

New York, 4 de abril de 1974.-

Alberto Fierro

Querido Alberto:

Ed está fuera de la ciudad por un tiempo, así que contestará sus preguntas sobre la retícula, etc. cuando vuelva.

Por ahora, ustedes deben haber recibido la versión final del contrainforme de Joe en el congreso mundial. Fue incluida en el último envío al comité de dirección de la fracción. No hemos tenido noticias del buró en Bruselas sobre si estarán de acuerdo en publicarlo.

Estamos trabajando en la traducción del informe de Stern, para poder enviarles una copia en francés en pocos días. Sin embargo, no publicaremos ni pondremos en circulación el informe de Stern hasta que hayamos tenido tiempo de considerar semejante paso más cuidadosamente. No es imposible que Stern estuviera de acuerdo con su publicación, por lo menos internamente, lo que sería, por supuesto, lo mejor.

En sobre separado les hemos enviado un ejemplar de la versión final de la resolución política. Como pueden ver, hemos incorporado los puntos del memorandum de Hugo sobre los que hubo acuerdo en la reunión de la fracción después del congreso: es decir, los puntos 4, 5 y 6. También hemos incorporado otras sugerencias hechas por los camaradas durante nuestras discusiones en Bruselas y en Rimini. Sobre los puntos 1 y 2 del memorandum de Hugo, como pueden observar, no hemos estado de acuerdo en introducir cambios en la línea de la resolución de la fracción, sino continuar la discusión como parte de la discusión interna de la internacional en su conjunto. Estamos ansiosos por conocer la opinión posterior de Hugo y del resto de los camaradas de la dirección del PST sobre cómo proceder.

También estamos ansiosos por discutir con ustedes los problemas del funcionamiento del centro de la fracción y, especialmente, las perspectivas para el trabajo en Europa y América Latina. Hemos estado pensando que sería una buena idea que uno de nosotros visitara B.A. en fecha muy próxima para discutir algunas de estas cuestiones con todos ustedes. Cuando vuelva Ed, en unos días, lo trataremos. Qué piensan ustedes? Si alguien va a B.A., podemos discutir también el problema de los capítulos restantes del documento de Hugo.

Va adjunta una copia de la carta que recibimos hace un día o algo así del camarada Silvio, a quien ustedes, por supuesto, conocen. Parece que la visita de ustedes sirvió para convencerlo de unirse a la fracción. Desde luego, le contestaremos de inmediato, dándole la bienvenida en la fracción. Quizás su acción tenga alguna influencia sobre los camaradas de la tendencia de Roberto.

También adjuntamos una copia de la carta de la Tendencia Kompass al Secretariado Unificado sobre el resultado de la convención alemana. Es el informe más exacto que hemos recibido hasta ahora sobre la conferencia del GIM.

No hemos tenido noticias de Blanco, pero Benny iba a encontrarse con él en Suecia a principios de abril y viajar juntos a Bruselas. Supongo que en los próximos días estarán con él en viaje a Bruselas. Benny y Sam ya están allí. Como probablemente se han enterado por el informe sobre la última reunión del Secretariado, la Mayoría del CEI puede negarse a permitir a Benny o a Blanco participar en el Buró... salvo que enviemos un comisario político para vigilar a los dos "campesinos"! El conjunto del problema de la composición del buró y del secretariado es uno de los temas que queremos discutir con ustedes más adelante, esperamos que en B.A.

Por favor, hágale llegar nuestros afectuosos saludos a Rita.

Fraternalmente,

Mary-Alice

P.D. También necesitamos conocer los nombres de los 7 camaradas que postulan para el CEI. Tenemos una lista de siete seudónimos del PST, pero tenemos que informar al secretariado quiénes son en realidad. La lista tentativa era Hugo, Lorenzo, Arturo, Mario, Alberto, Coral y Pedro. Hay algún cambio?

A 24 74

6 Frankfurt/M.  
Robert-Mayer-Str. 52  
West-Germany

April 20, 1974

Mary-Alice Waters  
SWP N.O.

Dear Mary-Alice,

I've started at the University of Frankfurt, so please note the new address. I just sent it to the YSA N.O. I'm certainly learning a lot of different things here.

Dieter shows me the faction documents, so you don't need to send them to me, at least as long as he's in Frankfurt (he's planning on taking a long vacation in July-August and then moving to Heidelberg). Also, I get copies of the IIDB's here.

Dieter, too, gave me a report of what happened at the World Congress, full of anecdotes about playing electric ping-pong with Geoff Mirelowitz and so forth.

I was not only at the GIM Conference, I even was a delegate, due to the rather strange system the GIM had for delegate representation (I was the only LTT supporter in the Hamburg branch, so I automatically became a delegate with 1 vote). In some ways it reminded me more of an antiwar conference than a Trotskyist convention, with all the pounding on tables and heckling -- only the LTT delegates didn't participate in that.

Of course, my German didn't enable me to understand everything at the Conference, but I could usually get at least the general points that were being made. It seemed that the best result of the Conference was the way it showed up the unviability of Compass. That certainly happened at the end. First Karl capitulated and handed over the GIM to the IT, but then wanted to attach a couple of small conditions that the IT didn't like -- holding the next Conference at the latest in January, 1975; having a monthly internal discussion bulletin of 50 typewritten pages. And when the IT wouldn't accept these, the LTT-Compass majority voted them in anyway. Karl was all ready to give the IT some perhaps 'abstract' thing like a Central Committee majority, but the first time it came to a concrete question, he turned around and used the LTT-Compass majority against the IT. That was an obvious contradiction that everyone could feel. I got the impression from talking briefly later to a couple of local Compass leaders in Hamburg that they were a bit perplexed and demoralized by the actions of the Compass leadership at the Conference. Also, especially on the last day of the Conference, the LTT and Compass both pounded away together at the IT, reinforcing each others arguments -- really de facto cooperating. Most importantly, there is certainly nothing like the hardness in positions among the

... and I think you feel in the SWP. There we've discussed everything out and almost everyone's confident they've chosen the right side. But in the GIM the comrades often aren't familiar with some of the basic positions of the tendency, and what's important, generally they realize that and are trying to understand better. That exists certainly even among comrades who voted for the IT. For example, the LPP Women's resolution was co-signed by an LPP member in Cologne. Two comrades I knew in Hamburg voted for the IT, although they told me 'on an international level' they are between Compass and LPP. They didn't like Compass's rejection of student and women's work, and seeing the IT as the only immediate alternative for the GIM leadership, they voted that way.

All those factors together with God-knows-what experiences the new IT leadership will give us certainly favor a growth of the LTT, although obviously it will take awhile.

There were a couple of specially interesting contributions at the Conference. At one point a delegate, who had voted for the IT line in his branch, attempted to be called on to speak as an independent, that is, without using up a slot from the allotted number of IT speakers. This was protested. In reply, Winnie, a key national ITer, explained that this comrade had voted this time for the IT, but really shouldn't be looked on as an ITer because he "isn't organized in the tendency."

Pierre Frank made a really blundering type of intervention at the end of the Conference in the debate on Karl's proposed conditions. He explained how he had refrained from intervening in the political debate, but that now it was necessary that he intervene, as it is the responsibility of the international leadership to help give direct leadership to the individual sections. He explained that he had made a similar necessary contribution at the last IMG Conference.

His contribution was so factional that it provoked loud groans even from the Compass delegates. He informed us how the sections of the FI were no discussion clubs, etc., and therefore we shouldn't have this continuing internal bulletin, rather let the majority carry out the practical work of the section (forgetting, naturally, that no majority existed). He asked rhetorically, "Do you want to discuss this Carrero Blanco assassination more?" A few of the LTT delegates shouted back "Ja!", which seemed to shake him up a bit.

Perhaps the most interesting thing to me at the Conference was the functioning of the LTT, which really worked together very well as a team. At the tendency meeting during the Conference we had to decide if we would vote to put the Compass in as the majority leadership. Naturally, all the comrades supported that, but at first one of the leading comrades suggested we demand certain things from Compass in return for our support, like not tampering with the student and women's work. The meeting simply discussed that for

while and reached a consensus, without any real difficulty, first making any such demands.

A lot of talks by the LPP comrades at the Conference were really good, especially Siegfried's summary under the perspectives point, which probably evoked the most response of any contribution at the whole Conference -- and a favorable one from both Compass and LPP members. He used almost all of his 20 minutes to clearly show the differences between the LPP and the LPP.

The other thing that impressed me at the Conference, and in general in discussions I've had with Compass people, is their tendency to defend the SWP in spite of all the slop that's been thrown about. And in the GIM, that slop is certainly considerable. I've enclosed a copy of Sybille Hlogsteit's report on the SWP Convention, in case no one there has seen it (unfortunately, in all the bulletins page 3 is missing). This report is so slanderous it honestly makes 'Old Wives Tales' look like a defense of the SWP. It says straight out that we don't call for victory to the NLF, that we defend the democratic rights of fascists, that we call for self-determination for women in the same sense as we call for self-determination for Vietnam, and that 400,000 dollars was raised at the Convention for 3 purposes, one of which was faction work in the Fourth International. At one point she wrote, "The demand for the limiting of the apparatus of the SWP he B. Sheppard met with a question, who the SWP should let go (a consideration for the direct material interests of a self-designated autonomous layer of bureaucrats?!)".

So much for the GIM Conference. I only wanted to mention one other development here. At the Goethe Institute in Lüneburg I became a friend of a Turkish student, who has been involved with the movement in Turkey for several years and is interested in the FI. She was a member of the THKO, the Turkish People's Liberation Army, which did work among students and workers and carried out several terrorist actions. Now the group is dissolved and the former members are involved in very deep critiques and discussions in order to build a new group. They have, for example, decided the terrorist actions were incorrect. They designate themselves Marxist-Leninists, are firmly anti-Maoist, and call the Soviets revisionists. There are probably only 10-12 militants left over from the THKO after the repression and losses to the Maoists, but they are also discussing with other small groups in Turkey.

I introduced the Turkish student to the comrades in Hamburg, and we began having weekly discussions which they have continued after I moved. Naturally there are a lot of difficulties involved, since her German is no better than mine. She and I have also had discussions, and last weekend she visited me here. We were able to spend a lot of time with Dieter.

Comrades,

Veret Jetter

MAY 2 1974

Le 28 Avril 1974,  
Au Bureau National du SWP.

Chers camarades,

J'ai lu avec intérêt les deux numéros du bulletin intérieur du SWP rendant compte du Xème Congrès Mondial de la Q.I.(1). Je n'ai pas l'intention, dans cette lettre, de commenter sur le fond les rapports des camarades Joseph Hansen et Bill Massey-John Barzman; j'attendrai pour cela l'ouverture officielle, par le secrétariat unifié de la Q.I., de la discussion préparatoire au XIème Congrès Mondial. Pourtant, je désire ne pas laisser passer sans commentaires un passage de l'IIB No 4 qui me concerne directement.

Page 15, dans le troisième paragraphe de leur "report on the tenth world congress", les camarades Bill Massey et John Barzman écrivent: "Finally, in France... tendency as a whole". Je voudrais, pour l'immédiat, me contenter des précisions suivantes.

1) Les raisons de ma non adhésion à la troisième tendance internationale sont exprimées dans une déclaration faite lors du Xème C.M.(2), ainsi que dans un document écrit par le camarade Lesage et moi - "bilan du débat international" - et qui sera prochainement publié en français.

2) La tendance "Centre le Courant" s'est auto-dissoute à la suite d'une Assemblée Générale nationale de compte-rendu du Xème C.M., le 23 Février.

3) Contrairement aux camarades Massey et Barzman, je pense que le sujet abordé (bien ou mal, c'est une autre affaire) dans mon rapport au congrès national de préparation au Xème C.M.: les relations de la Q.I. avec les courants centristes ont toujours été, sont assurément aujourd'hui et seront probablement encore un certain temps au coeur même de nos discussions, de nos divergences, de toute stratégie de construction du parti marxiste révolutionnaire à l'échelle nationale et internationale; "they did focus indeed on the actual questions in debate"!

4) Enfin, j'avoue ne pas aimer le ton ni le contenu ni l'intention de la première phrase citée. Quelles que soient les irritations réelles et légitimes dues à nos carences multiples et graves en matière d'organisation, je refuse d'admettre que les camarades de CLC étaient "mainly determined... convention". Une affirmation aussi cavalière ne peut que signifier deux choses;

a) le vote négatif de CLC sur les documents internationaux de la majorité n'était que tactique, que destiné à préparer le terrain pour le futur cen-

grès national;

b) que notre opposition, loin d'être argumentée politiquement (3), n'était que constituée par un ramassis apolitique et hétérogène de "grognards" aigris contre la direction de l'organisation.

Dans le document prévu en français, Lesage et moi expliquons quelles erreurs nous avons commises dans ce débat international sans regretter un instant d'avoir contribué même modestement à la construction de la Q.I., malgré les résultats finaux concrets et l'échec lamentable de la troisième tendance internationale. Je suis convaincu que certains désaccords apparus lors de la discussion internationale se retrouveront et même se développeront en s'éclairant; que la majorité écrasante soudée à la direction pour le débat de tendances internationales ne se retrouvera pas telle quelle. Mais je ne me considère pas spécialement apolitique, tacticien, aigri par un combat même ultra-minoritaire - et l'en peut dire la même chose des 9/10èmes des militants de GLC. J'espère sincèrement qu'il en sera toujours de même pour les dirigeants de l'Internationalist Tendency dont il ne me viendrait jamais à l'idée de dire qu'ils se sentent "mainly detrainned by discontent with the discussion... and by a desire to register a critical vote in relation to specifically American questions which will come up at the SWP convention...". La condescendance des majoritaires n'est pas forcément le meilleur moyen de convaincre politiquement les minoritaires même lorsque la polémique fait loi.

Très fraternellement,

Jean-François DUMAS.

- (1) IIB N°4 Avril 1974 et IIDB Volume XI N°5 Avril 1974
- (2) "Why I did not join the Third International Tendency" in IIDB Volume XI N°5 page 15.
- (3) Voir IIB N°2 au 1974 et Dumas - Lesage: "Contribution au débat international" novembre 1973.