (The Control Commission report is appended. Also see Materials Related to the Split of the Internationalist Tendency from the Socialist Workers Party, SWP Internal Information Bulletin, July 1974, No. 6 in 1974.)

During the course of the investigation, the Control Commission examined previously secret internal documents of the Internationalist Tendency. Since these documents were relevant to IT activity within the YSA as well, the Political Committee turned the information over to the YSA National Executive Committee at the request of the YSA's representative on the SWP Political Committee.

On July 4 the NEC evaluated the meaning of the IT documents. These documents revealed that the IT was a separate, rival organization with a policy of conducting clandestine entry work within the YSA while organizing its own independent external work, often with opponent organizations.

In every way, the IT functioned as a rival organization-- a tightly-knit political party. It conducted its own convention and pre-convention discussion; published internal discussion bulletins, which it hid from the YSA membership as a whole; elected a national committee and political committee; financed a national center with a full-time staff; exercised its own binding internal discipline, superseding the discipline of the YSA; constructed its own financial apparatus taking precedence over the minimum, constitutionally-required financial responsibilities of YSA membership; launched its own subscription campaign for the Canadian Old Mole newspaper, while abstaining from the Young Socialist and The Militant sales drives; initiated unauthorized, autonomous discussions and joint activity with and intervention in opponent organizations; made plans to publish its own pamphlets;

and established its own local structure with regular local meetings, educationals, and work fractions.

All of these facts are verified by the secret IT documents themselves. The "Internationalist Tendency of the YSA" was a fiction. The IT had consummated a split from the YSA at its May 25-27 convention in Chicago. The perspectives document for that convention labeled the SWP, and by implication the YSA, "deadly sick," and contended that SWP members were "politically incapable of either understanding or putting into practice a revolutionary line."

At the same time, the new IT party decided to retain underground YSA membership status in hopes of winning more members before making its desertion public. The IT party was especially interested in regional YSA locals whose members, they believed, were newer and "less politically incapable..." The IT convention adopted an entry tactic toward the YSA with the aim of raiding our membership. To aid in this entry operation, the convention voted to establish a special "YSA commission."

The IT documents are very explicit on all of these points. The "Internationalist Tendency Newsletter" of June 6, 1974, contains a capsule summary of the report on "YSA work" given at the May IT party convention. The newsletter, which was prepared and distributed by the IT party political committee, reports:

"Mike Patrick then gave a report on work in the YSA. He stressed the need to work in regional locals first... There is a need for a YSA profile; each area could provide empirical data for this. We plan regional tours, with a focus on new areas. The reporter proposed a special YSA commission, to aid the Tendency's intervention into the YSA. The general line of this report was accepted unanimously."

In the next paragraph, the newsletter summarizes the organization report adopted by the convention. This report was presented by Hank Williams, a pseudonym for IT leader Bill Massey, who was not a YSA member. Williams is quoted as saying, "We need a major orientation to the YSA..." Later in the newsletter, in a section entitled, "Local Tasks and Perspective," we read, "The intervention in the YSA is the most important priority."

Separate Rival Organization

This is clearly the language of an organization that is not--

and does not consider itself to be--part of the YSA. YSA members do not "develop an orientation to" the YSA; they belong to it. Loyal members do not "intervene" in YSA activities; they participate in them in order to build the YSA. And YSA members certainly have no need for a special "YSA commission."

In another newsletter article, entitled "Our Tasks in the YSA," IT party leader Inessa outlines plans for the party's regional work:

"Regional traveling and follow-up will be an important aspect of YSA work. Some of our own regional probing can be done while fulfilling YSA assignments to petition, campaign tours, USLA trips, etc., where we can speak to YSA comrades. However, the most returns will come from forays into the region, taking the FI press and IT documents with us, looking up the regional local or at large comrades; where we are only going by an address in the Militant or a name and address obtained by questionable sources our audacity must be tempered by subtlety. As some IT centers have an extremely large territory to cover, we should get to those areas where we have already laid some ground work before school recesses for the summer. In conjunction with this the center is currently discussing putting regional travelers on full time in Houston, Chicago and New York. There are concrete needs for such assignments especially in Houston where it sometimes requires a full weekend of traveling to get to an area and back again. The tasks of the regional traveler could be expanded as necessary to include others of the myriad tasks of coordinating our YSA work..."

Legitimate YSA regional work is not organized autonomously by individual YSA members, but by the center locals in collaboration with the regional locals. Yet, the IT party undertook its own "regional forays": not to help build the YSA, but to recruit away from the YSA to its own organization. Inessa's remarks even indicate that the IT considered contact with regional YSA members much less fruitful when it occurred while fulfilling regular YSA assignments.

The IT secret documents definitively establish that the IT was a separate organization, not a tendency raising particular political and tactical disagreements within an overall perspective of loyalty to the YSA. In the words of one of its own political committee members, John Barzman (using the pseudonym "Vincent"), the IT is "not merely an ideological tendency, but the nucleus of a future section," that is, a separate party with the goal of replacing the SWP and YSA as the acknowledged voices of Trotskyism in the USA.

These documents indicated that there was complete unanimity within the IT on operating as a disciplined secret grouping, although there were some tactical differences on

timing a public announcement of the split and on how much they thought they could get away with in violating YSA discipline for the period in which they planned to remain in the YSA. Some IT members tended toward an immediate public break, while others were more inclined to prolong their entry in hopes of picking up a few new adherents, especially in regional locals.

In their letter of resignation from the IT prior to the May split convention, SWP members Bob Langston and Berta Langston, who remain ideological supporters of the International Majority Tendency, wrote, "...the logic of the ITPC's [IT political committee] position is that the IT, defining itself as the nucleus of a section in the U. S., would begin to combine the exercise of political leadership of a grouping outside the SWP and YSA with an entry tactic inside the SWP."

The facts show that this was not only the "logic" of the IT position, but the policy adopted by vote at their May convention, and the reality of their day-to-day practice. The factual documentation on this score is overwhelming. The contents of the IT discussion bulletins and newsletter clearly distinguished the IT in its own words as a rival organization to the YSA.

#### Pattern of IT Indiscipline

The IT split, formalized at its May convention, explains what lay behind the pattern of undisciplined IT activity in the months following the December 1973 YSA convention. The most serious nationally-coordinated violation of discipline occurred at the time of the May 11 actions in defense of Chilean political prisoners. Members of the IT in New York City, Washington, D. C., Minneapolis and Chicago participated in these actions unilaterally, rather than under the direction of the authorized YSA units. They sold publications and distributed leaflets of their own choice and without the authorization of their locals. In fact, in Washington, D. C., the public intervention carried out by the IT had been explicitly rejected by a majority of the YSA local.

Prior to, during, and after the weekend of the May 11 actions, IT members in Houston, Portland, St. Louis, Madison and Ann Arbor carried out unilateral and unauthorized sales of the Canadian Old Mole and leafleting of the September United Secretariat statement on Chile.

The crucial issue in each of these cases was not the nature of the material being distributed; what was involved was a direct challenge to the authority of YSA locals to decide on and direct all political activities of their members.

Meeting on May 21, the NEC heard a report on the IT activities during the May 11 USLA demonstrations and

passed the following motion: "That the NEC take note of these public violations of YSA discipline by the IT and that this matter be referred to the upcoming National Committee Plenum."

The May 11 incidents were only the most dramatic example of a nationally-coordinated campaign of IT in-discipline--a campaign fully documented in the report of the SWP Control Commission. For example, two members of the IT from the Chicago YSA local participated in the June Attica Brigade convention without the authorization of, and without even informing, the YSA National Office which was coordinating the YSA presence there. IT members in Minneapolis, Madison and San Jose worked with rival political organizations in public activities behind the back of their YSA locals and with a political line counterposed to that of the YSA.

These acts of indiscipline were combined with a level of activity and financial commitment on the part of the overwhelming majority of IT members that was below the minimum constitutional requirement of membership.

During this same period, YSA locals in areas where the IT existed were attempting to integrate these comrades into YSA work. These efforts were not reciprocated by the IT. The documents unearthed by the SWP Control Commission have clarified why this was so. IT members were devoting their time, energy and funds to building a rival organization. Their loyalty was clearly not to the YSA, its program, and its goal of becoming a mass revolutionary youth organization. They had abandoned all hope in the YSA. In the words of a document by several IT leaders, the YSA was simply the "bastard offspring" of the "SWP sect."

To the IT party, the YSA was just a high priority area of intervention. The perspective of the IT was to bide its time in the YSA until it was convinced that no further factional gains could be made. For IT members, abiding by YSA discipline was a purely tactical consideration. How much could they get away with without jeopardizing their entry operation? To what extent would abiding by YSA discipline cut across their larger goals?

The fact that IT had a policy of violating YSA discipline was noted by SWP members Bob Langston and Berta Langston, two supporters of the International Majority Tendency, who resigned from the IT just prior to the May split convention. Their statement of resignation, published in an internal IT bulletin, warned that the course of the IT leadership "would lead not merely to instances but to patterns of organizational indiscipline in regard to the party and the YSA."

#### NEC and NC Decision

Confronted with this situation, entirely unprecedented in

YSA history, the NEC on July 4 passed the following motion: "That the Internationalist Tendency's status as a separate, rival organization to the YSA be recognized and that members of this rival organization be informed that this status places them outside the constitutional provisions for membership in the Young Socialist Alliance." On the following day, the YSA National Committee, meeting in New York City, passed a motion to "commend and uphold" the NEC decision.

This was the only conceivable course for responsible YSA leadership bodies. The NEC and NC could not simply don blinders and ignore the mountain of evidence, thereby allowing a rival organization to continue functioning inside the YSA, disrupting YSA activities, and attempting to "raid" its membership. The YSA leadership had a responsibility to make the correct political assessment of the IT on the basis of the IT's previously secret newsletter and discussion bulletins--a body of documentary evidence that was beyond challenge.

The question posed to the NEC by the material contained in the secret IT bulletins was quite simple: how to respond to the discovery of a rival political organization inside the YSA.

The NEC and NC motions were the only possible response to take in order to defend the YSA against a clandestine entry operation employed by a rival organization.

#### Democratic Centralism

The YSA's organizational concepts flow from the type of organization that is necessary to advance our political goals. We are a Trotskyist youth organization that aims to win the leadership of American youth in the struggle for a socialist revolution in this country.

Political and economic power in the United States is centralized in the hands of the strongest and most ruthless ruling class in world history. Faced with such a powerful opponent, our political goals can only be realized by organizing ourselves in the most effective and professional fashion. The past history of the Marxist movement has provided an important model: the Bolshevik Party of Lenin and Trotsky. This model, adjusted to the conditions of the American class struggle by the more than 45 years of experience of the Socialist Workers Party, is based on the concept of democratic centralism.

The YSA has adapted democratic centralism to its special needs as a Leninist revolutionary youth group.

#### Majority Rule

The YSA is an action organization. Our political discussion has nothing in common with the endless "talk shop"

atmosphere that prevails in some sections of the radical movement. Democratic discussion and decision making in the YSA serve a single purpose: to determine the YSA's political positions and tasks.

For this reason, majority rule is one of the foundation stones of YSA organizational principles. After a position has been democratically discussed and decided by a national convention, every YSA member is obligated to loyally carry out that majority decision. Unity in action is an absolute necessity for the YSA in contending for the leadership of American youth.

At each convention the YSA elects a national leadership which is empowered to implement the convention decisions. This democratically-elected leadership, the National Committee and National Executive Committee, speaks publicly for all YSA members between conventions. On a local level, YSA members discuss how best to carry out the convention decisions in their area, and they elect a local leadership to direct this work.

The centralized implementation of convention decisions is a precondition for true internal democracy. If supporters of minority viewpoints were free to implement whatever policies they saw fit, the whole point of democratic decision making would be undermined. Convention votes would be binding on no one, making a mockery of democratic rule by the majority.

The democratic manner by which the YSA makes its policies and elects its leadership lends to convention decisions the authority which is essential to maintain centralism in action. Every member participates in making the policies which they are then obligated to carry out. After a convention, the YSA certainly does not require that members change their views if they disagree with a particular decision. That is a Stalinist conception entirely alien to our movement.

If certain members believe that the YSA arrived at an incorrect position, they can loyally implement the convention policy confident that experience will show which position is correct and that the elected leadership will adjust to changed conditions. During the next convention and pre-convention discussion, the YSA can collectively evaluate the test of its policies, and members once again have the opportunity to express their views, air their criticisms, and participate in national leadership selection.

### Internal Democracy

Internal democracy in the YSA is important not for moral reasons, but for practical political ones. The thinking and experience of our entire membership are necessary to keep the YSA on a revolutionary course and maintain its

Marxist program. During conventions and pre-convention discussion periods, the YSA marshals the ideas of the organization as a whole to analyze new developments in the class struggle. We evaluate our past successes and failures and set the tasks for our work in the year ahead.

The election of delegates in the YSA locals is conducted on the basis of shared political ideas and platforms. The written bulletins and pre-convention oral discussions provide all YSA members with the opportunity to decide where they stand on the questions facing the convention. The YSA guarantees all members the right to form political tendencies around points of common opinion.

The discussion prior to the December 1973 YSA convention was a model of thorough and democratic decision making. Eleven printed bulletins were distributed to all members, containing 72 contributions and totaling 360 pages. Thirty-eight percent of the pages in the 11-volume bulletin contained discussion articles from members of the IT. Every issue of the International Internal Discussion Bulletin was made available to YSA members, and at the YSA's request, the SWP made its internal bulletins available to all members as well.

Dozens of hours of oral discussion were conducted in most locals. To facilitate the understanding of disputed international questions, the NEC organized a special tour to 21 cities for representatives of the International Executive Committee Majority Tendency and the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction of the world Trotskyist movement.

In the local elections for convention delegates, the vote was overwhelming for the positions of the majority; only seven percent of the membership cast votes for the positions of the IT. Given the IT's small numerical size, it was not obligatory for the national convention to grant minority reporters equal time on all political points on the agenda. Nonetheless, to ensure a full understanding of the disputed questions, delegates in this case did grant the IT equal time. A full discussion took place on the convention floor, and again the vote for the positions of the majority was overwhelming. The convention also voted to place four IT members on the YSA National Committee, roughly proportional to the IT's size in the YSA.

Following the December convention, every effort was made to involve IT members in the political life of the YSA. IT members were elected to local executive committees in Berkeley, San Francisco, Madison, Chicago, Houston and Washington, D. C. The NEC included a leader of the IT in the small leadership delegation which observed the World Congress of the Fourth International.

All these measures reflected the YSA's concern to ensure the fullest and most democratic thinking out and

discussion of important national and international questions.

### Centralism and Internal Discipline

Article III of the YSA constitution states: "Membership shall be open to anyone under the age of twenty-nine who accepts the program and agrees to follow the policies of the YSA and engage actively in its work."

Acceptance of the YSA's program, of course, does not entail complete agreement with each and every position currently held by the YSA. It simply means that members agree in general with what the YSA stands for and will loyally carry out the decisions of YSA conventions and locals. A person in fundamental disagreement with the YSA on a whole range of important issues will most likely not join the YSA.

The YSA is an activist organization. To the best of their ability, YSA members regularly participate in YSA activities, sell the socialist press, attend local meetings, and build the actions and movements supported by the YSA. YSA members carry out all their political activities under the direction and discipline of YSA locals or appropriate leadership bodies. We organize our work in this way because the YSA must present a strong united face to the public.

The constitution also requires that members contribute financially to the activity of the YSA. Every member pays an initiation fee, monthly dues, and regular, voluntary contributions (sustainers and fund-drive pledges) in accordance with his or her individual financial means.

### What is Loyalty?

Loyalty to the YSA is the absolute bedrock of our organizational principles. Internal YSA discipline would not be possible without the trust and loyalty of every member. As Leon Trotsky wrote in 1931, "... the first characteristic of a revolutionary is his firm attachment to his organization, his patriotism toward the organization, his sensibility toward all attacks against the banner of his organization." (Writings of Leon Trotsky (1930-31), page 323)

The YSA is an entirely voluntary organization that people join of their own free will and can leave at any time. We have no means of coercion or reward--no way to force members to implement our collective decisions and no apparatus to punish them if they don't. Members implement YSA decisions because they are proud of the YSA, committed to its revolutionary socialist goals, and consider it their organization. They do their best to help build the YSA.

That is the essence of loyalty and the sole source of the authority of all YSA local units and national leadership bodies. The YSA has a right to expect such loyalty from

every member; if we didn't, it would be impossible for the YSA to be free of internal disruption or to carry out its work as an action organization.

### Disloyalty, Discipline, and the IT Split

We have already seen that the IT party directly defied YSA discipline in Chile defense work, the organizations of sales and other aspects of public YSA activity. If loyalty is the bedrock of YSA internal discipline, the roots of the IT memberships' pattern of indiscipline are clear: their loyalty was not to the YSA, but to their own secret organization. In addition, the internal functioning of the IT party was just as corrosive to the democratic centralist norms of our movement.

Political discussion is a central activity for the YSA. Differences on analysis, tasks, or strategy and tactics can be debated among the entire membership. The written discussion bulletins, oral discussion sessions and convention debates are designed for precisely that purpose. But productive discussions, serving as a guide to action, must be open to all members, not a select few. And since delegates to YSA conventions are elected on the basis of political platforms, each member has a right to expect that every other member is speaking and voting his or her own mind. Otherwise, the election of delegates will not accurately reflect the thinking of the YSA membership.

James P. Cannon, the founder and lifelong leader of American Trotskyism, stressed this point over twenty years ago in his speech, "Internationalism and the SWP" (available in Pathfinder Press's Speeches to the Party). Cannon said:

"I remember what Trotsky wrote when he was fighting in the Russian party and the Comintern to mobilize the comrades to dare to have a thought and stand up for it. In his appeal to the Sixth Congress of the Comintern, Trotsky said, 'That party member who changes his opinion at command is a scoundrel.' He meant by that that such a member is disloyal to the party; because the least the party can expect from the most inexperienced, most rank-and-file member is that he be honest with the party, tell the party honestly what he thinks, and not change his opinion when he gets the command from this or that leader, or this or that committee,"

When YSA members vote together on common documents, they should be doing so because these documents are the political basis for their agreement. But when an ideological tendency places a person under discipline to vote or speak for a political platform that she or he does not agree with, that can only indicate that the grouping is not based on shared political principles. Such a grouping is instead an unprincipled combination based on personalities, common

gripes and grudges, or other nonpolitical factors.

The secret IT party documents demonstrate that this unprincipled practice was followed by the IT both before and after its May split convention. In a statement passed by the Los Angeles IT, entitled A Reply to Comrade Massey from Los Angeles, a group of IT party members state that they categorically disagree with the Bolivia document presented by the IEC Majority Tendency and passed at the Tenth World Congress. They state their opinion that this document reaffirmed a guerrilla warfare line. Yet prior to last year's convention, a member of the IT in the Los Angeles YSA local voted for a tendency platform based on that very document, among others.

Such conduct totally cuts across the foundation of an honest and democratic discussion in the YSA, which is the only way to achieve political clarity. The YSA preconvention period is the appropriate arena for discussion on important political questions.

The IT party discussion bulletins focused mainly on how to implement the IT's entry operation in the YSA and when to make its split public. However, the bulletins also contained articles on Black liberation, Vietnam, political perspectives for the United States, Chile defense work, strike support activity, the labor party, and other issues. On almost all of these questions, two or more positions were put forward in the bulletins and debated at the IT convention.

All of these issues are relevant to the work of the YSA. Comrades who hold differing positions on them have the duty to contribute these ideas to the whole YSA membership, not to circulate them to a select few for factional purposes. The variety of positions aired at the May IT conference suggest that if the proper course had been taken by individual IT members, several tendencies--not just one--would have existed in the YSA, with differing positions on the Black struggle, Vietnam and other issues. Clearly, political clarification in the YSA was not the goal of the IT party splitters.

Members of a tendency have the right to correspond and discuss in private how best to present their common ideas in proposed resolutions or articles for the YSA as a whole. But this was clearly not what was involved in the case of the IT party. Their documents were never intended to be submitted to the YSA membership as a whole; they were strictly "for IT members only."

The IT discussion was secret because their goal was to present a common face in the YSA, despite their internal differences on important political questions. They had to decide which political views to present in the YSA to further their entry operation, and which to hide from the YSA altogether.

## The IT Lies to the YSA

The IT party was fully aware of the fact that their procedures were totally outside democratic centralist norms. What the IT called its "security policy" of using pseudonyms and camouflaged bulletin covers is just one indication of this. They feared that their secret split maneuvering would be discovered by the rest of the YSA membership.

Another indication can be found in a letter sent by four members of the IT to the NEC on June 11, 1974. This letter, entitled "In Reply to the Call for a YSA Majority Faction," (see appendix) contained a bald faced lie to the YSA membership. The letter states:

"The [YSA Majority] faction declaration also raises the question of Houston, claiming that 'IT members are circulating their own bulletins and other materials to selected YSA members.' In fact, what is referred to here is the offering of copies of the YSA Discussion Bulletin. The 'other materials' consisted in copies of the SWP Discussion Bulletin. Both the YSA-DB and the SWP-DB are available to all YSAers at all times on request. There was nothing secret about this and comrades of the IT did not restrict their offer to 'selected YSA members,' but attempted to make them available as widely as their means would allow."

First, the YSA Majority Faction statement referred to the distribution of a mimeographed transcript of the Black struggle report given by Cathy Matson to the December 1973 YSA convention. Contrary to the IT letter, this document was circulated to a select few YSA members in Houston--not through the official channels of the YSA, but by the IT itself. This in itself violates YSA norms.

Secondly, we know from the materials gathered by the SWP Control Commission that the IT had an extensive secret discussion bulletin. And we know from the article by Inessa in the IT newsletter (reproduced in the Control Commission bulletin) that these IT documents were distributed to selected YSA members, with a special emphasis on new members in regional locals. Inessa wrote, "However, the most gains will come from forays into the region, taking the FI press and IT documents with us..."

The IT deliberately lied to the entire YSA membership about the existence of their secret internal bulletin. This in itself is a damning indictment of their loyalty. Political discussion in the YSA, or in any Leninist organization, does not consist of lining people up on the basis of "regional forays" and narrowly-circulated secret documents, which therefore are not subject to answer by YSA members with different views. Instead, democratic discussion in a Leninist youth organization like the YSA consists in participating fully in the duly-constituted discussion periods under



the guidelines established in the constitution.

The elected leadership bodies of the YSA regulate and organize the internal discussion, not individual members or political tendencies. Even if the IT had been circulating only YSA Discussion Bulletins, they would have wrongly usurped a political task that is correctly carried out only by the local, its executive committee, and the YSA National Office. These are the bodies that are in charge of the distribution of all YSA internal bulletins and the organization of pre-convention discussion.

As last year's convention shows, many avenues of free expression and debate were made fully available to the IT during the pre-convention discussion period. Their positions were read and discussed extensively in locals throughout the country. In spite of this, following the December convention, the IT went behind the backs of the YSA to conduct their own discussion--the discussion, in reality, of a rival organization conducting entry work within the YSA.

#### The YSA's Attitude Toward the SWP

In their day-to-day activity, the IT totally disregarded the YSA's unique relationship with the Socialist Workers Party--a relationship which flows from our shared political program and goals. The YSA and SWP collaborate in a spirit of mutual trust, knowing that each organization is concerned with the growth and development of the other. Our elected leaderships, on both a local and national level, work together to coordinate activities, map out common tactics, and carry out joint campaigns.

The YSA is an independent organization with its own leadership, political discussions, conventions, financial structure, areas of work, and political activity. We very much value our organizational independence; it is one of the guarantees that we can participate effectively in and provide leadership to the struggles of high school, college and working youth. Our independence, coupled with our socialist program, makes us a pole of attraction to serious, revolutionary-minded young people.

At the same time, the YSA realizes that a youth organization cannot play the decisive leadership role in overturning the capitalist system and replacing it with a socialist society. That task can only be accomplished by the mass working class revolutionary party that the SWP is striving to build.

The YSA collaborates closely with the SWP and looks to it for political leadership. In conducting our own political discussions, we give careful consideration to the party's political and tactical judgments. We know that the SWP as the vanguard party of the U. S. working class will take the lead in mapping out fundamental perspectives for the

American revolution.

This is the attitude toward the SWP that the YSA adopted in its 1960 founding statement, Where We Stand:

"14. The revolutionary youth are well aware that by themselves youth cannot lead the American working class to power. This is the historic task of the working class revolutionary party. The YSA recognizes that only the Socialist Workers Party, of all existing parties, is capable of providing the U. S. working class with political leadership on class struggle principles. The YSA finds itself in basic political solidarity, on the principles of revolutionary socialism, with the SWP."

The document passed at the 1969 YSA convention, entitled "The Worldwide Youth Radicalization and the Tasks of the Fourth International," (available from Pathfinder Press under the title A Strategy for Revolutionary Youth) provides a concise summary of our overall view of the relationship of revolutionary youth organizations to Trotskyist parties:

"The experience of the world Trotskyist movement during the past few years has shown that its work among the youth can most effectively be carried forward through revolutionary socialist youth organizations fraternally associated with the sections of the Fourth International but organizationally independent of them. . . ."

"The independent youth organization can attract radicalizing young people who have not yet made up their minds about joining any political party of the left and who are not yet committed to the Bolshevik perspective of becoming lifetime revolutionists, but who are willing and ready to participate in a broad range of political actions together with the revolutionary party and its members. It can lead actions and take initiatives in the student movement in its own name. It can serve as a valuable training and testing ground for candidates for party cadre status, and make it easier for them to acquire political and organizational experience and education required for serious revolutionary activity. Membership in the revolutionary socialist youth organization enables young radicals to decide their own policies, organize their own actions, make their own mistakes and learn their own lessons. . . ."

In its general outlines, this conception of youth-party relations dates back to the origins of the Communist Youth International in the years following the victorious Bolshevik revolution. James P. Cannon took note of this longstanding organizational concept in the interview he gave to the Young Socialist last spring. ("Youth and the Socialist Movement," July-August, 1974) Cannon was asked: "How did the YPSL and the Young Communists organize? Were they independent of the Socialist Party and the Communist

Party? Were they controlled from the top down?"

He responded: "They were completely controlled. The theory of the Communist youth organization as laid down in Russia by the Bolsheviks was applied only on paper here. The formula was an organization of young people politically subordinate, but organizationally independent of the party. That was the formula. But in practice it didn't amount to much here..."

Further on in the interview, Cannon continued: "The Young Socialist Alliance is an entirely new phenomenon, as far as my experience can judge, by its composition, its general activity and in practically every other way. The earlier youth organizations were not nearly as serious as the party itself."

In his answer, Cannon points to two important aspects of the YSA's position in the historical continuity of revolutionary socialist youth groups. On the one hand, the YSA's organizational concepts flow directly from those laid out in the early years of the international Communist movement. On the other hand, the YSA is in many ways the first organization to fully develop and implement these conceptions. Most of the young Communist parties after World War I were too inexperienced to foster healthy independent youth organizations; and after 1923, with the rise of Stalinism, the iron fist of bureaucratization fell as heavily on the youth groups as on the parties themselves.

#### Joint YSA and SWP Tendencies

The IT party challenged this longstanding YSA principle of organizational independence--not just by argument in the course of a pre-convention discussion period, which is the right of every YSA member, but by implementing their views in practice. They functioned as a single unit in both the YSA and the SWP, thereby violating the discipline of both organizations. In functioning this way, the IT party totally ignored the YSA's independent organizational existence.

A review of the previously secret IT party documents clearly illustrates this fact. At the May IT party convention, discussion of the IT "intervention" into the YSA was conducted by non-YSA members. The delegates, many of whom were also not YSA members, established a special "commission" to direct this intervention, and discussed and voted on a perspectives report determining the conduct of IT party members inside the YSA.

The IT party's top leadership bodies consisted in their majority of people who were not in the YSA and whose political decisions were binding on YSA ITers. In fact, the IT's political committee of five people contained only two YSA members. This is a totally outrageous violation of

YSA rights. How can a serious democratic centralist youth organization allow tendencies to include non-members in their leadership?

The IT half-heartedly maintained the fiction that there was a separate YSA IT, signing certain letters, "Internationalist Tendency of the YSA, c/o Cathy Matson." The existence of a single IT political committee, however, clearly proved that the so-called YSA IT was in fact nothing more than the IT party "youth commission" established at the May convention to carry out the IT party "intervention" into the YSA.

Some people may ask: "Aren't joint tendencies, although formally wrong, basically harmless--especially since the YSA and SWP are in such close political agreement? Aren't you turning organizational independence into a fetish?" The answer to both these questions is no.

Far from being a purely "formal" matter, joint tendencies severely hamper the independent development of the YSA. They can easily create an intolerable situation where non-YSA party members become deeply involved in making backroom decisions about internal YSA matters. Members begin operating not under YSA discipline, but under the discipline of a self-appointed group with no legitimate status in the YSA. Such groupings, if allowed to persist, could eventually subvert the YSA's ability to develop an independent and self-confident cadre.

Many YSA members also belong to the SWP. This is entirely as it should be, since one of the YSA's primary goals is to train and develop cadres to build the revolutionary party. It is only natural that as YSA members gain experience and confidence in the Trotskyist program, many will decide to join the SWP.

The SWP, for its part, takes an active interest in the growth and development of the YSA. When YSA members join the SWP, the party very often assigns them to stay and help build the YSA.

The SWP expects its members to be among the best and most loyal YSA builders; it demands that they abide by YSA discipline and seek to educate new recruits in the political and organizational principles of Trotskyism. Party members in the YSA have no special rights or privileges.

As a result, these are the standards of conduct that the YSA has correctly come to expect from party members. They are the only possible standards between a healthy revolutionary youth organization and the party which it supports and seeks to build.

As part of our relationship with the SWP, the YSA

follows the party's debates and discussions. We view this as an invaluable source of our Marxist education. The SWP generally makes its internal discussion bulletins available to the YSA. YSA members are often invited to observe party conventions and sometimes branch preconvention discussion sessions.

At the same time, neither we nor the SWP have any interest whatsoever in seeing the YSA transformed into a staging area where party members battle out their internal political differences. These disputes should be debated and resolved within the party.

The YSA cannot develop as a truly independent youth organization if party members begin to view it as a battering ram or pressure group on the SWP--a launching pad for party tendencies and factions. That can only tear the YSA apart and stunt its independent political and organizational development.

But that is exactly how IT party members functioned in the YSA. Their only interest in the YSA flowed from their estimation that they could make gains for their party by "intervening" in the YSA. The Estreugal-Rahdnik IT document states: "... but until the LTF splits from the International, the YSA remains a more fertile ground for recruitment than the SWP." This idea recurs over and over again throughout the IT party documents.

Every member of the YSA had ample opportunity to become acquainted with the political program put forward by the IT in the SWP during the past two years. We read the SWP internal bulletins and attended two party conventions. Furthermore, supporters of the IT's political positions in the YSA made abundant use of the YSA preconvention discussion bulletin last fall and gave three major oral presentations at the YSA convention.

Party members in the YSA expressed their positions on disputed questions in the world Trotskyist movement, and the SWP even took the exceptional step of granting its members the privileges of presenting a political line on American perspectives that was in contradiction to the party's own positions.

But this was not enough for the IT party. They knew perfectly well that their ideas had received a full hearing in the YSA. Democratic discussion was not their goal. Their goal was to use the YSA--especially the regional locals--as an arena for secret factionalizing to build their own organization. The experience of the IT joint "tendency" is a lesson to the YSA in the inevitable dynamic of such formations, and a warning that they cannot be tolerated under any circumstances.

## YSA and the World Trotskyist Movement

In June, several weeks prior to the discovery of the IT split, four IT leaders wrote a letter to the NEC entitled, "In Reply to the Call for a YSA Majority Faction," (see appendix) In this letter, the four IT party leaders attempt to defend their violation of YSA discipline during the May 11 Chile defense demonstrations by charging, "It was not the members of the IT who are guilty of indiscipline, but the leadership of the YSA who are indisciplined toward the line of the Fourth International which the YSA orients to and supports although it cannot be an actual youth organization of the F. I. because of reactionary legislation."

The letter continues: "The Young Socialist Alliance refused to carry out its responsibility to the World Trotskyist Movement by implementing the Fourth International's line on Chile solidarity work.

"While the YSA is an independent Trotskyist youth organization, it sees itself as fraternally associated to the world Trotskyist movement, the Fourth International, and seeks to aid in the implementation of its campaigns. . ."

"Members of the YSA are supposed to carry out the line of the Fourth International at all times and in all places. They can do this verbally, by sales of the press of the Fourth International, or circulating its statements. Members of the IT have never refused assignments of the YSA, but they have insisted on their duty to carry the line of the Fourth International even if others are incapable of defending it."

There are several errors in this line of reasoning. First, no individual member or group of members has the right for any reason to break YSA discipline, whatever their opinion toward the YSA's performance in implementing the campaigns of the world Trotskyist movement. Only the YSA through its conventions and elected leadership bodies is empowered to decide how best to carry out its internationalist duties. It is through these official channels alone that we make tactical decisions about how to apply the program of world Trotskyism to the class struggle in the United States.

The IT line of reasoning is a formula for no discipline at all. For example, as a Trotskyist youth organization in the U. S., the YSA is fraternally associated with the SWP; it follows from the IT party's reasoning that individual YSA members could break YSA discipline if they differed with how the YSA was supporting an SWP election campaign. More generally, individual members could disregard local discipline whenever they felt that their local was not adequately carrying out YSA convention decisions.

Obviously internal organizational norms such as these would entirely undermine discipline within the YSA, making it impossible for the YSA to function in a centralist manner. Each individual member could justify any action under the sun on the grounds of holding a different interpretation of how best to carry out national or international campaigns.

The IT party leveled similar accusations of "international indiscipline" against the SWP. These false arguments were answered in the report of the SWP Control Commission:

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

The Control Commission report goes on: "There are no grounds whatsoever to allow any individual or group of individuals to take it upon themselves to decide when, where and how to implement policy. In fact, the IT accusations are not only in violation of the constitution and organizational principles of the SWP, but they are also in contradiction with the statutes and organizational principles of the Fourth International.

"The statutes of the Fourth International state the following:

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

"Article 15: 'In no case has it [the International Executive Committee] the power to alter the majority rule of a regularly elected leadership of a national section.' (International Information Bulletin, January 1969, part 1, pp. 11, 8).

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

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

#### YSA and Internationalism

The IT letter says that the "YSA cannot be an actual

youth organization of the F. I. because of reactionary legislation."

This is true. The IT implies, however, that if this reactionary legislation did not exist, the YSA would simply be the U. S. youth group of the Fourth International.

The IT once again ignores the fact that the YSA is an independent youth organization. We are not a youth group of the SWP, and if the reactionary Voorhis Act was rescinded, we would not become a youth group of the Fourth International. The YSA would continue to make its own programmatic and tactical decisions and to exercise its own discipline over all of its members.

What then is the real relationship of the YSA to the world Trotskyist movement?

First, as an independent Trotskyist youth organization, the YSA is fraternally related to the Socialist Workers Party in the manner previously described. We consider the SWP to be the party of world Trotskyism in the U. S. despite the government's ban on affiliation with the Fourth International. Through our relationship to the SWP, the YSA receives international discussion bulletins and is kept abreast of developments in the Fourth International.

Secondly, there is our collaboration with our sister Trotskyist youth organizations around the world. We constantly strive to strengthen and extend this collaboration.

The YSA is internationalist to the core. We reject the Stalinist conception of "socialism in one country" and seek to advance the prospects for a worldwide socialist revolution. We believe that the Fourth International is the world revolutionary party and are confident that parties of the Fourth International will stand at the head of socialist revolutions throughout the world, as well as political revolutions in the deformed and degenerated workers states.

We know from history that young people will play a significant role in those revolutionary struggles. The importance of this prognosis has been borne out by the development of the international youth radicalization over the past 10-15 years.

This internationalist outlook was embodied in our 1960 founding document, Where We Stand:

"The YSA will, to the best of its ability, bring Marxian socialism to American youth. But that is not enough. The only socialism which deserves the name is international in outlook. The YSA declares its solidarity with revolutionary youth in all countries. . . The YSA advocates the creation of a revolutionary youth international which will represent the political solidarity of socialist youth."

The document passed at the 1969 YSA convention, entitled The Worldwide Youth Radicalization and the Tasks of the Fourth International, was an elaboration of this goal and the means toward reaching it. The document was adopted by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International and was published by the World Congress as the basis for a discussion within the world Trotskyist movement on the question of the youth radicalization and youth organizations.

The document states: "The experience of the world Trotskyist movement during the past few years has shown that its work among the youth can most effectively be carried forward through revolutionary-socialist youth organizations fraternally associated with the sections of the Fourth International but organizationally independent of them."

That is why the YSA has always sought to promote the development of other Trotskyist youth organizations. We take an active interest in the growth of our sister youth organizations in Canada, Japan, Argentina, the Antilles, Australia and elsewhere.

A youth international could organize the worldwide distribution of information about the struggles of young people. An encouraging step in this direction was taken in 1969-70, when the YSA, our sister youth organizations, and sections of the Fourth International circulated seven or eight issues of a bulletin called the International Information Bulletin: Reports on Youth Work of the Fourth International.

A youth international could involve youth organizations around the world in common campaigns. For instance, it

could coordinate struggles against political repression in Chile and Argentina, actions against the apartheid regimes of Southern Africa, or rallies and demonstrations by Asian youth against the role of Japanese imperialism in that part of the world. Of course, a youth international would actively participate in all the campaigns of the Fourth International.

A worldwide Trotskyist youth organization would also organize its own international discussions and debates on important political questions. It would conduct its own international congresses, distribute its own discussion bulletins, and elect its own leadership. It would closely follow the discussions in the world Trotskyist movement as a whole.

Today there are well-established Trotskyist youth organizations in a number of countries, and a few more are soon to be launched. Given the growth of the Fourth International over the past decade, there is a great potential to build further on this achievement.

The YSA's internationalist duties bear little resemblance to the caricature advocated by the IT party in their letter to the NEC. Instead, the YSA's responsibility as a Trotskyist youth organization is to win American young people to the internationalist ideas of revolutionary socialism, to aid in the construction of the party of the American revolution, the SWP, and to promote the development of an international revolutionary youth organization dedicated to the Trotskyist program of the Fourth International.

That is the course that the YSA set for itself at its founding, and we remain on that course today.

# Report of the Control Commission of the Socialist Workers Party

Submitted July 2, 1974

## Part I

### Summary of Findings and Recommendations

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### *Evidence Examined*

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

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

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

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

The Control Commission was able to examine the fol-

lowing evidence, including both documentary material and interviews:

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

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

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

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

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

#### *Evaluation of Evidence and Recommendations*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Part II

### Findings

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

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

#### *The IT Is a Separate Party*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### *The IT Determines Its Own Independent Areas of Activity*

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

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

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

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

#### *The IT Violates the SWP Constitution*

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

#### *The IT Functions Secretly*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### *The IT Rejects the Discipline of the SWP in Internal Matters*

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

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

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

#### *The IT's Secret Internal Political Discussion*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### *The IT "Intervention Into the YSA"*

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

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

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

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

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

Not only is the IT intervention into the YSA by SWP

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

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

#### *The IT Rejects SWP Discipline in External Work*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### *The May 11, 1974, Actions and Other Examples*

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

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

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

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

We note two things about this argument.

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

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

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

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

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

The statutes of the Fourth International state the following:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Unauthorized IT intervention in the national conference of the Attica Brigade, a Maoist opponent group.

- Unauthorized IT work with the Puerto Rican Socialist Party of New York.

- Unauthorized work in the Stalinist-dominated Emergency Committee to Defend Democracy in Chile in San Jose, California.

- Unauthorized work with the Revolutionary Marxist Collective in San Francisco and Oakland-Berkeley. This includes unauthorized participation in a closed study circle of the RMC by a member of the IT.

- Unauthorized work with various opponent groups in Minneapolis.

- Unauthorized work with various opponent groups in Madison, Wisconsin.

- Unauthorized work with the Baltimore Marxist Group and Chile Resistance Committee.

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

We append a report showing that a person from the

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

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

#### *The IT Is a Rival Party to the SWP*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### PART III

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

LETTER SENT FROM THE NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE YOUNG SOCIALIST ALLIANCE

TO ALL MEMBERS--July 4, 1974

July 4, 1974

TO ALL MEMBERS

Dear Comrades,

At its July 4, 1974 meeting, after careful consideration of the documentary material gathered by the Control Commission of the Socialist Workers Party and made available to the NEC upon our request by the SWP Political Committee, the National Executive Committee of the Young Socialist Alliance passed the following motion:

"That the Internationalist Tendency's status as a separate, rival organization to the YSA be recognized and that members of this rival organization be informed that this status places them outside the constitutional provisions for membership in the Young Socialist Alliance."

In compliance with this motion, each local is instructed

LETTER SENT FROM THE NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE YOUNG SOCIALIST ALLIANCE

TO ALL KNOWN MEMBERS OF THE INTERNATIONALIST TENDENCY PARTY--July 4, 1974

July 4, 1974

TO ALL KNOWN MEMBERS OF THE INTERNATIONALIST  
TENDENCY PARTY

[A list of 70 names is omitted]

Dear Comrades,

On July 4, 1974 the National Executive Committee of the Young Socialist Alliance passed the following motion:

"That the Internationalist Tendency's status as a separate, rival organization to the YSA be recognized and that members of this rival organization be informed that this

MOTION ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE YOUNG SOCIALIST ALLIANCE--July 5, 1974

Motion: The National Committee of the Young Socialist Alliance commends and upholds the July 4, 1974 motion of the National Executive Committee recognizing the Internationalist Tendency's status as a separate, rival organiza-

tion and informing members of the Internationalist Tendency party listed in the enclosed letter.

All political relations with members of the Internationalist Tendency party must now be carried out under the direction of the appropriate elected bodies of the YSA.

Please read this letter to the next local meeting and call it to the attention of all members. The full report of the SWP Control Commission is available to all YSA members from the SWP National Office, 14 Charles Lane, New York, N. Y. 10014.

Comradely,  
s/Andrew Pulley  
National Chairman,  
for the YSA National  
Executive Committee

status places them outside the constitutional provisions for membership in the Young Socialist Alliance."

The NEC has instructed each local to reregister its membership by removing from its rolls as of this date all known members of the Internationalist Tendency party listed above. The National Office of the YSA has removed all at-large members of the Internationalist Tendency party from its rolls.

Fraternally,  
s/Andrew Pulley  
National Chairman,  
for the YSA National  
Executive Committee

cc: All YSA locals and at-large members

tion and informing members of the Internationalist Tendency party that this status places them outside the constitutional provisions for membership in the Young Socialist Alliance.



[On May 31, 1974, four YSA leaders, Geoff Mirelowitz, Delfine Welch, Andrew Pulley, and Malik Miah, issued a call for the formation of a YSA Majority Faction.

[On June 17, the YSA National Executive Committee received a letter from IT member Cathy Matson enclosing a

document entitled, "In Reply to the Call for a YSA Majority Faction."

[These two documents are printed below for the information of YSA members.]

#### DECLARATION OF THE YSA MAJORITY FACTION--May 31, 1974

This declaration initiates the Young Socialist Alliance Majority Faction. An exceptional measure of this nature is necessitated by nationally-coordinated violations of the YSA discipline by members of the YSA "Internationalist Tendency" (IT). In order to understand this decision, it is helpful to review how this new situation has developed.

#### The YSA's Tradition of Democratic Discussion

In preparation for the December 1973 YSA convention in Chicago, the YSA carried out the most extensive political discussion in our 14-year history. Eleven printed pre-convention discussion bulletins were distributed to all YSA members, containing 72 different contributions on the issues facing the YSA and the international Trotskyist movement. Every issue of the International Internal Discussion Bulletin, the Socialist Workers Party Discussion Bulletin and the Internal Information Bulletin were made available to all YSA members.

In addition to the weekly discussions and debates in YSA locals preceding the convention, the YSA National Executive Committee (NEC) organized a special national tour of 21 different cities for international representatives of both the International Executive Committee Majority Tendency and the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction of the Fourth International.

At the end of the YSA's three-month preconvention discussion period, all locals elected convention delegates on the basis of the platform of either the outgoing NEC or the IT. The overwhelming majority of YSA members voted for the positions of the NEC; seven percent of the membership voted for the positions of the IT.

To ensure the fullest possible clarity on the issues in dispute, the convention delegates granted representatives of the IT equal time to the NEC reporters on every political question on the agenda -- a generous amount of time considering the numerical size of the IT. The delegates also chose to grant the IT proportional representation on the incoming YSA National Committee.

In the period following the December 1973 YSA convention, IT members were elected to local executive

committees in Berkeley, San Francisco, Madison, Chicago, Houston, Washington D. C. and other cities. In February the NEC further demonstrated its willingness to include the IT in all YSA activities by financing the trip to the World Congress of an IT member who was part of the YSA's small leadership delegation that observed the gathering.

#### May 11 Violations of Discipline by the IT

During the May 11, 1974, demonstrations in defense of Chilean political prisoners, IT members openly flaunted the democratically-arrived at decisions of YSA locals. Because of the actions of IT members, two public faces of the YSA were presented to participants in the demonstrations.

On the one hand, YSA locals voted that the political participation of all YSA members in the demonstrations would be through building the United States Committee for Justice to Latin American Political Prisoners (USLA), carrying banners and signs in support of the demands raised by USLA, handing out USLA materials, as well as through organizing sales of The Militant and Young Socialist and distributing SWP election campaign materials.

On the other hand, IT members decided behind the backs of YSA locals to carry out different political activity: sales of the Canadian Old Mole newspaper and distribution of the September 19, 1973, statement by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International on the coup in Chile.

The issue raised by the actions of the IT has nothing to do with the political content of the materials distributed by the IT. The issue is the right of the YSA to decide on the political activities of all its members. This has been our tradition ever since the Bolshevik concept of membership in a democratic-centralist organization was spelled out in 1903. This has been a basic principle of the YSA since its founding in 1960.

Unilateral public interventions by YSA IT members occurred in New York City, Washington D. C., Minneapolis and Chicago. Prior to, during and after the weekend of the May 11 actions, YSA IT members in Houston, Portland, St. Louis, Madison and Ann Arbor carried out unilateral and unauthorized sales of the Old Mole or distribution of

the September United Secretariat statement on Chile.

In addition, members of the Socialist Workers Party "Internationalist Tendency" conducted identical breaches of SWP discipline in other cities where there were no YSA IT members. In fact, wherever possible the IT functions as a single disciplined faction of both YSA and SWP members, carrying out common public activities in violation of the decisions of both the YSA and the SWP.

The crudest breach of discipline by YSA IT members was carried out in Washington D. C. In this case, the IT proposed a motion to reprint and distribute the United Secretariat statement. The Washington D. C. local then decided on other priorities for its intervention at the May 11 demonstration and pointed out that the United Secretariat statement would be available in a back issue of Intercontinental Press at the YSA's literature table for the May 11 action. Despite the democratic vote by the local, copies of the United Secretariat statement were distributed by IT members at the demonstration.

In Houston, IT members are circulating their own bulletin and other materials to selected YSA members, without informing the NEC or requesting approval for such actions. This is in clear violation of the right of the YSA as a whole to have its constitutionally-elected leadership bodies organize and control the YSA's internal bulletin and guarantee that such materials are made equally available to all YSA members in a democratic manner.

The actions by the IT violate the YSA Constitution and the rights of the membership as a whole. Like all other YSA members, IT supporters have the right to appeal any decisions or policies they disagree with to the highest bodies of the YSA, but until such decisions are changed, all members are obligated to carry out the democratically-arrived at decisions of the majority.

Such indisCIPLINED actions are incompatible with YSA membership. If any individual or group of comrades can decide unilaterally on their own political activity and if the decisions of the YSA units of organization are not binding on all members, the YSA's ability to act as a centralized fighting organization is destroyed. It would turn the YSA into a public federation of warring factions, tendencies and cliques. The majority would be unable to speak in the name of the organization, and the YSA's ability to function in a disciplined manner would be crippled.

To justify their actions, some IT members have argued that because they are in ideological agreement with the "International Majority Tendency" (IMT) of the Fourth International, they therefore have the right to determine the tactics to be followed by the YSA in this country. This argument is a mockery of Leninist concepts of democratic-centralism. In fact, the Political Resolution

submitted by the IMT and adopted by the February World Congress states: "The task of the [International] center cannot consist of making authoritative decisions about the tactics of national sections; this is forbidden by the International's statutes."

#### Why a Majority Faction is Necessary

Prior to these most recent events, supporters of the decisions of the December-1973 YSA convention saw no need to organize a majority tendency or faction. The YSA, however, is now facing a unique situation in the history of factional disputes within our organization: that is, the existence of a minority "tendency" that insists upon its "right" to carry out unilateral public activities in flagrant disregard for the democratically-arrived at decisions of the majority.

In order to forestall any possible disruptions of the YSA's day-to-day activities, it is now crucial for the YSA majority to organize itself into a disciplined faction formation. Majority supporters must be able to meet to discuss on both a local and national level the questions raised by the IT's actions. Local and national consultation is absolutely necessary to deal with this problem.

The National Executive Committee, the elected leadership of the YSA, has already referred the question of the May 11 violations of YSA discipline by IT members to the upcoming plenum of the YSA National Committee which will meet on July 4-7, 1974.

#### Platform of the YSA Majority Faction

The YSA Majority Faction platform is: 1) Support for the general line of the YSA NEC Political Resolution adopted by the December 1973 YSA convention; and 2) Support for carrying out the provisions of the YSA Constitution.

#### Majority Faction Functioning

The Majority Faction will elect a steering committee empowered to act in the name of the faction at a faction meeting to be held prior to the July 4-7, 1974, YSA plenum. Until that time the initiators of the Majority Faction will function as an interim steering committee, empowered to act in the name of the faction.

Members of the Majority Faction are required to observe faction discipline within the framework of the platform listed above. Majority Faction discipline does not transcend the discipline of the YSA; the faction is being established in order to help ensure that YSA discipline is observed.

Members of the Majority Faction must conduct themselves in a completely loyal manner to the YSA, maintaining their YSA-building activities in an exemplary way.

Financial contributions to the Majority Faction must not entail the lowering of the member's current regular YSA sustainer.

How to Join the Majority Faction

All YSA members who agree with the platform and goals of the Majority Faction should apply to join the faction. All applications must be approved by the interim steering committee. After local caucuses of the Majority Faction are established, comrades may apply to join the faction through its local caucuses. All members of the

Majority Faction must inform their YSA local leadership of this fact.

All communications to the YSA Majority Faction should be addressed to Delpine Welch.

Signed by

Malik Miah, Lower Manhattan YSA Local  
Geoff Mirelowitz, Brooklyn YSA Local  
Andrew Pulley, Lower Manhattan YSA Local  
Delpine Welch, Brooklyn YSA Local

The "YSA Majority Faction" called by four leading members of the SWP and the LTF is an attempt to complete the process of organizationally freezing the IT out of the political life of the YSA. It represents a new escalation of the war against the International Majority launched by SWP/LTF leader Barnes at the August, 1973 SWP convention. Like the "Leninist Trotskyist" Faction, the YSA Majority Faction is based on a list of alleged organizational atrocities committed by the IT, which are meant to serve as a substitute for a new "Barzman Letter". Like the LTF, the YSA Majority Faction is based on the most flimsy political grounds, the multipurpose descriptive YSA NEC Political Resolution of December 1973. However, while the LTF, (being a minority in the FI), was based on fighting for democracy, the YSA Majority Faction, (being a majority in the YSA), seeks to enforce centralism, a telling illustration of the leadership's double standard of demanding full democratization in the International while reducing the democratic rights of the IT to the barest minimum.

The stated reasons for the formation of the faction are that the IT has engaged in "undisciplined actions incompatible with YSA membership." Two sets of such actions are given: the basic accusation is the generalized selling of the "Old Mole" and distribution of the statements of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International by the Internationalist Tendency; secondly, as an added attraction we are treated to attacks on what the authors of the YSA Majority Faction declaration refer to as some of the "crudest cases" of such actions by the IT in a number of locals. The accusations contain a number of inaccuracies and red herrings which we will take up later, and each and every one of the slanders and charges of indiscipline made by the YSA leadership (now the leadership of the Majority Faction) will be soundly answered by the IT. However, the fundamental premise of these accusations reveals a completely federalist conception of internationalism. Indeed, the declaration states that there were two public faces of the YSA on May 11. This can only mean there was one based on the civil libertarian line of USLA and the other based on the Fourth International statement. It would seem that if the USLA civil libertarian approach was consistent with the line projected for Chile work in the FI statement then there would not have been two public faces of the YSA but one and the same line. If such were the case, there could be no basis for the charge of indiscipline. In fact, by stating that the distribution of Fourth International statements and the selling of "Old Moles"--a newspaper of the Canadian sympathizing organization of the Fourth International, the RMG, reflecting the views of the Fourth International Majority--constituted an act of indiscipline, i. e., the putting forward of a counter-line or "second face" the YSA is admitting that its own line stands squarely

counterposed to that of the Fourth International. It is not the members of the IT who are guilty of indiscipline, but the leadership of the YSA who are indisciplined toward the line of the Fourth International which the YSA orients to and supports although it cannot be an actual youth organization of the FI because of reactionary legislation. In handing out the statements of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International and selling the "Old Mole," the comrades of the IT were merely expressing the democratically arrived at positions of the Fourth International. In attempting to portray this as indisciplined, the YSA leadership itself is actually violating the most basic norms of democratic centralism.

Although the faction call is unclear on this matter, some members of the LTF, fraternal organization of the YSA Majority Faction, have attempted to demonstrate that the YSA and SWP's work through USLA corresponds to a tactical application of the USFI call for an international campaign of solidarity with the resistance in Chile. In order to make this argument, they must accept two premises which the LTF has so far been understandably reluctant to accept. The first is that there has been a call for an international Chile solidarity campaign by the Fourth International. The second is that this call is authoritative and requires action by the SWP and YSA, with due consideration for national tactical applications, of course. The reason the LTF has not used this argument is because it knows that its civil libertarian approach can in no way be construed as an application of a line of open solidarity as called for by the FI statement. To quote but a few sentences of the FI statement, "It is necessary now to build an active campaign of solidarity throughout the world in the best traditions of the mobilizations for Vietnam." There is no excuse for a fundamentally different line in the United States on Chile work as compared to other countries. In dealing with Vietnam, the FI had made a valid distinction between belligerent countries and others. There is no provision in the statement of the Fourth International for a different approach in those countries directly involved in Chile, as none of the imperialist powers are involved in the way that the United States was in Vietnam. Further, in the statement we find unambiguous demands and slogans "For immediate, massive, and militant solidarity with the Chilean proletariat! Halt the criminal hand of the assassins! Demand the re-establishment of the Chilean people's elementary democratic rights! Demand the immediate release of all political prisoners! Defend the right of asylum for political refugees from the other countries of Latin America and their right to travel to any country of their choice! Extend political and material aid to the heroic resistance of the Chilean workers!" Clearly the basic line here is one of organizing a campaign based on

solidarity with the Chilean working class. In this regard, the line of the USLA campaign was extremely limited in nature and the Young Socialist Alliance refused to carry out its responsibility to the World Trotskyist Movement by implementing the Fourth International's line on Chile solidarity work.

While the YSA is an independent Trotskyist youth organization, it sees itself as fraternally associated to the world Trotskyist movement, the Fourth International, and seeks to aid in the implementation of its campaigns. The IT has a view on how the Chile solidarity campaign should be tactically implemented in the USA. But to say as the faction declaration does, that "some IT members have argued that because they are in ideological agreement with the International Majority Tendency, they therefore have the right to determine the tactics to be followed by the YSA in this country" is a grotesque smokescreen. The IT never has sought to impose its own interpretation of the solidarity line but has merely asked that the solidarity line itself be implemented, which is not the case at the present time.

Members of the YSA are supposed to carry the line of the Fourth International at all times and in all places. They can do this verbally, by sales of the press of the Fourth International, or circulating its statements. Members of the IT have never refused assignments of the YSA, but they have insisted on their duty to carry the line of the Fourth International even if others are incapable of defending it. This is why members of the IT in Washington, D. C. sold copies of the "Old Mole" and handed out Fourth International statements even though their local proved unable to do so and instead chose to assign 2/3 of its forces in the Local to "Human Kindness Day." It is the policy of the IT to get out the line of the Fourth International as widely and as frequently as possible, and the IT will continue to do so, regardless of the YSA Majority Faction attempts to distort the norms of our movement.

The faction declaration also raises the question of Houston, claiming that "IT members are circulating their own bulletin and other materials to selected YSA members." In fact, what is referred to here is the offering of copies of the YSA Discussion Bulletin. The "other materials" consisted in copies of the SWP Discussion Bulletin. Both the YSA-DB and the SWP-DB are available to all YSAers at all times on request. There was no secret about this and comrades of the IT did not restrict their offer to "selected YSA members," but attempted to make them available as widely as their means would allow. This is a standard part of the education of YSAers in the history of the Trotskyist movement, and the fact that this event is thrown in to a faction declaration just demonstrates the flimsiness of the YSA Majority Faction's charges of indiscipline.

The question arises: why are four members of the LTF of the SWP calling for a faction in the YSA at this time? The specific reasons are not yet all clear but we can state that the basic consideration is the fear of an open political confrontation with the ideas of the Internationalist Tendency. At a time when the IT is exposing the YSA's boycott of the FI Chile solidarity campaign; at a time when the YSA finds itself incapable of carrying out any of its major tasks and is retreating in all the major cities into propagandism of the sect type; at a time when one of the YSA's model parties, the PST of Argentina, grovels in front of Peron's ministers and signs joint declarations with bourgeois ministers approving measures to forestall civil war, while its own militants are being gunned down and kidnapped from undefended meetings; at a time when the YSA's efforts to portray itself as guiding the world Trotskyist movement in the area of youth work are collapsing in the face of the success of the European sections of the FI in this work; at a time when the YSA's refusal to adopt an orientation to struggles of the working class is coming more and more into conflict with the organizational charges and prevent the necessary political debate from taking place so that the leadership can make some new empirical twists and turns. This course is detrimental to the interests of our movement. It would be entirely in order to demand the immediate establishment of a parity commission in the YSA to call an end to these kinds of slanders and charges and the dynamic set forth in the call for the YSA Majority Faction. Down with the factional discipline that stands in the way of a united effort to implement the line of the Fourth International! Down with the factional discipline that prevents the political clarification necessary to our movement! For an immediate parity commission to stop the split course of the Majority Faction in the YSA.

Rich Mitten  
YSA National Committee (New York)

Mark Lause  
Alternate YSA National Committee (St. Louis)

John Holton  
Alternate YSA National Committee (Madison)

Cathy Matson  
YSA IT National Coordinator (Chicago)

cc: USFI  
IMT  
Bill Massey, IT Coordinator

LETTER TO THE YSA NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

by Mike Leibman and Laura Kreis, Knoxville, Tenn., At-Large

December 3, 1974

To the YSA National Executive Committee

Dear comrades,

Enclosed you will find a motion which we are putting forward for the coming YSA convention. We would like both it and this letter to be published in the YSA internal bulletin, along with a number of items which you have in your possession, but to which we have no access.

The expulsion of the Internationalist Tendency from the YSA was--like the simultaneous expulsion of the IT from the Socialist Workers Party--an inexcusable act of factional arrogance. If anything, the YSA expulsions were worse; for, unlike the SWP leaders, the YSA leadership made not the slightest attempt to provide a documentary cover for its actions. Apparently not the slightest effort was made to investigate the actions of the Internationalist Tendency in the YSA; rather, the SWP leaders made their decision to boot out the IT and the YSA NEC gamely followed suit with an identically phrased expulsion order.

The YSA NEC apparently justifies its actions by explaining that it did not expel the IT; rather, the IT "split" and the YSA NEC simply took notice of this event. It would be kind to call this explanation inadequate; in reality, it reduces itself to gibberish. What sort of "split" is it when the alleged splitters are totally unaware of such a schism? When for more than a month after the split the members of the Internationalist Tendency continue to pay dues and to function on YSA fractions? The history of the Marxist movement is full of splits; but never before has a split occurred which required a Control Commission to uncover.

The ludicrous "split" charge is, in reality, nothing more than a crude attempt to place the IT outside the provisions of the YSA Constitution. On this basis, the YSA NEC felt it to be perfectly in order to ignore whole sections of the YSA Constitution regarding the right of accused persons to be given copies of charges in advance, to have hearings at which the accused can defend themselves and present counter-evidence, etc. But the attempt to evade the YSA statutes falls flat on its face, because even charges of a "split" such as hypothesized (or fabricated) by the NEC remain just that: charges. Conclusions from the YSA NEC are not correct just because the NEC makes them; nor is it sufficient to discuss the charges--even in detail--in a faction caucus. The crucial right to reply to the charges,

to expose fabrications and distortions, to submit counter-evidence, is missing. IT supporters on the National Committee were even excluded from the NC plenum which "discussed" and confirmed their expulsion. The IT's appeal for reintegration into the SWP and YSA was not circulated to the membership and, in several localities, YSAers were apparently informed that the IT had not appealed at all.

The purge of the Internationalist Tendency makes the fate of the remaining supporters of the International Majority Tendency in the YSA very precarious. Events subsequent to the expulsion only underline this; in the wake of the expulsions, for example, several comrades who protested the purge and expressed solidarity with the IT were similarly tossed out. Comrade Adam S., a former IMG branch organizer who arrived in the U. S. after the Control Commission was set up in the SWP, has been barred from the SWP and the YSA. We are informed that the SWP has decided to reimpose the discipline on SWPers in the YSA which was relaxed for the last YSA convention. If true, this can only further hamper the ability of IMT supporters in the YSA to contribute to YSA discussions at every level.

It is in this context that we submit the enclosed motion for consideration by the YSA National Convention, calling for the full and immediate reintegration of all the supporters of the Internationalist Tendency who signed their appeal.

For the comrades of the YSA to judge fairly on this issue, certain other documents are also necessary--documents which the NEC has, but which we do not. We therefore request that the following items be included with our letter and motion in the internal bulletin:

- (1) The reply of the IT to the YSA Majority Faction declaration.
- (2) The text of the statement of comrade Peter G., a full member of the YSA National Committee and comrade Aubin (of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International) made at the July plenum opposing the expulsion of the IT comrades.
- (3) The appeal of Internationalist Tendency supporters for reintegration into the YSA.

Comrades should also acquaint themselves with a forthcoming international bulletin which, we are informed,

will contain the reply of the IT to the SWP expulsion document and the Protest of the USFI regarding the expulsions.

With Revolutionary Greetings,  
s/ Mike Leibman  
s/ Laura Kreis

MOTION PRESENTED FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF THE YSA NATIONAL CONVENTION

by Mike Leibman and Laura Kreis, Knoxville, Tenn., At-Large

(1) The action taken by the National Executive Committee (confirmed by the National Committee) in expelling the supporters of the Internationalist Tendency from the YSA without prior notification of charges, a formal hearing, opportunity for defense, or provision for appeal is a violation of the YSA Constitution.

(2) At this point, no evidence indicates that the Inter-

nationalist Tendency had "split" from the YSA; rather the evidence indicates the contrary.

(3) Therefore, the YSA National Convention rescinds the expulsion of the supporters of the Internationalist Tendency and authorizes the full and immediate reintegration at every level of all IT supporters who have appealed for such reintegration.

December 3, 1974

A BRIEF REPLY TO LAURA KREIS AND MIKE LEIBMAN'S REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL MATERIAL RELATING TO THE INTERNATIONALIST TENDENCY PARTY SPLIT FROM THE YOUNG SOCIALIST ALLIANCE

by Steve Clark, Lower Manhattan, N. Y. local

In their letter to the National Executive Committee, comrades Laura Kreis and Mike Leibman "request that the following items be included with our letter and motion in the internal bulletin:

"(1) The reply of the IT to the YSA Majority Faction declaration.

"(2) The text of the statement of comrade Peter G., a full member of the YSA National Committee and comrade Aubin (of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International) made at the July plenum opposing the expulsion of the IT comrades.

"(3) The appeal of the Internationalist Tendency supporters for reintegration into the YSA."

The reply of the IT to the YSA Majority Faction is

available elsewhere in this bulletin as an appendix to the NEC statement, The Split of the Internationalist Tendency: An Assessment in Light of the Organizational Principles of the Young Socialist Alliance.

Comrade Aubin did not speak on the question of the IT during the July National Committee plenum. Comrade Peter G. has not submitted his remarks at the plenum to the discussion bulletin. If he does so prior to the closing of the bulletin, his remarks will be printed.

A letter to the NEC dated November 10 from IT leader Cathy Matson, calling for the "reintegration" of the IT with the YSA, is printed elsewhere in this bulletin as an appendix to A Reply to the Democratic Centralist Tendency by Steve Clark and Jose G. Perez.

December 7, 1974

## A REPLY TO THE DEMOCRATIC CENTRALIST TENDENCY

by Steve Clark and Jose G. Perez, Lower Manhattan, N. Y. local

In a contribution to the Young Socialist Discussion Bulletin No. 3, Comrades Kurt T. Hill, Daniel Sabo, and David Strong announce the formation of the Democratic Centralist Tendency in order to "obtain a rejection of the July 4, 1974 expulsion of the Internationalist Tendency and to establish a principled basis for their re-admission into the YSA."

The DCT characterizes as "illegal" the motions adopted by the National Executive Committee and the National Committee recognizing the Internationalist Tendency's status as a separate, rival organization to the YSA. The comrades say that "those expelled were not accorded the democratic rights of accused YSA members as contained in Article IX of the YSA Constitution." Furthermore, the comrades argue that the NEC and NC action "undoubtedly served to aggravate the already serious divisions within the world Trotskyist movement, and has thus helped to promote the split dynamic in the Fourth International as a whole."

### The IT Party Split

One question the DCT document consistently avoids is the character of the IT grouping, but this is essential to understanding the actions of the YSA national leadership. The comrades of the DCT correctly point out that the 146-page bulletin, Materials Related to the Split of the Internationalist Tendency from the Socialist Workers Party (SWP Internal Information Bulletin No. 6, July 1974), provides "convincing evidence of numerous acts of indiscipline and disloyalty by members of the Masseyite [IT] grouping in the SWP and YSA." However, the central fact that this bulletin demonstrates is that the Internationalist Tendency was a separate, rival organization to the YSA. The "numerous acts of indiscipline and disloyalty" were simply a manifestation of their split from the YSA.

The split by the IT is established in the Materials bulletin by a wealth of previously secret IT internal discussion and information bulletins. These documents establish--in the IT's own words--that this group had a secret, highly organized party structure: a national office, national committee, political committee, special commissions, locals, local executive committees, local organizers, sales directors, full-time staff, internal discussion bulletins and a delegated, decision-making national convention preceded by preconvention discussion. All of these were kept secret from the YSA as a whole through the IT's "security policy," which included such things as disguised bulletin covers and the use of false names by IT members. The decisions made by the IT were binding on all of its members within the YSA, even when these violated YSA discipline.

The "Internationalist Tendency of the Young Socialist Alliance" was a fiction: what really existed was a single IT party which included non-members of the YSA. This organization adopted and carried out a policy of "interventions" into the YSA in addition to autonomous and unauthorized political activities with opponents of the YSA.

The attitude of the IT party to the YSA can be judged from their secret documents, which generally treat the YSA and the SWP as a single unit. Although the IT party convention rejected the Estreugal-Rahdnik document as a whole, the section dealing with the nature of the SWP was approved by the convention. There our movement is called a "sect" whose political line "has been on an uninterrupted rightward course." We're called a "degenerate organization" with a "degenerate line." Other documents contain even more distasteful characterizations; one brands the YSA as the "bastard offspring" of the "SWP sect."

Holding such views, the ITers decided to build a separate, rival organization to both the YSA and the SWP. The Carapace, et al. document, signed by a section of the IT leadership, reports that, "the transformation of the tendency into a revolutionary organization has been correctly recognized by the SC [Steering Committee] to be the number one item on the agenda." The section of the Estreugal-Rahdnik document adopted by the IT's national convention concludes with this political characterization: "Any hopes of regeneration of the SWP... are illusory. Our tendency in the SWP is the nucleus of the future section of the Fourth International in the United States."

As the secret IT documents in the Materials collection show, the IT completed the process of constituting itself as a separate, rival organization at its May 25-27 national convention, thereby consummating a split from the Young Socialist Alliance.

As one tactic to carry out their general orientation of building a rival organization, the splitters decided at their national gathering to maintain formal membership in the YSA, in order to recruit to their organization at the YSA's expense. By a unanimous vote of their convention, the ITers established "a special YSA commission" to carry out their "intervention into the YSA." A central aspect of this "intervention" was to be "forays into the region," through which the ITers hoped to line up newer, less-experienced YSA members through one-sided discussions, in violation of the YSA norm of open, democratic discussions where all points of view can be aired.



## The NEC and NC Procedures

The procedures followed by the National Executive Committee and approved by the National Committee to defend the YSA from the IT party's attempt to raid us were completely correct from the standpoint of our Leninist norms and the YSA constitution.

In June 1974, the special fact-finding SWP Control Commission investigation of IT violations of SWP discipline was initiated by a meeting of the SWP National Committee. In the course of its investigation, the Control Commission obtained copies of the IT documents which showed that the IT had consummated a split from the SWP. On July 2, this material was presented to the SWP Political Committee along with the Control Commission's report. Since the situation revealed in the IT documents affected the YSA, the YSA's representative on the SWP Political Committee requested that the documents be made available to the YSA National Executive Committee, and the SWP Political Committee concurred with this request.

The NEC concluded, after studying the material, that the IT was a separate, rival organization to the YSA. On July 4, 1974, the NEC passed a motion acknowledging this and recognizing that this fact placed all IT members outside the constitutional provisions for membership in the YSA.

On July 5, the YSA National Committee, the highest decision-making body of the YSA between national conventions, passed a motion to "commend and uphold" the July 4 NEC action.

### No Other Procedure Was Correct

The comrades of the Democratic Centralist Tendency charge that the NEC "ignored the provisions of the YSA Constitution and illegally expelled the Internationalist Tendency as a body!" They argue that the NEC should have instead followed the disciplinary procedure outlined in the YSA Constitution, which includes the presentation of written charges and a trial.

Such a procedure, however, would have been inappropriate and incorrect in this instance. What was necessary was not an investigation of specific alleged violations of YSA discipline, but a political evaluation of the IT organization based on the contents of the IT documents. The appropriate body to make such an evaluation was not a trial committee, but the elected leadership of the YSA.

A trial proceeding is designed to gather evidence and establish the facts concerning accusations of particular violations of YSA discipline by individual members. It gives an accused member an opportunity to attempt to demonstrate that the charges are untrue or unsubstantiated.

A trial committee is a fact-finding body; it has no constitutional powers to take disciplinary action.

If a trial committee finds that an infraction of discipline has occurred, it can recommend that the appropriate YSA units take specific disciplinary steps. But only the regularly constituted bodies of the YSA--the locals, the National Executive Committee, the National Committee and the national conventions--have the power to take disciplinary action.

The evidence concerning the IT party was not in dispute. The evidence consisted of the IT documents, and there was no question as to the authenticity of these documents. The task was not to gather evidence and establish facts, but rather to evaluate what those documents revealed about the IT. This was a job for the NEC and NC, not a trial body.

The discovery of the IT party was not like the case of John Zanellotti, who was expelled from the YSA in 1972 for being a member of the Workers League. The DCT comrades cite the procedures in the Zanellotti case as exemplary. When examined more closely, however, the parallel between the IT party and the Zanellotti case does not hold up.

Zanellotti was charged with disloyalty to the YSA based on allegations by several comrades that he was a member of the Workers League. Had Zanellotti admitted the charge there would have been no need for a trial, since no evidence and facts would have been in dispute. The NEC could have simply removed his name from the YSA membership rolls. But Zanellotti denied the charge, claiming it was a "fabrication" designed to drive him out of the YSA for his dissenting political views.

The NEC constituted itself as a trial body and held a trial, in order to determine the facts. Although Zanellotti continued to formally deny the charge, during the course of the trial he solidarized himself with the Workers League, describing it as the revolutionary party and agreeing with the Workers League position that the YSA is a reformist organization that should be "smashed." These statements by Zanellotti corroborated the allegations of the comrades who had reported that he was a Workers League agent in the YSA, and exposed as false his formal denial of membership in the Workers League. Based on this information, the NEC found him guilty and expelled him from the YSA. The National Committee and national convention upheld Zanellotti's expulsion. <sup>7</sup> See Appendix for NEC documents on the Zanellotti case.

However, the situation with the IT was totally different. No one could claim that the IT documents were fabricated, nor did the splitters try to hide their membership in the IT.

There was no need for a trial body to establish these key facts. Moreover, the motion passed by the NEC was not a disciplinary action, that is, an action based on specific infractions of YSA discipline. Instead, it was a political characterization of the IT grouping based on what the IT said about itself in its own internal documents.

Since the ending of the IT's entry operation in the YSA, the IT party has argued that it had the right to act as it did. It should be noted, however, that the IT has not challenged any of the essential facts concerning their secret discussion and convention. What they challenge are the longstanding organizational principles and norms of the YSA. But these have been established by decisions of YSA conventions and elected leadership bodies, and only those bodies can change them. A discussion of what the YSA's organizational principles and norms ought to be is totally out of order at a trial.

The NEC did not need to, nor did it attempt to, establish and take action on specific violations of discipline committed by the ITers. What was required was an acknowledgement of what the IT said about itself in its own documents: that it was a separate, disciplined organization carrying out an entry tactic within the YSA. The NC and NEC put a stop to the IT party's "intervention" in the YSA by exposing the accomplished fact of the IT party split.

Not only would any other course of action have been procedurally incorrect, but failure to stop the IT party's secret operation in the YSA would have been irresponsible. The NEC and NC have not only the power, but also the duty to defend the YSA from such attempts to undermine our organization.

#### International Considerations

The DCT comrades raise the question of the international repercussions of the NEC and NC actions, claiming these have "exacerbated the split dynamic among certain groups within the Fourth International." The comrades feel that the recognition of the IT split (which they call an "illegal expulsion") is being used by the IT party to make the victim of their split--the YSA--look like the criminal.

The YSA takes a great interest in the development of the world Trotskyist movement, even though we have no organizational ties to the Fourth International. A year ago we devoted a major portion of our convention to discussing the issues that were facing the World Congress of the Fourth International, which was held after the YSA convention and to which we sent several observers.

During that discussion and afterwards, many comrades noted with alarm the split dynamic that has been developing within the world movement.

The split of the IT party was part of that dynamic. It was a carefully placed dynamite charge designed to blow up the unity of the Fourth International and the "Agreement on Measures to Help Maintain the Unity of the Fourth International" adopted by the February 1974 World Congress. The split was all the more ominous because leaders of the International Majority Tendency--a faction in the world Trotskyist movement that the IT supported--were given secret documents charting the IT's split course. A section of the IMT leadership was thus complicit in the IT split by failing to inform the elected leaderships of the Fourth International, the Socialist Workers Party and the Young Socialist Alliance of the IT's split plans.

The action taken by the NEC and NC was best suited to cut across the IT's drive to split the entire world movement. It was necessary that all the facts come out in the open, and that the secret documents of the splitters be brought to light. In that way, the united moral authority of the majority of the international movement could isolate pro-split elements and put a stop to maneuvers aimed at additional splits in other countries. Moreover, to have condoned the IT actions by allowing the IT to continue its entry tactic in the YSA would have had the opposite effect. It would have encouraged split-minded factionalists elsewhere to attempt similar disloyal conduct.

The NEC and NC's major responsibility was to face squarely the reality of the IT split. A trial procedure focusing on individual indisciplined acts would have been a mistake in this regard. It would have obscured the essential fact of the IT party split, focusing instead on myriad charges and counter-charges about this or that incident. The NEC and NC lived up to their internationalist duty by acting decisively to bring the IT split to light, helping to isolate those who had engineered it and helping to prevent its extension to other parts of the world movement.

#### "Reunification" with the IT?

The comrades of the Democratic Centralist Tendency outline a "reunification" procedure to be followed if the convention rejects the NEC and NC action. They propose: "The National Convention empowers the incoming National Executive Committee to open discussions with the leadership of the Internationalist Tendency group to establish the basis for a principled re-unification of American Trotskyist youth...."

There is an immediate problem with this proposal. What the motion calls "the leadership of the Internationalist Tendency group" is in fact the IT party political committee, the majority of whom were not even YSA members prior to their May split convention. We are sure that comrades Sabo, Hill, and Strong did not intend to suggest that the NEC should open up "reunification" discussions with IT

political committee members Bill Massey and John Barzman, for example, who have not been YSA members for several years. Intentions aside, however, that would be the reality if their motion were adopted.

The so-called "Internationalist Tendency of the YSA" was a fiction in July, and it remains a fiction when the term is used by the IT party today. The IT internal documents proved that there was a single unified IT organization composed of YSA members and non-members alike. The "IT of the YSA" is merely the IT's "security policy" name for the "special YSA commission" which prior to July 4 was in charge of carrying out the IT party "intervention" into the YSA.

Further on in their document, the Democratic Centralist Tendency correctly explains: "The Masseyites [the IT], by their own admission, have violated the democratic centralist norms of the YSA. It is only prudent to establish some safeguards to determine if they really have had a political change of heart."

A November 10 letter addressed to the NEC from IT leader Cathy Matson (see appendix) clearly indicates that no "political change of heart" has occurred. To the contrary, although the letter purports to be a petition for "reintegration" into the YSA, its contents expose the IT's rejection of abiding by the norms and constitution of the YSA.

The IT letter vigorously defends the policies implemented by the IT while it functioned within the YSA, including its unilateral infractions of discipline, its financial boycott, its secret discussion bulletins, and its unauthorized work with opponents of the YSA. The IT claims that these are "the basic norms of democratic centralism," and promises, "if reintegrated we will consider these... to be our rights and will act accordingly. Otherwise it will be impossible for us to assume our responsibility as a minority."

In other words, the IT has enumerated a series of conditions for their "reintegration" which they know full well run counter to the YSA's Leninist organizational principles. The November 10 letter is consciously intended to prevent any possible "reintegration" of IT party members into the YSA by making their willingness to rejoin conditional on our willingness to scrap democratic centralism and throw away the YSA Constitution.

First, Matson says nothing about the willingness of those IT members who were formerly YSA members to cease functioning as part of a tightly-knit disciplined grouping that contains non-YSA members. Matson writes in the November 10 letter, "... the Steering Committee of the Internationalist Tendency recently met and instructed me to explain to you our view of the situation." (emphasis added) With these words, even the fiction of a separate YSA IT has been dropped.

This phrase from the November 10 letter is borrowed word for word from a letter sent by IT leader Bill Massey to the Political Committee of the SWP. In fact, almost the entire November 10 letter is literally word for word the same as the Massey letter. The only differences in text are substitutions of "YSA" for "SWP" at appropriate points and the rewording of a few sentences which apply only to the YSA. (The Bill Massey letter is available in Report on Recent Developments Concerning the Internationalist Tendency Party, SWP Internal Information Bulletin, December 1974, No. 9 in 1974.)

The "IT of the YSA" has so little regard for the YSA's organizational independence that Matson doesn't even bother to reword the arguments.

We can only conclude from the November 10 letter that if IT members were readmitted to the YSA they would continue to function within a single IT organization along with non-YSA members and that they would continue to abide by the discipline of that organization rather than YSA discipline.

Comrades Sabo, Hill, and Strong suggest that after a six-month probation period, "the Internationalist Tendency group shall be re-admitted into the YSA on the following basis:

"(1.) The Internationalist Tendency group shall agree to recognize the democratic centralist nature of the YSA;

"(2.) The Internationalist Tendency group shall agree to abide by the democratically made decisions of the YSA, including the decisions of all elected bodies and leaderships..."

The November 10 letter makes it crystal clear that the IT is unwilling to submit to either of these conditions. For example, the letter states: "Whenever the YSA violates the statutes [of the Fourth International] and presents public positions at odds with the line of the FI, or its member sections in other countries, we will publicly disassociate ourselves from such actions and defend the line of the International."

The letter singles out several issues that are likely to require such "disassociations": "... particularly in cases of issues such as: the Allende government, and the military coup in Chile; revolutionary strategy for Europe and Latin America; the nature of the detente; the Peace Accords in Vietnam; and the character of the French Union de la Gauche."

This is a pure and simple reaffirmation of the IT's intention--were it readmitted to the YSA--to continue

making its own unilateral political decisions about public activity, in total disregard for YSA discipline. In practice, such a policy would mean that nationally-coordinated incidents such as the IT's indisciplined conduct during the May 11 Chile demonstrations would become normal within the YSA. Every time the YSA participated in a Chile defense action, the IT would feel free to hand out its own leaflets or in some other unspecified way "publicly disassociate" itself from the articles on the Allende government in the Young Socialist, The Militant, and Pathfinder pamphlets. Using this criterion as a guideline, the IT could virtually publish a weekly newsletter "publicly disassociating" itself from YSA positions which it unilaterally considers counter to the "line of the FI."

The IT also claims the right to disassociate itself publicly from YSA positions which in its opinion differ from the line of the Fourth International's "member sections in other countries." Today there are Trotskyist organizations in more than 30 countries, which take positions on issues as diverse as abortion, Stalinism, defense work and the energy crisis. This IT condition of "reintegration" would give the IT a green light to publicly denounce almost any YSA position at one time or another, claiming that it was defending the line of "member sections in other countries."

The conditions advanced by the IT in the November 10 letter would obviously undermine the democratic centralist functioning of the YSA. Article X, Section 1, of the YSA Constitution states: "All decisions of the governing bodies of the YSA are binding upon the members and subordinate bodies of the YSA."

The constitutionally-established requirements of YSA membership also preclude acceptance of the conditions laid down by the November 10 IT letter. Article III, Section I, states: "Membership shall be open to anyone under the age of twenty-nine who accepts the program and agrees to follow the policies of the YSA and engage actively in its work." (emphasis added) Membership is not open to individuals who agree to abide by all YSA policies except on popular frontism in Chile, except on the Vietnam peace accords, except on the analysis of detente. There are no exceptions; YSA discipline is unconditional.

We hope that comrades Sabo, Hill, and Strong will agree that "reunification" on this basis would simply allow the IT to continue functioning as a separate, rival organization within the YSA, throwing our Leninist organizational principles out the window. The IT conditions certainly don't measure up to the basis for readmission outlined by the DCT document, that is, agreement "to recognize the democratic centralist nature of the YSA," and "to abide by the democratically made decisions of the YSA, including the decisions of all elected bodies and leaderships."

### Some Other IT Conditions

In the November 10 letter, the IT claims that while they are waiting for their reintegration, they "have been forced to devise applications of the general line of our movement to interventions, mass work and the recruitment of new militants to Trotskyism through our own limited means." They claim that this is "merely the recognition that without all the rights of membership in the YSA, not all the responsibilities of membership in the YSA can be carried out."

The IT secret internal bulletins show the hypocrisy of this statement, which pretends that autonomous IT intervention in external public activities is something new. In fact, the IT "devised its own applications" while it was still conducting entry work in the YSA--at Chile defense activities, in sales of the press, in opponents' work, and elsewhere.

Furthermore, even when the IT members were fully covered by "all the rights of membership in the YSA," they failed to carry out "all the responsibilities of membership." Their general level of activity was among the lowest of any YSA members. This belies the IT's assertion that its members had been excluded from productive political work in the YSA and were given "just organizational and administrative assignments."

Not only does the IT reaffirm its "right" to ignore the YSA's organizational independence and to break YSA discipline at will, it challenges the YSA's right to regulate internal political discussion. The IT promises to continue circulating secret internal discussion bulletins and organizing unauthorized national conventions.

The IT also states that it will continue its financial boycott of the YSA. "Until the YSA decides to give financial assistance to all significant tendencies and factions, we must have the right to finance our faction's activities. Inasmuch as none of us are independently wealthy, this inevitably means a much reduced financial contribution from our individual militants to the YSA."

All factions and tendencies in the YSA, majority or minority, have the responsibility to finance themselves, with the exception of the cost of discussion bulletins and conventions arrangements which are covered by the YSA National Office. Tendency contributions, however, are entirely secondary to the financial responsibilities to the YSA as a whole. In promising to continue its financial boycott as a condition for "reintegration," the IT demands that it be exempted from the financial responsibilities constitutionally required of all members.

It should also be noted that the IT states that the YSA "conducts a total financial boycott of the Fourth International." The truth is, as Matson is fully aware, that the YSA is prohibited by reactionary legislation from affiliating with the Fourth International or giving money to it.

In addition, there are several other conditions of "re-integration" raised in the November 10 letter. The real purpose of this IT party declaration is transparent; it is designed to cover up the IT's split. With the IT party openly announcing its plans to continue violating the YSA's organizational principles, norms, and discipline, it would be a grave error for the convention to allow the IT party back into the YSA.

## Conclusions

Comrades Hill, Sabo, and Strong are incorrect in characterizing the NEC and NC recognition of the IT party split as "illegal" under the YSA Constitution. The NEC and NC procedures simply acknowledged what had already taken place. These decisions brought an end to an entryist raid on the YSA and helped bring to light the danger to the unity of the Fourth International represented by the IT split. The appropriate action for the upcoming convention is not to reject the NEC and NC motions, but to uphold and commend the actions taken by the YSA's election national leadership with regard to the IT.

December 7, 1974

There are several sentences and phrases in the following letter which could be interpreted in such a way as to misrepresent the relationship of the Young Socialist Alliance to the Fourth International. The YSA is prohibited by reaction-

ary legislation from affiliating with the Fourth International or financially contributing to it. At the same time, the YSA considers the Fourth International to be the world party of socialist revolution and works in solidarity with it.

LETTER FROM CATHY MATSON OF THE INTERNATIONALIST TENDENCY PARTY  
TO THE YSA NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE-- November 10, 1974

Internationalist Tendency of the Young Socialist Alliance  
c/o Cathy Matson  
Chicago, IL

National Executive Committee, YSA  
New York

November 10, 1974

Dear Comrades,

On July 17, 1974, a letter signed by sixty-eight members of the Young Socialist Alliance who had been purged on July 5, 1974, was sent to the National Executive Committee of the Young Socialist Alliance. The letter also spoke for YSA comrades who were purged without being named in the NEC's letter listing "known members of the Internationalist Tendency Party". Our July 17 letter demanded our immediate reintegration into the YSA. A statement by the leadership of the Internationalist Tendency of the Young Socialist Alliance, which was appended to it, explained that this reintegration should take place on the basis of the "normal criteria for membership in the Fourth International, the SWP and the YSA-- agreement with the general program of the F. I., acceptance of the discipline of the Fourth International, the SWP and the YSA, and commitment to work as active militants in those organizations." Although this letter was submitted prior to the 15-day constitutional deadline for appealing disciplinary procedures, we have received no answer, or even acknowledgement that it was received. Furthermore the YSA leadership never even provided us with an explanation of the action it had taken: there was no control commission, no charges, no trials, no report, just a vote of the NEC acting on no mandate from the ranks of the YSA.

The statement appended to our letter explained that until a decision of the United Secretariat had been made, we would continue to regard ourselves as disciplined members of the YSA. We stated: "a) we will not publicize our expulsion; b) we will not discuss internal matters of the SWP or YSA with persons who are outside 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." Since that time, the United Secretariat has met and taken up the question of the expulsion of the Internationalist Tendency

from the Socialist Workers Party and Young Socialist Alliance. The expulsion was condemned as a bureaucratic act, and the SWP was urged to immediately and collectively reintegrate the IT. The same applies to the YSA. Resolutions passed by the national leadership of numerous sections of the Fourth International have taken the same stand. In addition, the Internationalist Tendency's answer to the charges contained in the "Materials..." document of the SWP -- which we assume the YSA leadership based its own bureaucratic measures on -- have been made available to your fraternal co-thinkers at the United Secretariat meeting, and will be printed in a forthcoming International Internal Discussion Bulletin. As you are aware, this answer contains a series of refutations of the accusations against the IT, acknowledgement of certain minor errors which were not subject to expulsion, and a recapitulation of our general view of the situation and the proper functioning of democratic centralism.

Since the September meeting of the United Secretariat, we have received no word from you. In fact, the efforts which various comrades of the Internationalist Tendency have made to collaborate with the YSA in its activities have met with hostile responses. For example, two comrades in Oakland, California, were refused Militants by the SWP without the YSA saying anything about it. In other instances, comrades who asked to collaborate with SWP or YSA fractions were summarily dismissed. It has become impossible for the comrades of the Internationalist Tendency to attempt to guess what the current national orientation of the YSA is toward the handling of any number of issues, or how the YSA locals have decided to prioritize such orientations in terms of allocation of forces to various areas of work and specific directives for intervention. Therefore, although we refuse to believe that the leadership of the YSA will persist in refusing our reintegration, and although we do not wish to become a public faction, in order to carry out our revolutionary duties in the mass movement, we have been forced to devise applications of the general line of our movement to interventions, mass work, and the recruitment of new militants to Trotskyism, through our own limited means. This in no sense implies the setting up of a rival organization to the YSA, a rival press, or written public attacks on the present course of the YSA. It is merely the recognition that without all rights of membership in the YSA, not all the responsibilities of membership in the YSA can be

carried out. We sincerely hope that this undesirable situation will be resolved as rapidly as possible so that we can assume fully our responsibilities as members of the YSA.

In line with our stated desire to resolve the situation created by our expulsion as rapidly as possible, the Steering Committee of the Internationalist Tendency recently met and instructed me to explain to you our view of the situation. In our view, a step toward resolving the division in the American Trotskyist movement, by agreement of the two parties involved can be taken prior to the meeting of the International Executive Committee which is scheduled to take up the question in late December, 1974. We believe such a step would be a significant contribution to lessening the tensions which exist within the International. It is with this goal in mind that we send this letter. A common initiative on our part can only help the work of the International Control Commission and of the International Executive Committee.

We believed at the time of our expulsion and we still believe now that the differences between the Internationalist Tendency and the YSA majority do not warrant a split on a national scale, any more than the differences between the International Majority Tendency and the International Minority Faction warrant one on an international level. In our opinion, the single most important factor which led to the situation where the IT was purged from the YSA was the unduly factional and monolithic conception of internal party life and relations with the International which guided the actions of the YSA leadership. Such factional behavior by the leadership of the YSA was made possible by the ambiguity of the YSA's interpretation of the YSA Constitution and democratic centralism is grossly lopsided in not indicating the rights of minorities, and in implying that all minorities rapidly become the toy of alien class pressures rather than positive contributors to the process of political clarification through ideological struggle. At present what must be established to ensure a functional and lasting re-integration of the IT into the YSA is the willingness by both sides to abide by the norms of democratic centralism as defined by the founders of the international communist movement, and as enriched by the practice of our world-movement. We think the following clarifications of the norms of democratic centralism must be accepted by all parties concerned:

#### 1. The Rights of Tendencies and Factions to Hold Internal Discussions and Meetings

This is a right the LTF claims for itself but rejects for other tendencies and factions within the International and the YSA. We believe such a right must apply universally. It includes the right to hold faction meetings on both a local and national scale. It includes the right to internal literary dis-

ussion and communication within the faction, not merely oral discussion and personal correspondence. We reject the conception of the YSA leadership that minorities are automatically obliged to submit all such materials to the leadership for approval. Such a conception contradicts the very purpose of a faction; i. e. to be a separate, organized formation to conduct political struggle inside the revolutionary organization. We claim the same right of faction privacy for our faction that the LTF claims for itself. Finally, we reject any conception that organized minorities have no right to exist except during pre-convention discussions.

#### 2. Faction Structure and Leadership Bodies

We believe that factions have the right to elect executive bodies at the local and national level to lead the faction, to speak for it within the revolutionary organization and where necessary, to determine faction policy between collective meetings and conferences. We accept the principle that the composition of such bodies should be announced to the YSA majority. We also believe that the faction has the right to hold delegated conferences at the national level. Given the numerical size and dispersion of our faction and the geographic reality of the United States, this is a basic pre-condition for our democratic functioning.

#### 3. Representation on YSA Leadership Bodies

Representation of significant minorities on the leading bodies of the revolutionary organization is not a privilege. It is a right. In fact, it is one of the most elementary aspects of democratic centralism. We do not hold a rigid position on the question of proportional representation, but we think the denial of any representation on the National Committee, to a minority of nearly 10%, as occurred in the SWP, would be inexcusable, particularly when this minority represents the views of the majority of the Fourth International.

#### 4. Finances

The financial policy of the YSA leadership is purely factional. The official finances of the YSA (which includes both LTF and non-LTF comrades) are used to finance factional activities of the LTF, both within the U. S. and abroad. At the same time, the YSA refuses to give any financial assistance to minorities (unlike most sections of the FI) and conducts a total financial boycott of the Fourth International. Until the YSA decides to give financial assistance to all significant tendencies and factions, we must have the right to finance our faction's activities. Inasmuch as none of us are independently wealthy, this inevitably means a much reduced financial contribution from our individual militants to the YSA.

## 5. Non-Factional Recruitment

Membership in the world Trotskyist movement must be open to all those who agree with the basic program and adopted positions of the Fourth International. While faction members are obliged to avoid contravening the positions of the YSA majority on U. S. questions, or other questions as yet unresolved by the F. I. in discussion with non-members of the F. I., they have every right to engage in contact work on the basis of the positions of the F. I. Militants who agree with those positions have every right of membership in the YSA, and should not be subjected to discriminatory tests and other forms of harassment.

## 6. Majority-Minority Collaboration Inside the YSA

In order to maximize the possibility of both factions working together to build the Trotskyist movement in the United States, in order to reduce tensions which are not directly related to differences over questions of political line, it is necessary for the YSA leadership to integrate minority comrades into all areas of work, not just organizational or administrative assignments. In the past, minority comrades have been largely excluded from anti-imperialist fractions, presentation of internal educationals and public forums, selection as candidates in the SWP or YSA's numerous election campaigns, etc. Minority comrades who are union members have not been permitted to develop union interventions under the leadership of the YSA. This discrimination has contributed to the development of incorrect attitudes among minority comrades in relation to the unity of American Trotskyists. In order for such attitudes to be corrected, it is necessary for the YSA leadership to make specific and concrete commitments to insert our faction into the YSA's political interventions and campaigns. The general model for the content and implementation of such commitments should be the recommendations of the report of the IMG fact-finding Commission.

## 7. The Norms of the International

The indiscipline, disrespect, and outright disloyalty of the SWP, the politically authoritative model of the YSA, and of the YSA itself, in relation to the statutes and decisions of the Fourth International is notorious throughout our world movement. Our faction accepts the discipline of the YSA on all questions where the FI has not adopted clear positions. We do respect the right of the YSA leadership to determine the tactics for implementing specific decisions of the FI in the USA. We will not consider ourselves to be a separate organization if reintegrated. Therefore, even when the YSA refuses to implement decisions of the Inter-

national to build specific actions or campaigns, or does so on a different political basis (as is usually the case), we will not seek to execute this implementation ourselves, but will struggle inside the YSA to insure that decisions of the International are respected. But on questions of program and political line, the authority of the Fourth International remains paramount. We will continue to support and advocate all adopted positions of the Fourth International, inside and outside the YSA, particularly in cases of issues such as: the Allende government, and the military coup in Chile; revolutionary strategy for Europe and Latin America; the nature of the detente; the Peace Accords in Vietnam; and the character of the French Union de la Gauche. Whenever the YSA violates the statutes and presents publicly positions at odds with the line of the FI, or its member sections in other countries, we will publicly disassociate ourselves from such actions and defend the line of the International. Until the YSA begins to fulfill its obligations to distribute Imprecors, as an organ of the United Secretariat, we will continue to assume certain responsibilities in relation to its sales as well as those of publications from other sectors of the International. (We note here the precedent of the IMG fact-finding Commission recommendation that the British minority be given special responsibilities to distribute Intercontinental Press).

The above points of clarification are not a "special arrangement" to alleviate organizational problems. They are the basic norms of democratic centralism. They are universal criteria for the functioning of a Trotskyist organization (except under specific conditions such as clandestinity). Such criteria are commonplace in the vast majority of organizations of the FI. They thus constitute part of the principled basis for membership in the American fraternal organization of young revolutionaries. The IEC should assign the International Control Commission or an ad hoc committee (on a parity basis, for instance) to supervise the implementation of these norms in the YSA, in order to really solve the crisis surrounding the expulsion of the IT. If reintegrated, we will consider these clarifications to be our rights and will act accordingly. Otherwise, it is impossible for us to assume our responsibilities as a minority: that is, our duty to help build the YSA under the direction of its leading bodies; to accept majority rule; to avoid obstruction of the implementation of the majority line; and to contribute to the political clarification of the YSA and its adoption of a correct revolutionary Marxist orientation.

Comradely,

s/Cathy Matson

copies to: United Secretariat, International Control Commission, Files.



THE CASE OF JOHN ZANELLOTTI

John Zanelotti was expelled from the YSA on August 7, 1972, by the National Executive Committee, having been found guilty of disloyalty to the YSA, based on his membership in the Workers League. Zanelotti has appealed his expulsion to the National Convention.

The letters, statements, and other materials included in this bulletin are documents pertaining to the charges brought against John Zanelotti by the National Executive Committee, his trial and expulsion, and his appeal to the National Convention.

In his letter of August 20, 1972, appealing the decision of the NEC, Zanelotti claims that "the charges brought against me by the NEC are total fabrications" and that he was expelled from the YSA for "struggling for Trotskyist politics as an oppositionist."

The charges brought against Zanelotti and his subsequent expulsion were based on substantial evidence submitted prior to and during the course of the trial, conducted on June 10, 1972, by the National Executive Committee, which conclusively proved that Zanelotti was a member of the Workers League. The 1965 YSA convention adopted a motion that: "Membership in, support to, or collaboration with the Spartacist group or the American Committee for the Fourth International group (now the Workers League) is incompatible with membership in the YSA."

Zanelotti was not expelled on the basis of his political disagreements, which as a member of the YSA he was free to raise during the discussion period preceding last year's YSA convention. He did so in the resolution "Toward a Mass Working Class Youth Movement: A Resolution on Perspectives," and would have been free to do so again for the upcoming convention. He is not, however, free to function in the YSA as an agent of the Workers League.

Zanelotti was expelled for belonging to an opponent organization whose aim is to destroy the YSA, a position Zanelotti agrees with, as he stated at the trial conducted by the NEC.

In his letter of appeal Zanelotti further confirms his political agreement with the sectarian Socialist Labor League of Gerry Healy in Great Britain and its U. S. satellite, the Workers League, making even clearer his contempt for the YSA. In a frantic tirade against the Trotskyist movement, he charges that the YSA, the SWP, and the Fourth International are in a state of "crisis," have "abandoned dialectical materialism," and uphold "revisionist theories."

In his appeal, Zanelotti fails to differentiate himself in any way from the Workers League and he does not deny his membership in the Workers League. He does not present any evidence contradicting the evidence presented at the trial. He does not offer any evidence that the trial was conducted in an unfair or undemocratic manner. He does not present any evidence that he, as a member of the YSA, was denied the right to express his political views and attempt to win support for them during the appropriate time for discussion.

The NEC recommends that the convention uphold the action of the NEC in expelling John Zanelotti and will ask the pre-convention plenum of the National Committee to present a motion to the convention that the NEC's decision be upheld.

**National Executive Committee**  
**October 26, 1972**

NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE STATEMENT  
ON THE CASE OF JOHN ZANELLOTTI

During pre-convention discussion for the 1971 convention, a resolution entitled "Toward a Mass Working Class Youth Movement: A Resolution on Perspectives" was submitted by six members of the YSA who declared themselves the "Minority Tendency." This resolution was published in Young Socialist Discussion Bulletin Vol. 15, No. 5 (pages 9-11).

In March, 1972, the National Office received a letter from Tom Burghardt, a cosigner of the resolution under the name Tom Peterson, who was dropped from membership after the convention for inactivity and non-payment of dues. In this letter he indicated that he was the author of the Minority Tendency resolution and was a member of the Workers League at the time that the resolution was written.

Upon request of the National Office for more information about the functioning of the Minority Tendency, Burghardt submitted a written report to the National Executive Committee stating that the Minority Tendency resolution was written by members of the Workers League in the YSA, in collaboration with and under the leadership of the Workers League. Those YSA members named by Burghardt as Workers League agents, in addition to himself, are: Dave Durstan, Upper West Side YSA; Dick Merrill, Boston YSA; Carol Merrill, Boston YSA; Larry Kerry, Brooklyn YSA; and John Zanellotti, Washington D.C. YSA.

Based on this information the National Office initiated an investigation of the comrades named by Burghardt as Workers League agents. All four comrades, when asked, denied the allegations. The fifth cosigner (Dave Durstan) was dropped from membership in the YSA earlier this year for inactivity and non-payment of dues and could not be reached.

No corroborating evidence has been found in the cases of Dick Merrill, Carol Merrill, and Larry Kerry. No charges have been brought against them.

However, in the case of Comrade Zanellotti, two additional reports submitted to the National Office confirmed Zanellotti's membership in the Workers League. These reports were submitted by Mike Priddy and Jim McCaffrey, both members of the College Park YSA and former members of the Workers League prior to joining the YSA. Priddy was a member of the Workers League from June, 1971, to the end of that summer and joined the YSA in October, 1971. McCaffrey was a member of the Workers League from October, 1970, to December, 1971, except for a brief period in early 1971, and joined the YSA in May, 1972.

The reports from these two comrades, along with Burghardt's statement, make the following allegations about Zanellotti's political activity since becoming a member of the YSA.

(Zanellotti joined the YSA in mid-June, 1971, as an at-large member in Columbus, Maryland, as recorded in the minutes of the June 16, 1971, meeting of the NEC.)

Zanellotti was a contact of the Workers League during the summer of 1971 and was contacted at least once by members of the Workers League during that time. On the last week of August, 1971, after having joined the YSA, Zanellotti sold the Bulletin, organ of the Workers League, on the corner of 14th and Park, N. W. in Washington, D. C., along with other members of the Workers League, including Mike Priddy.

Zanellotti joined the Workers League at a meeting of its Baltimore branch at which both he and Mike Priddy were present. His membership was taken up under a special point, separate from other membership applications, and branch members were told that his membership was to remain a secret since his assignment would be to act as an agent of the Workers League in the YSA.

In late August or early September Zanellotti attended a Workers League educational conference in the Catskills, in New York State, where he met with Tim Wohlforth, National Secretary of the Workers League, and other members of the Workers League to discuss his activity in the YSA. Jim McCaffrey also attended this conference.

On the second week in November, 1971, Zanellotti attended a meeting at the Workers League headquarters in New York, to discuss the resolution and the activities of the Minority Tendency in the YSA with leaders of the Workers League, including Tim Wohlforth and Lucy St. John. Tom Burghardt was present at this meeting.

On the basis of these allegations from various independent sources, the NEC voted at its meeting of May 30, 1972, to charge Zanellotti with disloyalty to the YSA based on his membership in the Workers League.

\* \* \*

The decision to bring charges against Comrade Zanellotti was based on the YSA policy, adopted at the 1965 YSA convention, which states: "Membership in, support to, or collaboration with the Spartacist group or the American Committee for the Fourth International group is incompatible with membership in the YSA." (The American Committee for the Fourth International is the predecessor to the Workers League.)

This motion was passed by that convention in response to the cases of several members of the YSA who had been functioning as agents of the Spartacist group and the American Committee and who were appealing to that convention for a

reversal of disciplinary measures taken against them by the New York local and the NEC.

These members had developed differences so deep that they found them irreconcilable with carrying out the democratically arrived at decisions of the majority and chose instead to violate those decisions by publicly carrying out a line counter to that adopted by the majority.

It became clear that membership in those two organizations had led these YSAers to carry out, over a period of time, a consistent pattern of calculated and deliberate violations of discipline, under instructions from the Spartacist and American Committee groupings, which demonstrated their disloyalty to the YSA. Furthermore, it was evident that under those circumstances, the only purpose of Spartacist or American Committee members in the YSA was, not to build the YSA, but to destroy it--to create havoc within the YSA and to use it as a ground for recruiting YSAers to their own organizations.

For that reason the convention voted, not only to expel those members, but also to set a policy that membership in the Spartacist group or the American Committee is incompatible with membership in the YSA.

The American Committee for the Fourth International was originated by a group of YSA and Socialist Workers Party members who in the early 1960s developed fundamental differences with the YSA and the SWP on several major questions, including our analysis of Cuba. They continued to develop a totally sectarian line and eventually split from both the YSA and the SWP to form the ACFI and launch the Bulletin, in the pages of which they carried slanderous attacks on the YSA, the SWP, and the Fourth International.

Since their departure from the YSA they have carried out a consistent campaign to attempt to destroy the YSA, and have repeatedly stated this intention in the pages of the Bulletin for seven years.

The Workers League is in political solidarity with the so-called International Committee of the Fourth International led by Gerry Healy's sectarian Socialist Labour League in Britain. The "International Committee" states that it is at "war" with the Fourth International and all its sympathizing groups, whom they call the "Pabloites," which include in this country the Socialist Workers Party and the Young Socialist Alliance. The Newsletter (now the Workers Press), organ of the SLL, has charged the SWP with having "capitulated to imperialism" (August 20, 1966, Newsletter.) Of James P. Cannon, one of the founders of the world Trotskyist movement, they say that "He had decided to sell out to the Stalinist bureaucracy and the imperialists." And in the same article they state that, "The Socialist Labour League is out to destroy Pabloism and its SWP accomplices. There can be (sic) and, we repeat, there never will be a compromise on these questions--the fight will go on until we destroy the Pabloites and the revisionist SWP." (Sep-

tember 3, 1966, Newsletter.) Similar statements abound in the Workers League press.

What are the implications of the Workers League and the SLL position on the politics of the SWP, the YSA, and the Fourth International? To them, destroying these opponent organizations is not merely a question of engaging in political debate. They instead use their political differences and frantic accusations of "revisionism" and "capitulation to the imperialists" to justify any and all measures to deal blows against those organizations, physical attacks not excluded.

On November 17, 1966, SLL members, in the presence of Gerry Healy, attacked Comrade Ernie Tate, a member of the Fourth International, for selling a pamphlet criticizing the SLL, outside an SLL public function, injuring him to the point that he had to be hospitalized.

The response of the Workers League to the Tate incident was to publish an article in the Bulletin where Tim Wohlforth defended Gerry Healy and his attack on Tate on the grounds that "Ernest Tate and his political allies represent political scabs of the worst sort."

To make it even clearer that this was no accidental occurrence Wohlforth further stated that the relationship between the SWP and its co-thinkers on the one hand, and the SLL and its co-thinkers on the other, "is symbolized by this confrontation," thus not only attempting to politically justify such practices on the left, but even praising them. We can only reach one inescapable conclusion: that the aim of the Workers League is to destroy the Fourth International and organizations in political solidarity with it, including the YSA.

The question then arises, can a person who holds these views about the YSA, who has such fundamental differences with the YSA, remain a loyal member of the YSA, help build the YSA, and recruit to its program? The answer is obviously no.

Membership in the Workers League is incompatible with membership in the YSA because loyalty is one of the fundamental prerequisites for membership in the YSA.

The YSA is the only youth organization in this country structured along democratic centralist lines. Every aspect of its program has been reached after the freest, fullest possible discussion since its very inception. Democratic centralism allows every member or grouping the right and the opportunity to raise disagreements on any aspect of the YSA's program or organizational policies during the appropriate time designated for this purpose to try to win over the majority to its point of view. Every possible measure is provided to assure that minority viewpoints get an adequate chance to be heard and expressed.

Once all the questions have been thoroughly discussed and debated a decision is reached by a vote. The will of the majority then becomes the official policy and program of the orga-

nization. Disputed points may be raised again, at the appropriate time when discussion is once again reopened. While minorities have full rights to present their views within the organization, the majority also has the right to have its decisions carried out, and the centralist aspect of our organization ensures that the democratically arrived at decisions of the majority are implemented.

Therefore, loyalty to the YSA is not an abstract concept in the YSA Constitution. Loyalty is a basic prerequisite for membership that ensures that each and every member abides by the decisions of the majority and agrees to build the YSA and carry out its program.

As the NEC statement on the expulsions of Nancy Adolphi and Ken Simpson (Documents on the Cases of Nancy Adolphi and Ken Simpson -- YSA Internal Information Bulletin) states: "It is not correct, however, that one can have any political ideas whatsoever and still be a member of the YSA, so long as one refrains from breaking discipline. There are limits, because we understand that a person can have disagreements with the YSA so basic, so fundamental, that she or he would find it impossible to loyally build the YSA. One cannot be a member of the YSA and advocate support for imperialist war. One cannot be a member of the YSA and support racism. One cannot be a member of the YSA and advocate the destruction of the YSA."

\* \* \*

The NEC constituted itself as the trial body to hear the charges against Comrade Zanellotti. The trial was held on June 10, 1972. The trial body heard testimony from Comrade Zanellotti, Comrade Priddy, Comrade McCaffrey, College Park YSA organizer Steve Sluchan, and Washington D. C. YSA organizer Chuck Petrin.

In his statement to the NEC, presented during the trial proceedings, Zanellotti charges the YSA with having "abandoned the Marxist method," claiming that "this abandonment of Marxism... is leading (the YSA) into open collaboration with the Stalinists and the petty bourgeoisie."

At no time during the course of the trial did Zanellotti attempt to differentiate himself from the politics of the Workers League. In fact, when asked if he was in basic political agreement with the Workers League, Zanellotti replied "Yes." When asked if he agreed with the Workers League position that the YSA is totally reformist and has to be smashed, he replied "Yes." When asked if he believed that a vanguard party exists today in the United States, Zanellotti replied, "I believe that to be the Workers League."

Zanellotti's differences with the YSA are so profound that he admits to being in political agreement with the Workers League, considers the Workers League the revolutionary vanguard party, and believes that the YSA is a revisionist organization in a state of total crisis.

He concludes from this that the YSA needs to be "smashed." Zanellotti's statements at the trial explaining his attitudes toward the Workers League and toward the YSA, even if he were not formally a member of the Workers League, would be unambiguous evidence of disloyalty to the YSA and grounds for expulsion.

Moreover, the National Executive Committee believes the testimony presented to the trial committee confirming that Zanellotti is in fact a member of the Workers League.

The evidence presented to the NEC confirms that the only basis for Zanellotti's membership in the YSA is that of acting as an agent of the Workers League. The purpose of the Workers League in sending agents into the YSA can only be to destroy the YSA and not to build it.

The National Executive Committee finds John Zanellotti guilty of disloyalty as charged, based on his membership in the Workers League.

The National Executive Committee hereby expels John Zanellotti from the YSA.

(Adopted August 7, 1972)