

George
Dobson
Lester
P...

October 1, 1974

To the Leninist Trotskyist Faction Coordinators

Dear Comrades,

Enclosed are the following items:

1. A report by Stateman on the decisions reached by the September 7-8 meeting of the United Secretariat.
2. The IMT statement on the IT's split from the SWP. This was adopted by them as a United Secretariat statement.
3. An exchange of correspondence between Ernest and Mary-Alice concerning the list of IMT nominations to the International Executive Committee.

Comradely,

Ed Shaw

REPORT ON MEETING OF THE UNITED SECRETARIAT, SEPTEMBER 7-8, 1974,
by Stateman

The meeting was a large one. In addition to the regular members of the United Secretariat, a number of IEC members belonging to the IMT attended. The IMT was holding a leadership meeting in conjunction with the United Secretariat meeting. Massey and Barzman attended the IMT meeting, but unlike all the other IEC members present were not asked by the IMT to attend the U.S. meeting.

Members of the United Secretariat who are members of the ITF and who attended the meeting were Johnson, Martinez, and Williams. Celso and Stateman attended as IEC members.

The two major points on the agenda were the call by the SWP Political Committee for a special world congress, and the public debate between the IMT and the Argentine PST.

Special World Congress. The IMT had decided to reject the SWP call for a Special World Congress. The IMT had also prepared a lengthy statement on this question and on the split of the IT from the SWP, attempting to justify the actions of both the IT and the IMT [enclosed]. Although this statement is clearly a statement of the IMT, they insisted on utilizing their majority to pass their statement as a "United Secretariat" document.

The ITF members on the United Secretariat put forward a motion to call for a Special World Congress. The IMT members made a counter-motion calling for an IEC meeting, which, of course, was passed. No date was fixed for the IEC; it was projected for the end of the year or early next year. The IMT comrades proposed three initial points for the IEC agenda: 1) Discussion of a report on the recession of the international capitalist economy and its repercussions; 2) The request by the PC of the SWP to convene an extraordinary world congress of the FI; 3) Discussion of reports on the organizational norms of the F.I. and the conditions for maintaining the unity of the world movement.

The statutes state that a special world congress can be called by one-third of the sections. It was agreed that the ITF could endeavor to obtain support from one-third of the sections and sympathizing groups for such a call, and to do this through the International Internal Discussion Bulletin. Two IIDB's concerning this question were agreed to. One would contain the SWP Control Commission report and Political Committee statement calling for a special world congress, the IMT statement (now passed as a United Secretariat statement), and a new statement by the IT attempting to justify their actions. [See statement sent out with September 26, 1974, mailing.] Since these latter two items are long, it was agreed that the SWP could add additional material to this bulletin to make the pages for each side roughly equal. A second bulletin would contain an appeal by the ITF to the sections and sympathizing groups to call for a special world congress. Thus, while the IMT rejected the call for a special world congress, it was agreed that the ITF could present the substance of its case to the ranks of the International through the IIDB.

2.

The IMT also made a motion, passed unanimously, to ask the International Control Commission to investigate the charges made by the SWP Political Committee against the IMT.

PST Statement. The public statement by the PST Political Bureau refuting the public attack leveled against the PST by the IMT (in the form of a United Secretariat statement), had just been published in Intercontinental Press. The LTF members on the U.S. presented a brief motion, designed to end the public debate on this question. This motion would have had the United Secretariat, in light of the PST statement, acknowledge it had made an error of fact, and therefore an error in its conclusions and characterizations of the PST's political positions. But the IMT comrades, while they appeared to consider a course which would not deepen the public debate, finally rejected this motion and decided to plunge ahead and write a public answer to the PST statement. A lengthy discussion took place on this point, and on the question of how Marxists defend democratic rights in general. It is not clear what the content of the IMT answer to the PST will be. Again, they made the mistake of deciding to make their reply a "United Secretariat" statement.

Under this same point, the LTF comrades raised two other questions. One was the fact that the Spanish-language Cuarta Internacional, published in Argentina, has printed the full text of the IMT's resolution on Argentina, including the attacks on "Morenoism," which the United Secretariat had decided would not be made public. The second was that when the paper of the Swedish section printed the United Secretariat statement attacking the PST, it contained an introduction that also stated, falsely, that the PST was not recognized at the 1969 and 1974 world congresses for political reasons and because its "loyalty to the Fourth International" was in question. On the first point the U.S. unanimously passed a motion urging the editors of Cuarta Internacional to allow the PST to publish in that magazine a rebuttal. On the second point, Swedish comrades who were present at the meeting said that the editors of their paper, being inexperienced, had made an error, and that a correction would be printed.

Under a different agenda point, an IMT comrade who recently went to Argentina reported that the two sympathizing groups that supported the IMT, the Fracción Bolchevique and the Fracción Roja, had suffered a number of splits since the world congress. There are now six groupings extant who are offshoots of the Fracción Bolchevique, the Fracción Roja, and the Grupo Obrero Revolucionario. None of them publishes a regular organ.

A report on Greece indicated that the Greek section has emerged in the new political situation as a cohesive and active organization. It was agreed that the U.S. would send two representatives, one from the IMT and one from the LTF, to meet with these comrades.

A discussion on Chile defense work resulted in a motion, unanimously agreed to, to the effect that there is no need for internationally centralized tactics in this work, and each section or sympathizing group should continue to work out its own tactics.

3.

In a discussion of the Krivine tour to Canada and the factional manner it was carried out, leaders of the FCR insisted that the FCR bore sole responsibility for the tour, and the IMT had nothing to do with it. A point was made that Comrade Mandel's Australian tour was organized by both sympathizing groups there.

September 27, 1974

[The following three motions were adopted by the United Secretariat at the meeting of September 7-8, 1974.]

Motion

The Un. Secr. requests the International Control Commission to investigate the accusation made by the PC of the SWP that "the leadership of the International Majority Tendency, including elected members of the United Secretariat, was involved in the split operation carried out by the IT...". It requests that this body make a full investigation of all the facts and conditions leading to these accusations and submit a report to the next International Executive Committee on the basis of its findings relative to all these facts and conditions.

Motion

The United Secretariat decides to convene a session of the IEC for the Christmas 1974 period.

It proposes as first points on the agenda of that meeting:

- (1) Discussion of a report on the recession of the international capitalist economy and its repercussions.
- (2) The request by the PC of the SWP to convene an extraordinary world congress of the FI.
- (3) Discussion of reports on the organizational norms of the FI and the conditions for maintaining the unity of the world movement.

At its next session, the United Secretariat will discuss possible addition of supplementary items to that agenda.

The United Secretariat recalls what was clearly stated at the 10th World Congress: that in view of the substantial extension of the number of IEC members, the United Secretariat can take no financial responsibility for travel expenses to the IEC meeting(s), nor cover them out of its normal budget.

Motion

To adopt the general line of the draft statement submitted in reply to the SWP PC statement of July 4, 1974.

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

Draft Statement of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International Regarding the Call for a Special World Congress of the Fourth International Adopted by the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party on July 4, 1974 - Draft Submitted by the IMT members of the United Secretariat

[The general line of this statement was adopted by the United Secretariat majority at the meeting on September 7-8]

The United Secretariat placed on its agenda the request of the SWP that a call for a special world congress of the Fourth International be issued. It has examined the contents of the statement adopted by the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party on July 4, 1974, which argues the case in favor of such a special congress; the report of the Control Commission of the Socialist Workers Party submitted to the PC of the SWP on July 2, 1974; the motions adopted by the PC of the SWP on July 4, 1974; and all matters relevant to these issues contained in the SWP's Internal Information Bulletin No. 6 in 1974, which has been widely circulated throughout the FI by unilateral decision of the SWP; and the IT statement of July 5 protesting the expulsion and demanding immediate re-integration. The United Secretariat has decided to issue the following statement in regard to the above-mentioned material.

The United Secretariat of the FI notes that the July 2, 1974, report of the SWP Control Commission contains the following sentence: "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." (IIB No. 6 in 1974, p. 6). It further notes that the statement adopted by the SWP Political Committee on July 4, 1974, contains the following sentence, "the leadership of the International Majority Tendency (IMT), including elected members of the United Secretariat, was involved in the split operation carried out by the IT. . .the IMT allowed the split operation to proceed and helped to cover it up." (IIB No. 6, in 1974, p. 18).

The United Secretariat considers these accusations to be of the gravest possible nature, for they allege that a substantial part, if not the majority, of the elected leadership bodies of the FI were party to an alleged split of the world Trotskyist movement. It rejects these accusations as unfounded, slanderous, and scandalous. It has decided to transmit the matter of these slanderous accusations to the International Control Commission and requests that this body make a full investigation of all the facts and conditions leading to these accusations and submit a report to the next International Executive Committee on the basis of its findings relative to all these facts and conditions.

The United Secretariat wants to reiterate what it has stated many times before on the occasion of various discussions and disputes within the FI since the reunification of 1963. It is of the firm conviction that an international organization can and will be built only if certain rules are respected by all members, sections, tendencies, and factions:

"Respect of discipline of national sections, which means the respect of their statutes, of the right of elected leaderships to lead the organization in all public activities, of the right of minorities to full freedom of discussion during pre-congress discussion periods or other occasions of discussion decided by the leadership, of the substantial and not merely formal right of minorities to form tendencies or factions on declared political platforms, of the necessity of subordinating the functioning of such formations to the collective needs of party building under the leadership of the section.

"Respect of the discipline of the International, which means respect of its statutes, of the duty to apply World Congress decisions, of the right of the elected leadership of the FI to lead the organization in all international public activities, of the right of minorities to full freedom of discussion during pre-world congress discussions or other occasions of discussion decided on by the leadership of the FI, of the substantial and not merely formal right of international minorities to form international tendencies or factions on declared political platforms, of the necessity of subordinating the functioning of such formations to the collective needs of building the international under the leadership of its elected bodies."

Obviously, these common rules of national and international democratic centralism should also apply to the SWP, which is prevented by the reactionary Voorhis Act from being a section of the FI but which operates in full solidarity with the world Trotskyist movement.

This means that the United Secretariat has not supported and will not support, uphold, or defend any act that violates these rules, whatever formal justification or cover up may be advanced. We consider these rules to be substantive and not at all "formal" in nature.

We consider that defense and application of the program of revolutionary Marxism leading to the victory of the world socialist revolution -- the very reason for the existence of the FI -- is impossible without the building of an international organization based on the full program and embodied in living cadres acting along those lines. We consider that nowhere in the world are there substantial forces outside of the Fourth International that have shown by historical record any ability or inclination to fulfill that task better or more effectively than the sections of the Fourth International (and the SWP in the United States). We therefore consider that the solution of the crisis of leadership of the world proletariat can be realized only through the building of these

organizations. Whatever differences exist today, however substantial they may be in this or that field, however much a tendency or faction may believe that a radical change in policy or leadership in this or that part of the movement is called for, there is no indication that this basic rule can be challenged and that the building of revolutionary Marxist parties can be achieved more effectively outside that established organizational framework.

The basis of the unity of the Fourth International is exactly this principled political conviction, and not some tactical or diplomatic consideration. We stand on that principled conviction. We defend it everywhere. And we reiterate that without complete and unquestioned assimilation of that conviction, the unity of the Fourth International will be threatened by what we call "organizational sectarianism" or blind factionalism; that is, the tendency of groupings to decide to "go it alone" every time serious differences arise (as they are apt to arise in a world movement like the Fourth International, subjected to the pressure of constantly varying relations between the classes in many countries and in many ways), the tendency to try to "test out in practice" the ability of small factions to "build the party" through the application of some particular gimmick, tactic or shortcut. The same tendency has sometimes been evidenced in attempts by majorities to impose a monolithic situation in national sections. History has conclusively proven that such disruptive organizational sectarianism only weakens the movement as a whole and reduces the ability to test out in practice any tactics, including those advocated by the factionalists themselves.

We also reiterate that in a democratic movement, these rules will be observed only if they are observed universally, if no section or tendency, or faction of the movement claims as privileges for itself rights that it is not willing to grant to others and if all aspects of these rules are observed equally. Only on that condition will organizational disputes be eliminated from center-stage and will the movement's political practice become the sole supreme test of whether this or that line defended by this or that formation has shown itself to be effective in building the Fourth International on the basis of its commonly agreed on program.

II

In addition to charging that the IMT leadership helped or covered up a split in the SWP, the statement adopted by the SWP PC on July 4, 1974 makes the following charges against the IMT leadership, that is, against the majority of the members of the United Secretariat and the IEC:

-Operating as a secret faction and engaging in secret political discussion behind the back of the elected bodies of the F.I. (IIB, No. 6 in 1974, pp. 18-19).

-Having set up a "secret apparatus paralleling the official elected bodies of the Fourth International. Parallel to the IEC, there is the IMT Steering Committee; parallel to

the United Secretariat, there is the IMT Enlarged Bureau; parallel to the administrative bureau of the United Secretariat, there is the IMT administrative Bureau. . .". (IIB No. 6 in 1974, p. 20).

The "proof" advanced to support these allegations is the fact that the IMT leadership was aware of the internal discussions in the IT around an alledged split course, warned these comrades against that course, but did not immediately inform the elected bodies of the SWP and the FI about these trends and did not seek the "aid of the leaderships of the SWP and the FI to prevent the split." (IIB No. 6 in 1974, p. 18).

The accusation that the IEC majority tendency operates as a "secret faction," already made previously by IEC minority members of the leading bodies of the International, is ridiculous and unfounded. The IEC Majority tendency announced its formation and its platform publicly to all members of the FI through statements published in the International Information Bulletin during the discussion prior to the Tenth World Congress. It submitted political documents to that discussion and to the vote of that congress. It designated reporters to that congress, as well as to numerous national congresses that had been held prior to the world congress. It submitted a list of Steering Committee members, these being the IEC members agreeing with the general line of the IEC Majority documents. It submitted a slate of candidates for the IEC at the World Congress, and that slate was elected. There was and is nothing "secret" about any of these normal applications of the right of tendency, upheld by the statutes of the FI. Besides at the end of the 10th World Congress, it was stated clearly by common agreement of the two main tendencies at this congress that these were not to be dissolved formally, that the dissolution could be only the consequence of a process within the life of the international.

The grave accusation so lightmindedly advanced by the statement of the SWP PC rest on two assertions:

(1) That "secret" parallel bodies are functioning in addition to the publicly and officially declared Steering Committee of the IMT. This accusation is unfounded. What's more, the accusation itself implies a further questioning of the substantive right to form tendencies, as we already warned the members of the IEC when we answered the SWP PC's comments on the so-called Domingo letter.

When formally declared tendencies exist on a political basis, it is absolutely normal that their members consult each other on issues arising out of discussions in leadership bodies. Would the SWP PC deny the right of United Secretariat members adhering to the IEC Majority tendency to consult each other on matters discussed at the United Secretariat? Do they deny that right also to IEC minority members?

Such a denial would imply that the right to form tendencies and factions is in fact restricted exclusively to the right to

hold literary discussions in internal bulletins. It would give elected majority leaderships immense privileges of centralisation and would suppress that minimum of centralisation for minority tendencies without which no real tendency struggle could be waged. It would in fact be an important step toward strangling internal democracy and the right to form tendencies and factions inside the FI, an important step toward the bureaucratization of our movement.

We will not accept any such restrictive interpretation of democratic centralism. We will not deny the right of mutual consultation and the elaboration of mutual proposals for individual participating in minority tendency or faction members on leading bodies concerning any proposals coming up at these bodies. But just as we uphold these rights for minorities, we must uphold them for majorities as well. The SWP PC accuses the IEC Majority tendency of having set up "secret parallel bodies." We reject that accusation. We say that what they call "secret parallel bodies" are merely the normal consultation channels of members of a tendency who are members of leading bodies of the International or of any of its sections and sympathizing groups.

(2) That the leaders of the IEC Majority tendency failed to inform the leading body of the SWP and FI of the internal discussing going on in the IT and failed to warn the SWP leadership about the danger of a split involved in proposals submitted to the IT by various individuals? The SWP leadership admits in passing--and in contradiction to the final paragraph of the July 2 report of the SWP control commission as well as to various allegations contained in other paragraphs of the July 4th statement of the SWP PC -- that the leaders of the IEC majority tendency warned the IT against any course or step that could lead to their expulsion from the SWP. Later, such clearly acknowledged warnings are construed as "proving" that the leaders of the IEC majority tendency "covered up" a split or were even "party" to it!

Here again, what the SWP Political Committee is actually doing is challenging the right of a tendency to have internal discussions. We must strongly stress that this right exists and that we reject such challenges of it. The organisational rules of Leninism do not and cannot entail any "duty" of members of a tendency to "inform" the opposite tendency about internal discussions.

Whether it would have been easier to homogenize the IT around the perspective of building the tendency in the SWP and the YSA and avoid organisational mistakes in the framework of the factional atmosphere of the SWP and the YSA inside a common tendency, or whether it would have been easier to do this through an opened discussion in the world movement as a whole, a discussion involving strong factional opponents of that tendency, is a matter on which we obviously have opinions that differ strongly with those of the Political Committee of the SWP. But that no "secret faction" or "violations of democratic centralism" are involved in such internal tendency

discussions is a matter of organisational principle on which we stand unequivocally, in defense of the fundamental democratic rights of all members of the FI.

The apparent indignation of the SWP PC on both these matters -- "secret parallel bodies" and "secret consultations and discussions" within a tendency -- would sound more convincing and less hypocritical if the comrades of the IEC Minority faction (with whom the SWP PC is in close solidarity and association, although it is prevented by reactionary legislation from belonging to it) had acted differently from the manner in which they claim the IEC majority tendency to have acted. In that case we would have had a genuine difference on an organisational principle. This could have led to an interesting and constructive international discussion.

But the reality is that the IEC minority faction and with it the SWP leadership has been following precisely the same procedure that the SWP PC reproaches the IEC majority tendency for having followed. In light of this fact, the "accusations" made by the PC of the SWP can only be interpreted as a claim for special privileges for one side -- privileges that are at the same time hotly denied to the other side. Such organisational "principles" are inadmissible and can only disrupt the movement.

The SWP PC statement of July 4, 1974, says: "This (behavior of the IEC majority) contrasts sharply with the methods employed by the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction (LTF). The LTF was openly declared. Its membership, leadership structure, and limits of its discipline, were all openly stated" (IIB No. 6 in 1974, p. 19).

Were they indeed? The only leadership of the IEC minority faction that has been "openly declared" is the list of members of its Steering Committee, parallel to the "openly declared" Steering Committee of the IEC Majority Tendency. But in addition to that "openly declared" Steering Committee, there are various other bodies functioning, bodies that, according to the logic of the SWP PC, should be branded and condemned as "secret bodies." According to the same logic, the fact that they don't even have formal names (at least, it would seem, formal names used in writing) makes them even more "conspiratorial" and "secret," and thereby more reprehensible and no less real and functional.

Prior, during and after each and every meeting of the United Secretariat, IEC minority section members of that body meet and consult each other. Various members of the IEC Minority Faction who are not members of the United Secretariat, and sometimes not even members of the IEC, are involved in these "secret" consultations. What is the nature of this "secret body"? What is its composition? The International has never been informed of this secret body -- not the leadership of the International, and not its membership --. Is it a "sub-bureau" of the IEC Minority Faction Steering Committee? Is it a "subfaction"? What is its undeclared political plat-

form? What is its function? Is it to work out common lines, proposals, and votes for the meeting of the United Secretariat behind the back of that body? What terrible behavior! Is the IEC Minority Faction a "secret faction" with parallel leadership bodies? We of course never thought of raising such questions because we recognized that there was in the United Secretariat and in the International a minority that could not function without such meetings.

There is definite documentary evidence that the IEC Minority Faction has created a "faction center" to which correspondence is addressed. Never has the existence of this "center," its composition or its various functions been communicated to the leadership or the membership of the FI. According to the logic contained in the SWP PC statement of July 4, 1974, the IEC minority has thereby committed the deadly sin of creating a "secret center."

The IEC minority faction has been engaged in stepped-up international factional activity since the world congress (which is not very "normal" in the framework of democratic centralism, to say the least). This activity involves a great deal of travel and significant expense. We have convincing evidence that the trips are not being done by the members of the "publicly declared Steering Committee" of the IEC minority faction taken as a body. It is done by individuals, some of whom are not among the members of that "publicly declared Steering Committee." Who selects these individuals? Who decides the allocation of funds? A full meeting of the "openly declared Steering Committee"? Does this body meet every day? Is there an intense correspondence and telephone network working day and night to decide about these grave matters of principle? Or has decision-making power in such matters been delegated to the "secret center," somebody that acts in practice like a day-to-day faction bureau? European supporters of the IEC minority faction have consulted each other on various occasions "behind the back of their respective sections and their normally elected leaderships," as one can easily substantiate from documentary evidence. What is the name of that "secret body" whose existence and composition has never been made known to the leadership of the International? Is it perhaps a "secret European sub-bureau" of the IEC minority faction?

Through the medium of the Militant, the members of the United Secretariat, including three associate editors of Intercontinental Press, learned accidentally that IP had decided to include Spanish-language material. Never had this measure -- perhaps useful, perhaps constructive, perhaps of extreme importance for the building of the FI -- been discussed or submitted to any leadership body of the FI. Who took that decision? The PC of the SWP? Since when is Intercontinental Press an organ of the SWP? Or is it the organ of the secret "faction center" of the IEC minority? Has IP become a faction organ? In addition to that decision, it was decided to transfer to the staff of IP several leading members of sections or sympathizing organizations of the FI, without any consultation

or information to the United Secretariat. What secret body took these decisions, in open violation of article 32 of the statutes?

For four months the FI has been faced with a very grave political problem. One of its sympathizing organizations, the PST of Argentina, whose leaders are among the leading members of the IEC minority faction, is publicly on record as favoring the defense of the institutions of bourgeois democracy, that is, of a specific form of the bourgeois state, in alliance with bourgeois parties against the allegedly immediate threat of fascist or right-wing dictatorship. This is a complete reversal of the fundamental programmatic position of revolutionary Marxism, the position that only a workers (or workers and peasants) united front can conduct an effective struggle against fascism and that any sort of confusion between the defense of democratic rights for the workers movement and defense of the institutions of the bourgeois state actually feeds the fascist onslaught.

Nowhere in the "openly declared" political documents of the IEC minority faction is there anything that could be interpreted as acceptance of such a revisionist position. It could therefore have been assumed that the IEC minority members of the United Secretariat would have immediately disassociated themselves from these positions. But they did not. They stalled for month after month, evaded any precise political position, tried to obstruct the United Secretariat from acting in defense of the principles and programmatic integrity of our movement which they are duty bound to uphold, and even went so far as to refuse to make their position on the substantive matter involved in these discussions known to the leaders of the FI, not to mention the members of the FI. In the meantime, they were involved in frantic "secret" negotiations with the PST leadership, exchanging telephone calls and sending emissaries to and from Argentina, all "behind the back" of the elected leadership bodies of the FI, without giving the members of these bodies an opportunity to participate in these "secret" discussions.

Is this not the operation of a "secret faction" trying to patch up internal differences behind the back of the movement and subordinating the common interests of the Fourth International to the sordid goal of maintaining a common factional facade even on such a grave programmatic and principled issue and even in face of growing differences within the IEC minority faction on this matter?

Who took the decision to follow such a disastrous course? Was it the IEC minority faction's Steering Committee? When did that body's meeting on this issue take place? Why was this meeting and its agenda "hidden" from the normally elected leadership bodies of the FI? And if this decision was not taken by the "openly declared" IEC minority faction Steering Committee, what other person or persons, acting as a "secret faction administrative secretariat" or "political bureau" took it upon themselves to advocate and follow such an unprincipled course

"behind the back of the elected leadership" of the FI?

The IEC minority faction's alleged "organizational principle" on matters of "parallel leadership bodies" is contradicted by its own practice. Likewise, the practice of the IEC minority faction in the matter of threatened splits in Trotskyist organizations is in crying contradiction to its alleged commitment to public discussion in the whole international as opposed to "internal faction discussion." There are at least four cases that testify to such behavior:

1. During the summer of 1972 a violent discussion on the question of "Canadian nationalism" erupted in that part of the Canadian section that later came to adhere to the IEC minority faction. As soon as he got wind of what looked like a very wrong political position being adopted by the majority of that grouping, a leading member of the future IEC minority faction took a plane to Canada, entered into closed discussions with the comrades involved, and achieved a reversal of political position leading to a change in leadership. This action led to the formation of the tendency led by Ross Dowson and to a struggle that ended in the split from the Canadian section of one of its acknowledged leaders for more than 20 years and of a substantial part of the section's oldest working-class cadre. Dowson was at the time a member of the IEC.

We can easily grant that the intentions of the IEC minority leadership involved in this operation were honorable. They wanted to defend the programmatic and organizational integrity of the FI in Canada. But the point they make in the case of the IT discussions obviously applies equally to the intervention in the ISA/LSO discussion by a leader of the IEC minority. At no time was the leadership of the FI, of which this comrade was a member, informed or consulted about this operation. At no time was the United Secretariat informed of the gravity of the differences involved. At no time were we informed of the fact -- already known to leaders of the IEC minority faction -- that the Ross Dowson grouping had decided to vote for the IEC minority and against the IEC majority documents in the pre-world-congress debate (thereby influencing the out-come of the world congress) while at the same time this grouping had already decided to split from the Canadian section and the FI and to set up a separate organization and a separate newspaper.

Why did the leaders of the IEC minority faction hide this fact from the United Secretariat, the IEC, and the world congress? Why didn't they act as "responsible leaders" who "would have immediately placed before the elected bodies of the FI" the information they had of the split plans of the Ross Dowson tendency and "sought the aid of the leadership of the FI" in preventing the split? Because they placed the interests of their own faction above the interests of the FI, subordinating everything to the rather childish consideration of preventing IEC majority members from receiving additional ammunition in their attempts to go "dragon hunting in the North?"

2. In the autumn of 1972 a split took place in the GCI, the Mexican sympathizing section of the FI. This split was engineered by a youth tendency that was sympathetic to and later joined the IEC minority tendency (and later the IEC minority faction). There is substantial evidence of close consultation in the months and week preceding the split between the leaders of that youth tendency and leading North and South American associates of the IEC minority faction. At no time was the United Secretariat or any other leadership body of the International informed about these consultations and discussions; we were merely faced with the fait accompli of the split.

It is probable that during these consultations and discussions the North American associates of the IEC minority faction exercised a restraining influence, trying to avoid a split. It is less probable that the South American associates of that faction acted in the same way; indeed there is some evidence that they counseled and favored a split course. But independently of that, we note that the IEC minority leaders did not follow the course they now claim to be the course of "responsible leaders." They did not immediately place their information about the internal debates among IEC minority associates about the possibility of a split in Mexico before the elected bodies of the FI. They did not seek the aid of the GCI leadership and the FI leadership in preventing the split.

3. Barely two months after the Tenth World Congress comrade Tony Roberts, a leading member of the IEC minority faction who was elected to the IEC on the slate of that faction at the Tenth World Congress, decided to split from the IMG, British section of the Fourth International, and join a small grouping called the RCG. This split is all the more irresponsible in that this grouping had in fact opened unity negotiations with the IMG and comrade Roberts is busy poisoning their minds about alleged "violations of internal democracy" in the IMG.

The first thing the United Secretariat heard about the resignation of this member of the IMG was its receipt of his letter of resignation. It is difficult to believe that the IEC minority faction had no prior information as to the plans of this comrade, especially in that his brother and close political cothinker for years remains a member of the IEC minority tendency inside the IMG. Yet at no time was the leadership of the IMG or the FI informed about the discussions in the IEC minority tendency inside the IMG that had preceded this resignation. (Likewise, neither the IMG nor FI leadership has ever been informed about a mysterious split followed by a no less mysterious reunification between the Roberts brothers and the other IMG supporters of the IEC minority faction some time previously.) At no time did the IEC minority faction apply to itself the rule of conduct that it now sets up as the guide to action of "responsible leaders." At no time did the IEC minority leadership bring its information to the leading bodies of the IMG and the FI and "seek the aid of these bodies" in preventing a split.

4. But the worst instance of all is the one relative to the split inside the SWP itself. There is now evidence that the leadership of the SWP had finally made up its mind to expel the IT at the time of the June 20, 1974 meeting of the SWP National Committee. (The expulsion is based almost exclusively on the evidence of internal IT documents that, according to the Political Committee, were obtained by the Control Commission in the two weeks prior to its July 2, 1974, report.) There is definite testimony that members of the IEC minority faction's Steering Committee living in Europe had been consulted on the advisability of these expulsions prior to the July 4, 1974, meeting of the SWP PC. The leadership of the IEC minority faction, as well as the SWP Political Committee, knew that a United Secretariat meeting was scheduled for July 3-4. Yet on this matter of the greatest importance for the unity of the world Trotskyist movement -- the question of the unity of the SWP and the grave possible consequences of the expulsion of the IT -- they preferred not to apply their alleged standards of how "responsible leaders" should behave. Their representatives and associates were present at that United Secretariat meeting. They hid the preparation of the intended expulsions from that body, not even putting the question on the agenda of the meeting. In no way did they "place immediately before the normally elected bodies of the FI" these grave threats to the unity of the world movement, nor did they seek the "aid of the leadership of the FI to prevent the split." On the contrary, they acted "secretly," "behind the back" of the leadership, informing only the factional grapevine, thus putting factional discipline above the interests of the elected leadership and the collective interests of the world movement.

In view of all this evidence, it is impossible to resist the conclusion that the leadership of the IEC minority faction wants to impose grave constraints on the right of the IEC majority tendency to function as a tendency, constraints that it does not recognize as applying to the functioning of its own faction. This is in accordance with the fact already denounced before the World Congress that the SWP leadership applies double standards -- one for itself and another for the majority of the International. An international organization can never be built on the basis of double standards. This is why we reject outright all the accusations about the alleged "secret faction" operations of the IEC majority made in the July 4, 1974, statement of the SWP Political Committee.

III

The claims of the SWP PC and the SWP Control Commission are summarized in the title given to Internal Information Bulletin No. 6 in 1974: "Materials Related to the Split of the Internationalist Tendency from the Socialist Workers Party." If this title is supposed to indicate what happened in the Socialist Workers Party in May, June, and July 1974, we are certainly dealing with one of the strangest notions in the already over-rich history of organizational disputes and

splits in the workers movement and in revolutionary organizations. What the SWP Political Committee purports to call a "split" is a previously unheard of species: a split which had not taken place, until those who made it "discovered" an unknown party.

We are faced with the undeniable fact that the comrades of the IT most strongly deny ever having "split" or having had the intention of splitting from the SWP (see Statement by the IT). Regardless of whether these comrades have or have not committed breaches of discipline, no formalistic or talmudic mental gymnastics can warp the meaning of words to the point that a split (that is, the leaving of an organization) can be imputed to people who have never left the organization and who, in an internal memorandum issued July 1, two months after their alleged split, define their activities explicitly in the framework of the SWP and YSA and the respect of the discipline of these organizations.

In reality, what we are faced with is the expulsion of the IT from the SWP on the grounds that the IT set up a secret and tightly organized faction with its own discipline inside the SWP; that this faction has broken public discipline on several occasions; and that it has been systematically subordinating the discipline and interests of party building to the interests of its faction. Even if all these accusations were completely correct and substantiated by unassailable evidence, they would prove the existence of a secret faction in the SWP and not the existence of a separate organization outside the SWP. The question would then be one of judging whether the expulsion of that faction would be justified and under what conditions and through what procedures. The preposterous statement that the faction had itself "split" and set up a separate organization outside the SWP would still be out of order.

Furthermore, any Trotskyist leadership respecting the spirit and letter of democratic centralism would have been duty bound to communicate the proposal for expulsion to the members of the secret faction and to explain the charges on which the proposal was based. It would have been duty bound to give them the opportunity to defend themselves against these charges, as is clearly called for in articles 29 h and 43 of the statutes of the FI, adopted at the Tenth World Congress. (Although the SWP is forbidden by reactionary legislation from becoming a section of the Fourth International, the definition of democratic centralism contained in these statutes accepted by the SWP at the 10th World Congress can be considered as having universal application to all Trotskyist organizations, irrespective of formal affiliation to the FI.)

The whole fanciful "split" of the "Internationalist Tendency party" -- a party of which nobody has ever heard, a "party" that lacks a program, statutes, public statements, press organs, or even a name -- is merely a convenient device used by the SWP leadership to avoid the burdensome procedure of

granting members threatened with wholesale expulsion the elementary right to defend themselves, a right explicitly guaranteed by our statutes. This sets a grave precedent in the history of the Trotskyist movement, the champion of workers democracy and staunch defender of the fundamental difference between democratic centralism and bureaucratic centralism. One essential aspect of the difference is precisely the right guaranteed under democratic centralism to minorities to defend themselves against the charges and threatened disciplinary action by leaderships. This is a tradition of which we are proud, and we will defend and uphold it as a basic principle of the Trotskyist movement.

The SWP's IIB No. 6 in 1974 presents only two charges that relate to the IT functioning outside the SWP: that the IT collaborated with "opponent groups" outside the SWP and that one (we repeat, one) non-member of the SWP and YSA allegedly attended the IT national conference held May 25-27. The latter charge has been extensively refuted in the IT answer to the expulsion. As to the first accusation, it is clear that such collaboration behind the back of the leadership of a section of the FI, or of an organization like the SWP that is prevented by reactionary legislation from affiliating to the FI, would be inadmissible and violate democratic centralism. Since then, the members of these so-called opponent groups (28 people in 3 cities) have sent letters applying for membership in the SWP in which they clearly state their agreement with the program and policies of the FI and their resolution to recognize the leadership and organization of the SWP and abide by its discipline. The IT has stated that what actually happened was that some comrades of the IT came into contact with sympathizers of the FI with the perspective of recruiting them to the SWP. We think that the IT made a mistake in not fully and officially informing the SWP of these contacts until its letter of June 9. There is no doubt in our minds that certain comrades of the IT have behaved wrongly in respect to such contacts outside the SWP (be they extremely limited and marginal in character). However, under advice of the IEC majority tendency they showed their willingness to make a self-criticism on this point and corrected their course. (The SWP's harsh and unfraternal attitude toward them has not helped that process of correction, to say the least.) It appears to us completely unjustified to expel them on this very narrow charge.

It must again be pointed out that the comrades of the IEC minority faction, who take such an uncompromising attitude on the duties of minorities in the SWP, become rather more generous when it comes to evaluating the behavior of the adherents of their own faction in organizations in which they are a minority:

1. In Britain members of the IEC minority faction (including one leading member) took it upon themselves to maintain contacts with the RSL, a group that split from the Fourth International, and even to speak before an aggregate of this organization. Unlike the "opponent groups" with which the

IT is said to have associated, the RSL publicly and constantly attacks the Fourth International and its British section. These contacts occurred without previous consultation with the elected bodies of the FI or of the British section.

2. Leading comrades of the PST (a sympathizing organization of the Fourth International) who are at the same time leading members of the IEC minority faction, have been active for months, if not years, in contacting and working with various Bolivian persons and groupings behind the back of the Bolivian section and the United Secretariat. In fact, we found this out only when we read in Avanzada Socialista the brazen public assertion of this intrigue: a "greeting" sent to the congress of the PST by "revolutionary socialist Bolivians" outside the official section of the FI in Bolivia.

3. Comrade Hugo Blanco, a member of the United Secretariat and a leading member of the IEC minority faction, several times visited Portugal on behalf of his faction. There he contacted all sorts of individuals and grouplets, including a Lambertist one, without first asking the advice, opinion, or instruction of the United Secretariat or the leadership of the ICI, sympathizing organization of the FI in Portugal. To top it off, he granted a friendly interview to the weekly paper of the Lambertist organization in France, which is a bitter opponent of the FI and our French section and engages in constant slander against both.

Presumably, according to the standards laid down by the SWP PC, the comrades involved in these practices should now be expelled forthwith from the FI, as the IT has been expelled from the SWP. Or should we rather conclude again that the IEC minority faction claims more rights for its own adherents than it grants to adherents of the IEC minority tendency, and rights that trample on the norms of democratic centralism?

In the SWP's internal information bulletin accusations that, if proven, would constitute real breaches of discipline on the part of the IT are interwoven with allegations of such breaches of discipline that cannot be accepted as real. These fall into two categories:

First, statements and evaluations made during internal discussions of a tendency or faction about the nature and perspectives of the organization within which they function, and statements and evaluations about the nature and perspectives of the tendency or faction are construed as providing grounds for organizational reprisals. We would readily concur with the leadership of the SWP that some of the statements and evaluations in question made by individuals of the IT are of a highly irresponsible nature and could only increase to the utmost the suspicions the SWP leadership might have been harboring about the IT comrades. To speak of one's party as "completely degenerate" and its membership as "politically incapable of either understanding or putting into practice a revolutionary line," is utterly false. We note that the IT

comrades have made an appropriate self-criticism in this regard, making it clear that they are prepared to accept the discipline of the SWP not for "tactical" reasons but because they are convinced as we are that today the building of the revolutionary party in the United States means the building of the SWP.

But it is alien to the traditions of Bolshevism and Trotskyism to discipline or expel comrades for opinions expressed in internal discussion, however harsh and provocative these opinions may be. Indeed, not a single example can be cited from Lenin's party in which expulsions were carried out on such grounds, despite the fact that some of Lenin's factional opponents used language that was quite stronger than that used by the IT comrades (in 1918 for example, during the Brest-Litovsk discussion). To initiate organizational reprisals not for acts of indiscipline but for opinions expressed is to begin to strangle free internal discussion and debate. It leads logically to methods of internal witch-hunting, trying to discover the "secret" opinions of fork-tongued party members. This is not in conformity with the statutes of the FI nor with the definition of democratic centralism as we understand it and as it is explained in the programmatic and official documents of the FI. It can only poison the atmosphere in an organization and hinder frank and democratic tendency debate.

Second, it is alleged that the IT comrades have endowed themselves with a form of organization, internal financing, and discipline that goes far beyond that of an ideological tendency. In fact they formed a tightly knit faction and should have described themselves as such. They should have called their leading bodies faction organs and not "PC," etc. It is further alleged that the IT comrades have heavily concentrated their commitments in finances and press sales on either faction activities or activities in conformity with their tendency opinions (sales of FI organs like Old Mole, INPRECOR, and International). We would fully agree with any leading comrade who stated that all these attitudes are unhealthy and indicate the existence of a highly explosive factional atmosphere uncondusive to the defense of party unity and of the overall interests of party building. But we cannot accept that they are synonymous with public breaches of discipline. One could say that the responsibility of the SWP leadership -- in which the IT was not represented -- would have been to give guidance to the tendency in proposing to it meaningful fields of activity which wouldn't lead it into conflict with the interests of party building. And the very least one can say is that such a type of behavior was not initiated by the IT comrades. They were merely following the example set previously by comrades of the IEC minority faction, beginning with the British supporters of that faction.

Let us refresh the memory of the members of the SWP PC and the IEC minority faction leadership in this regard. Without asking either the advice or permission of the IMG

or the U.SEC, Comrade Adair at the time a member of the USec and of the NC of the IMG, took it upon himself to become a full-time "sales agent" of Pathfinder Press in Britain, concentrating on the circulation of Intercontinental Press. Intercontinental Press is supposed to be an organ of the International. But without any consultation with the International's leading bodies, and without any decision being made by them, funds were made available (by whom?) for setting up a public Pathfinder Press center in London (and later in Nottingham as well), premises were hired, up to six additional full- and part-timers were apparently employed. The entire group of supporters of the IEC minority faction in the IMG became organized around these activities, selling only Intercontinental Press at public activities of the IMG and public activities of the International, going so far as to appear wearing recognition badges on which were printed "Intercontinental Press."

At no time had the IMG or the United Secretariat decided that members of the IMG should devote their exclusive public activity for a period of several years to the sale of Intercontinental Press instead of to sales of the official organs of the British section. At no time were the supporters in the IMG of the IEC minority faction granted permission to behave in this way. At no time did they even request such permission. They simply went ahead and did it, neglecting their general financial, party-building, and party-defending activities toward the IMG, at least to the same extent as the IT comrades are accused of having done in the SWP.

Yet when these comrades were mildly challenged by the IMG leadership for this obviously abnormal behavior -- not expelled or even suspended, just mildly challenged and, in one case, censured -- the entire IEC minority faction (then tendency) was up in arms. How can anyone dare to try to prevent comrade Harris from "making a living" through the sale of Intercontinental Press and Pathfinder literature? How can anyone dare censure (not expel or suspend, just censure) a minority comrade for "breaches of discipline" without due process of law, without first presenting him with written charges, without granting him every right to defend himself? The Political Committee of the SWP even voted a resolution condemning the IMG for such an "abuse of authority." But in the SWP and YSA more than 100 comrades are being expelled for similar, if not much milder, acts of a factional character without any possibility of being confronted with written charges, without any possibility of defending themselves against charges whose nature they learned only after they had already been expelled. Should this not also be considered an "abuse of authority"?

Once again the conclusion is unavoidable: The IEC minority faction claims for itself and its supporters privileges that it refuses to grant to the majority of the members and supporters of the FI. Such an "organizational principle" is inadmissible. No international organization will ever be built in a durable manner on such a weak foundation. We cannot in any way accept such a principle. The same rules must and shall apply to everyone in the world Trotskyist movement.

We repeat: The method of factional selection of public activities and priorities and of financial commitments, first started by the supporters of the IEC minority faction within the IMG and now repeated by other groupings, including the IT in the SWP, is highly irregular and abnormal. We cannot support or condone it as correct behavior. But when such actions occur, they testify to the existence of a tense factional situation that in turn cannot be alleviated by organizational reprisals. Organizational reprisals can only exacerbate the factional situation and increase the risk of a split. That is why we did not approve of the sanctions taken against the supporters of the IEC minority faction in the IMG, even though they had given the leadership grounds for those sanctions. This is why we advised the leadership of the IMG to give supporters of the IEC minority faction meaningful areas of public activity with which they could easily [word or sentences missing; in an earlier draft this phrase ends with "agree"]. Since the fact finding commission report, the IMG has complied with these recommendations. The SWP, however, has followed a completely different course. The SWP leadership refused to give the IT any representation on the NC. This was protested by comrade Livio Maitan, the representative of the United Secretariat to the August 1973 SWP convention. In addition, the IT has extensively documented in its letters of October 29, 1973, and June 9, 1974, other outstanding factional acts by the leadership of the SWP, such as factional exclusion from assignments and a factional recruitment policy.

Comrade Diego, a vigorous spokesman for the IEC minority faction and a staunch defender of the SWP leadership, had the following to say about the dispute in the IMG that led to the United Secretariat's setting up a fact finding commission:

"The documents of the IMG are full of references to the principles of 'democratic centralism.' This is not some abstract concept that more often than not is saluted in a ritualistic way. It involves a scrupulous regard for the democratic rights of the ranks. The IMG leadership is fond of repeating that it is the right of the majority to rule, and that is certainly true. But to have the right to rule. . . means to have in the eyes of the ranks a moral authority. This in turn reflects a mutual confidence. This does not exist in the IMG. The moral authority of the present leadership is seriously compromised. . . . Take for example, the behavior of the Scottish comrades. A 'smash the tendency' campaign . . . was decided upon in London and several plenipotentiaries ticked off to travel there and do the job. And when the members of the tendency resisted, they were entrapped and chopped."

Remarkable analysis indeed! We only wonder whether comrade Diego is prepared to apply it to the SWP as well. What moral authority could the SWP leadership have had in the eyes of the IT after the "war speeches" delivered at the August 1973 convention, which voted to place "all the resources"

of the SWP at the disposal of a fight for the platform of a faction with which the IT comrades strongly disagreed? What moral authority could it have had in the eyes of the IT when the IT was publicly warned that it would be smashed if it did not capitulate? What "scrupulous regard for the democratic rights of the ranks" is manifested in the July 4, 1974 expulsions?

It is high time to remind the comrades of the SWP leadership that our movement originated with the "New Course," when in the Political Bureau of the Soviet CP a motion was presented ordering members of this party to inform the leading bodies and the GPU of secret groups or factions existing in this party. In a letter to the CC and the Central Control Commission, of October 8, 1923, Trotsky opposed this demand for police measures, urging the leading bodies of the party to seek first for the conditions that had brought members of the party not to express openly their views or to organize secret groups for discussion inside the Bolshevik party at that time. Let us read what he wrote at that time on the question:

"The existence of a left communist faction (at the time of the Brest-Litovsk peace debates) represented an extreme danger for the unity of the party. It would not have been difficult to bring about a split then, and it would not have called for. . . a great effort on behalf of the leadership: It would have been sufficient to issue an order forbidding the left faction to exist. However, the party adopted more complex methods; it preferred to discuss, to explain, to prove by experience, and to resign itself temporarily to this threatening anomaly which was the existence of an organized faction in its midst." (The New Course)

This was Trotsky's opinion at the very origin of our movement. This has also been the line of conduct adopted by the IEC majority tendency and the leadership of the Fourth International ever since the beginning of the current dispute in the FI. It is highly advisable that all leaderships of national sections and sympathizing organizations, like the SWP, including the leadership of the SWP, conduct themselves in the same way. It is for that reason -- to defend the unity and integrity of the Fourth International as an organization -- that we cannot accept the proposal of the SWP PC to hold a special world congress of the FI. We urge all IEC members and all sections and sympathizing organizations to reject the proposal.

The world congress is the highest body of our movement. Its task is to decide a political line and elect leading bodies for implementing this line. Organizational conflicts of the type raised by the SWP leadership are cleared up by control commissions, which have the power and the means to investigate accusations and grievances of all kinds. Members of our movement all over the continents can through proper debates take political positions with validity on the orientation of the movement as a whole or even in some parts of the world.

They have no means to check any and sundry accusations against this or that comrade or group of comrades. This can be done only by a control commission, in the present case by the control commission elected by the Tenth World Congress, which will report to the IEC and to the next world congress.

Already before the Tenth World Congress we refused to follow the SWP leadership when it tried to replace political debates with organizational disputes and accusations. We avoided this danger of a "free for all" battle on questions which did not deal with the political problems. If we would accept today the SWP leadership's proposal for a special world congress held about the morality or immorality, not the politics, of the majority members of the international leadership, that sort of free for all battle would erupt. The dynamics of such a free for all are obvious: They are the dynamics of a split. The assertion of the SWP PC that a special world congress held on such issues would "avert the dangers to the international arising from the actions of the IMT" is not a serious prediction made by responsible leaders. It is an irresponsible factional maneuver threatening to set in motion a most dangerous chain reaction. Anyone with even a minimum of experience in tendency struggles knows that such a "special congress" could well result in a split in the Fourth International. The congress itself could even be the occasion for a split.

But another, and graver, matter is involved in the call by the SWP leadership for an extraordinary world congress on such matters. Prior to the Tenth World Congress, the International went through an intense political debate on a world scale. The debate lasted for fifteen months and involved the publication of 150 discussion articles. It led to innumerable membership aggregates and local, regional, and national conferences at which all the issues were debated. This process ended with the world congress, which, after a democratic discussion held on the basis of membership election of delegates and political differentiation in strict proportion to the strength of the contending tendencies, voted on documents and elected a leadership by majority vote. To call for a special world congress on the basis of an organizational dispute only a few months after that congress would mean in effect to attempt to overturn the decisions of the Tenth World Congress, to try to overthrow the normally elected leadership of the International. It is an attempt to utilize organizational grievances and "horror stories" to nullify a political verdict based on a political judgment made by the ranks of the world movement. This verdict can be challenged only after experience allows the correctness or incorrectness of the decisions of the world congress to be judged, that is, after the elected leadership has had time to apply its line in practice. The attempt to nullify the decisions of the Tenth World Congress is a violation of the basic rules of democratic centralism: that after a decision is made by a majority at a democratically convened and organized world congress, the minority must collaborate loyally with the application of the majority line before it wins the right through this loyal behavior to challenge that line and leadership again.

To accept the convening of a special world congress under these circumstances would mean in reality to declare null the decisions of the Tenth World Congress, to prepare a new congress not only on nonpolitical matters, but also on a new parity basis. That would mean the transformation of the FI as an organization based on democratic centralism into a loose federation of factions, tendencies, and sections that "collaborate" with each other when they agree and refuse to collaborate whenever disagreements appear. This would be a denial of everything Trotsky stood for and fought for after he recognized the final degeneration of the Comintern in 1933. It would be a denial of the very statutes that were adopted unanimously at the Tenth World Congress.

The call for a special world congress just a few months after the Tenth World Congress is all the more ominous in that it comes on the heels of a whole series of actions by the IEC minority faction that seriously place a question mark over its willingness to behave in a disciplined and loyal manner after that congress, despite the fact that it enjoyed and still enjoys full and even exceptional minority rights.

It comes after the refusal of the IEC minority faction to send its main leaders to the United Secretariat and the administrative bureau, to share responsibility for the day-to-day leadership of the International and the application of the world congress decisions, as is its normal duty. This refusal came just twenty-four hours after the conclusion of the congress in flagrant contradiction to the solemn promises made by the IEC minority faction at the end of the congress. It was based on the flimsiest of pretexts: the fact that the IEC majority tendency, which holds 60% of the posts in the IEC, was granted 66% of the seats on the United Secretariat. The IEC minority faction utilized this pretext, despite the IEC majority's statement that it was perfectly willing to revise that figure on the basis of serious and responsible counterproposals for a more effective functioning of the leading bodies of the International.

It comes after the decision of the IEC minority faction to maintain its faction and continue the faction fight after the World Congress, which is highly abnormal and in contradiction to the spirit, if not the letter, of democratic centralism, and is again in contradiction to the solemn promises made by representatives of the IEC minority faction at the end of the congress.

It comes after the stopping by the sections led by the IEC minority faction of all payments of dues to the international leadership. All sections and sympathizing organizations led by supporters of the IEC minority faction -- with the single exception of the New Zealand section -- have taken this step.

It comes after a substantial reduction of the overall financial support to the International that can be credited in any objective way to these sections and sympathizing organiza-

tions. This reduction is out of all proportion to the fraction of the membership of the international that the minority claims to represent, as reflected in the mandates credited to the IEC minority faction at its own demand during the Tenth World Congress.

When the call for a special world congress and the proposal to overturn or modify the leadership that was democratically elected at the Tenth World Congress after the longest and most democratic discussion period in the history of our movement comes after all these previous acts and is seen in that specific context, it can only demonstrate to the leaders, cadres, and members of the FI that the IEC minority faction wants to shirk its responsibilities after having fully enjoyed all its rights. This again is utterly intolerable. After the Tenth World Congress, sections and sympathizing organizations have to concentrate on public activity and not internal debates. They have to shift resources from internal discussion to party-building activities. They have to collaborate unanimously, regardless of political differences on the application of world congress decisions. They have to support the international leadership in that respect and collaborate with it loyally. After a congress, a loyal minority does not clamor for "rights," such as the "right to agitate for a special world congress;" it carries out its duties. That is what democratic centralism means. We shall uphold this principle in order to defend the unity and integrity of the world Trotskyist movement.

Every single step that has been undertaken up to now to escalate the internal dispute in the FI has been undertaken by the IEC minority. It was the IEC minority that first set up a tendency instead of keeping the discussion open and uncrystallized. It was the IEC minority that transformed its tendency into a faction. It was the IEC minority that challenged the representative character of the then upcoming Tenth World Congress and the democratic character of the pre-congress discussion, retreating step by step until it had to acknowledge the validity of the 10th World Congress at its conclusion. It was the IEC minority that shirked its duty of loyally applying world congress decisions, of loyally collaborating and participating with the democratically elected leadership -- using all sorts of pretexts and gimmicks to justify their behavior, the call for a special world congress being only the latest in a long series. And it is the co-thinkers of this IEC minority faction that have now topped this escalation with a wholesale expulsion from the SWP and YSA of around 130 supporters of the IEC majority tendency's political line and platform, thereby creating a grave threat to the unity of the world Trotskyist movement since the current dispute arose.

The IEC minority faction and its cothinkers have made a habit of accusing others of harboring split intentions. This is the axis of the July 4, 1974, statement of the SWP PC, just as it was the axis of numerous interventions before and during the Tenth World Congress. The IEC majority tendency, in part or in toto, was accused of plotting the expulsion of the PST, the expulsion of the ISA/LSO, the expulsion of the IEC minority supporters in the IMG. But the evidence is now crystal clear.

No section or sympathizing organization led by supporters of the IEC minority has been expelled, and no supporters of the IEC minority has been expelled from any section or sympathizing organisation led by supporters of the IEC majority. But one of the main ideological components of the IEC minority has now gone over to wholesale expulsion of its ideological opponents. This unassailable fact is more eloquent than one hundred and forty six pages of gossips, unsubstantiated or contestable allegations, and "working hypotheses" about "intentions" that have not been proved and cannot be proved. It places the responsibility for the grave and dangerous increase of tensions within the world trotskyist movement squarely on the shoulders of the leadership minority faction and of the SWP leadership.

The United Secretariat has up to now answered these acts of escalation with restraint and moderation. It will continue to do so. It is convinced that the defense of the unity of the International on the grounds of principle is part and parcel of the defense of our program, of the struggle for the successful building of a new revolutionary leadership of the world proletariat. The record shows that avoiding factional traps and reprisals, maintaining strictly principled attitude and defending organisational rules and regulations that must be commonly applied to all sections and members of the movement helps to strengthen the political views of those who are correct and to expose the errors of those who uphold an incorrect political line. This has been proven on more than one occasion in the past and it will be confirmed in the future.

Only tendencies or factions acting under the pressure of alien class influences could willfully provoke a split in the Fourth International today. A split would be totally unjustified given the existing political differences. We therefore call upon sections, sympathizing organisations, cadres, and members of the FI irrespective of tendency or faction affiliations to unite in a common struggle to take advantage of the constantly growing opportunities for party building in most countries and on an international scale.

We call upon them to reject the maneuver of a "special world congress," which is intended to deviously undo what was openly, normally, and democratically done at the tenth world congress. We call upon them to oppose that maneuver along the following lines:

-For the defense of international democratic centralism.
After the tenth world congress the duty of the IEC minority is to loyally apply the world congress decisions and to collaborate with the international leadership in doing so to the best of its ability.

-For the defense of democratic centralism nationally.
The duty of any minority of a national organization is to loyally apply party discipline and subordinate factional interests and calculations to party building under the leadership of the

section or sympathizing organization. The duty of any national leadership is to respect the full rights of any minority.

For defense of the unity of the IVth International.
No expulsions or organizational reprisals against members of minorities for expression of opinions inside the movement. All comrades of the I.T., after acknowledging and recognizing the discipline of the SWP, should be reintegrated immediately and collectively into the SWP as a faction or tendency with full rights. The International faction fight should be halted until the next pre-world-congress discussion is opened.

The dangerous drift toward an international split, which we tried to reverse at the tenth world congress can be definitively reversed only by applying all these principles together and simultaneously. Then all our efforts can be concentrated on what is our number one duty and responsibility under the present conditions of the growing crisis of world capitalism and the bureaucracies in the workers states, of the rising tide of world revolution: the building of the Fourth International through increased and coordinated intervention in the international class struggle and the revolutionary mass struggle.

September 7, 1974

COPY :

COPY

COPY

COPY

September 7, 1974

Dear Mary-Alice,

Concerning your letter on the composition of the IEC.

We do not agree with your interpretation of the World Congress decision as to the nature of the consultative IEC members. It is true that the World Congress first voted a resolution in the sense you quote. But under item X on the agenda, entitled Election of the IEC, the motion says:

"Members of sympathizing groups elected to the IEC have a consultative vote."

It further says: "Consultative members, 52. Of these, 31 to be chosen by the IEC Majority; 21 by the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction" (a formulation to which we object, by the way, and which we shall change in the French edition of the minutes by "chosen by the IEC minority faction).

There is nothing in this formulation which says that the consultative IEC members must be chosen among representatives of the sympathizing organizations. Furthermore, the original draft of the motion ("Sympathizing groups are to be represented by members having a consultative vote") was changed into the above formulation which is still far away from any ambiguity in that respect. As the second vote supersedes the first one, if you believe there is a contradiction between the two, we cannot see how the IEC majority tendency's decision to nominate some members of sections as consultative IEC members could be really challenged.

As to the actual list of consultative members presented to you, I agree that there was duplication in some cases, and we apologize for the negligence. The names submitted instead of the duplicate ones which you point out are comrade Torben K. (Denmark), Mecki (Germany), Penta (Austria) and Josef (Luxemburg).

We shall communicate to an IEC minority representative present at the September Un. Secr. meeting the identity of the French comrades listed in the previously transmitted list, and clear up any additional misunderstanding as to the addresses and ways of communication with any other IEC member which you might raise.

We are awaiting your possible answer to the 2nd statement of the IEC majority tendency attached to the WC minutes, so that we can finally publish the International Internal Bulletin with these minutes. We propose to include among the statement the one submitted belatedly by the Kompass tendency. We imagine you will agree with this.

Fraternally yours,
s/Walter

New York
September 30, 1974

Brussels

Dear Ernest,

Unfortunately your letter of September 7 still leaves unanswered a number of questions about the list of IEC members nominated by the IMT.

1. We still do not know who the alternate members are nor the order in which they are ranked. As you will recall, the list submitted at the world congress contained 13 names instead of 12. (Edgardo should also be included in the list on page 10 of IIDB No. 5). It was agreed that the IMT would decide who to eliminate and submit a ranked list of 12.

2. In my letter to you of July 16, I indicated not only four names that definitely appeared on both the alternate list and the consultative list, but at least three additional names that seemed to be duplicates. Your letter does not clarify this.

3. Your letter to me of July 4 lists a "Riss (USA)" as a consultative member. When we asked Comrade Aubin about the identity of "Riss" he insisted that there is no such person on the IEC in any capacity, either full, alternate or consultative. Could you please clarify this?

4. We do not yet know the names of the comrades selected by the GRS in the Antilles. They were to name one full and one alternate member.

In order to eliminate these confusions and ambiguities, I would suggest that one of the IMT leaders in a position to know simply submit three lists to the next United Secretariat meeting:

1. A list of 27 full members of the IEC;
2. A list of 12 alternates, ranked;
3. A list of 31 consultative members.

You can then meet with one of the IMT members on the United Secretariat and tell us who these members are.

Concerning your interpretation of the world congress decision, we of course do not agree. As you will recall, there was only one reason for creating the very unusual category of "consultative" members. The IMT leaders objected to including leading comrades from sympathizing organizations on the IEC with the same voting rights as comrades from the leaderships of sections. We disagreed, but in the interests of reaching a compromise that would maintain the unity of the International, we proposed that a consultative membership status be added to the IEC, with the explicit provision that "full members and consultative members shall have the same rights in everything except voting."

2.

If the reason for creating a consultative status had not been to find a solution to the problem created by the fact that many important organizations were being recognized only as sympathizing groups, I am sure that no one would have seen any need for such an innovation. It certainly was not intended simply to enlarge the IEC.

Which vote supercedes which is an argument we can leave for lawyers. The framework of the nine-point "Agreement on Measures to Maintain Unity of the Fourth International" makes the purpose, character and composition of the consultative membership on the IEC unambiguous. Your list is not in accordance with the world congress decision.

However, this question will hardly be resolved in correspondence between you and me. And since the IEC cannot meet until the international is informed who is on that body, I propose that you simply advise the United Secretariat who the IMT has nominated as members of the IEC. Frankly, our primary concern ought to be the fact that seven and a half months after the close of the world congress no one yet knows the composition of the leadership body elected there.

Comradely,

Mary-Alice