

International Internal Discussion Bulletin

volume XII number 1

January 1975

FOURTH WORLD CONGRESS SINCE REUNIFICATION (Tenth World Congress) February 1974 Part II

1. IEC Members Nominated by the IMT 4
2. IEC Members Nominated by the Japanese Section 4
3. Declaration Concerning the 'Statement of the Majority Tendency at the Conclusion of the Tenth World Congress of the Fourth International,' June 9, 1974 5
4. IEC Majority Tendency's Reply to the Statement by the Minority Faction, August 8, 1974 8
5. Rejoinder by the Leninist Trotskyist Faction, November 13, 1974 9
6. Point 36 of the IMT Resolution 'Argentina: Political Crisis and Revolutionary Perspectives' 10
7. Concluding Paragraphs of the LTF 'Counter-report on Armed Struggle' 11
8. Minutes of the International Executive Committee, February 15, 1974 12

price 20 cents

The International Internal Discussion Bulletin is the English-language edition of the internal discussion bulletin of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International.

It is published by the Socialist Workers Party as a fraternal courtesy to the United Secretariat of the Fourth International.

Bulletin Department, 14 Charles Lane, New York, N. Y. 10014

Introductory Note

The material published in this bulletin is an addendum to *International Internal Discussion Bulletin* Vol XI, No. 5, published in April 1974. It completes the record of the Fourth World Congress Since Reunification (Tenth World Congress) held in February 1974. On the second printing the contents of the two bulletins will be combined.

IEC Members Nominated by the IMT

Full members

Aubin (France)
Fourier (France)
Roman (France)
Georges (France)
Segur (France)
Thinville (France)
Ghulam (Britain)
Jones (Britain)
Ned (Britain)
Petersen (Britain)
Kurt (Germany)
Mintoff (Germany)
Livio (Italy)
Fedeli (Italy)
Rudi (Belgium)
Walter (Belgium)
Carl (Switzerland)
Duret (Switzerland)
Jens (Sweden)
Tom (Sweden)
Huarte (Bolivia)
Roca (Bolivia)
Valdes, Chile)
Mikado (Israel)
Jaber (Lebanon)

Hovis (USA)
Philip (Antilles)

Alternate members

(1) Domingo (France)
(2) Vergeat (France)
(3) Brewster (Britain)
(4) Moss (USA)
(5) Fred (Austria)
(6) Alfonso (Italy)
(7) Mogens (Denmark)
(8) Metz (Luxemburg)
(9) Sylvia (Germany)
(10) Hugo (Holland)
(11) O'Leary (Ireland)
(12) Carlos (Columbia)

Consultative members

Enrique (Spain)
Jesus (Spain)
Jaime (Spain)
Toni (Spain)
Miguel (Mexico)
Ricardo (Mexico)
Saul (Argentina)

Claude (RMG/GMR Canada)
Jim (RMG/GMR Canada)
Alva (Australia)
Tom (South Africa)
Josef (Luxemburg)
Penta (Austria)
Torben (Denmark)
Tim (Ireland)
Hans (Holland)
Franz (Germany)
Philippe (Belgium)
Sven (Sweden)
Jeremy (Great Britain)
Anna (Brazil)
Said (Palestine)
Guillaume (Switzerland)
Roger (Switzerland)
Jean (France)
Pierre (France)
Maline (France)
Jules (France)
Simon (Italy)
Jean (Antilles)

Open
Greece

IEC Members Nominated by Japanese Section

Comrade Hino was nominated as an alternate member of the IEC.

Declaration Concerning the 'Statement of the Majority Tendency at the Conclusion of the Tenth World Congress of the Fourth International'

The "International Majority Tendency" within the 4th International has considered it necessary to add a statement to the minutes of the Congress subsequent to its conclusion. This procedure—which is not quite usual in our movement—has been accepted by the International Minority (LTF) on condition that they could add a counter-declaration to the minutes of the Congress as well. Both statements are included in the minutes of the World Congress. (IIDB Vol. XI, Nr. 5; April 1974) and have thus come to our knowledge.

This "Declaration of the Majority Tendency" deals with the "International Mezhrayonka-Tendency"—we were members of during the 10th World Congress—in a way which is not acceptable to us, and is considered by us as a threat to the future functioning of Democratic Centralism inside the 4th International.

The IMT introduces its statement with the sentence: "The majority tendency accepted numerous organizational compromises in the preparation for, and the course of the World Congress."

Among these "Compromises" it lists: "Recognizing the Mezhrayonka de facto as an international tendency, when the statements published during the Congress (declaration of tendency, and the "semi-dissolution" statement) demonstrate its lack of a clear basis. The Mezhrayonka was set up and maintained for one week in order to "obtain a guarantee of equal rights" with the supporters of the majority and minority and "to defend the unity of our movement" (how?). It got 2.5 percent of the mandates. This sort of thing tends to deprive the very concept of international tendencies of its meaning (since the concept of forming international tendencies requires presenting political perspectives on the questions in dispute that constitute an alternative orientation to that of the other tendencies and an alternative for our movement as a whole)."

These "concessions" are qualified by the IMT in the following way: "These organizational compromises are considerable. They can make the development of our movement more difficult in certain cases. They put some of our organizational principles partially in abeyance."

We strongly reject this interpretation made by the IMT. Our recognition as a tendency at the World Congress was neither an organizational "concession" nor did it "put our organizational principles in abeyance". We say on the contrary, that a refusal of us would have meant a violation of these principles, because a part of the 4th

International would have been excluded from the deciding process in the International without being excluded or suspended or having left the movement.

Since the "Statement of the Majority Tendency" addresses a readership which to a large extent is not familiar with the details, it is necessary to recall some of the facts:

1. The Mezhrayonka Tendency did not come into existence out of a clear sky, nor did it by a sudden "maneuver" during the World Congress, but its delegates—with the exception of Comrade Chandra—all have been elected delegates at the basis of their sections on those positions they advocated at the World Congress.

Comrade Chandra subsequently joined these positions and the Tendency during the Congress, while on the other side Comrade Dumas, who represented two mandates on the "Contre le Courant" ticket, dissociated himself from some of its positions and kept his distance from the Mezhrayonka Tendency. Both cases are in accordance with the freedom of mandate and in conformity with the principles of our movement.

2. The Mezhrayonka Tendency has made its positions known on all subjects under discussion at the World Congress and defended them during the debate. We admit the right of the IMT to reproach our positions with "lack of clarity". But the assessment of a tendency's position by another tendency can be no criterion for the recognition and the legitimacy of the tendency concerned. The next step would be, not to recognize a tendency because a majority position considers those positions to be "wrong".

It is correct that we ourselves regarded the degree of homogenisation among us prior to the World Congress as unsatisfactory. We think, however, this true for the Majority Tendency as well. Let us recall that at the time of the formation of the IMT only the European Perspective draft was available (and not documents to "all questions in dispute"); that some members of this Tendency, Comrade Beauvais in any case, did not vote for the Argentine and Bolivia resolution of their tendency, but for a "promise" (that these resolutions after the vote at the IEC would be discussed and reversed inside the IMT); that during the pre-Congress discussion on Europe every author of the IMT gave a different interpretation of the EPD and a different definition of the "New Mass Vanguard" in the pages of the IIDB; that prior to the World Congress and during the Congress the IMT undertook far-reaching and substantial changes and amendments

to documents that had been adopted as "programmatic basis" of the Tendency before, amendments, that for instance in the Armed Struggle resolution expressed the exact opposite of the original formulation. We did not differ from the IMT in the unsatisfactory degree of homogenisation, but in the different conclusions we have drawn from that: we considered the formal formation of an international tendency to be premature.

3. It is true that the Mezhrayonka Tendency did not submit *documents* on all questions in dispute, but it had adopted *positions* on all these questions.

On one hand the documents "On the Orientation in Latin America" (which was the only counter-resolution to the draft submitted by the IMT on the Armed Struggle in LA), and on Europe (by the Compass Tendency Germany) had been introduced in time (October 73) for the discussion in the International.

On the other hand concerning the Political Resolution we did not get beyond a written criticism of the IMT-draft, distributed at the Congress itself, and we did not formulate own documents on Argentina and Bolivia. But, as we see it, this objection does not hold good either. For example, the International Minority had not submitted written counter-resolutions on all questions either, that is to say on the question of armed struggle in LA and on Europe, because the LTF did not agree methodological to submit such documents. So we regarded it wrong and unrealistic for us to submit our own interpretation on details and facts in Argentina and Bolivia.

4. The Statement of the Majority Tendency defines an "international tendency" in a way we can not accept and that can not be derived from the Statutes of the 4th International, either: "The presentation of political perspectives on *the* questions in dispute that constitute an alternative orientation to that of the other tendencies and *an alternative for our movement as a whole.*" (emphasis added)

In our opinion this rather looks like a definition of an international *faction*. According to the principles of our movement "tendencies" are ideological currents which may as well be formed on the basis of some important questions—or even one. And our statutes do not make any distinction on this point and do *not* require of an international tendency that it meets the criteria of a national faction. In our opinion the IMT actually puts an excessive stress on the formal difference between a "tendency including positions on international questions" and an "international tendency", a distinction which is necessary, but can only get such an importance if one advocates an extremely federalist conception of the International. Our Statutes do not include any instructions like "a certain number of signatures from a certain number of different sections."

5. And this actually is the real problem with the Mezhrayonka Tendency at the 10th World Congress: the International Majority *did not* recognize us *de facto* as an "international" tendency as it claims in its statement—though truly speaking this would have been the correct way to solve the problem, and though some of the IMT leaders (German) initially had agreed to proceed in this way. The "Majority of the Majority" however insisted on a *de jure* version of an "international tendency", other-

wise, they declared, they would not concede us any rights to defend our positions as a tendency at the Congress. For this reason, really on *their* "command", we ad-hoc formalized ourselves as "International Mezhrayonka" to an International Tendency, as we had announced it for this (expected) case *before* the World Congress.

The Statement of the Majority Tendency so turns reality upside down. They accuse the Mezhrayonka of its sporadic existence of one week only, though this particularity was only due to the "this-way-or-nothing" pressure from the Majority of the Majority. In this we see another indication that parts of the IMT do not conceive democratic centralism as conscious expression of material conditions but as a catechism of rules to be used skillfully for the tendency struggle.

6. The fact that the IMT takes the numerically small extension of the Mezhrayonka (2.5% of the delegates) as an argument for their contention that the recognition of the Mezhrayonka was a "concession" constitutes a deplorable lapse. In our movement the right to form a tendency has always resulted from political positions and never from the numerical size. Unfortunately there is a precurs to this formulation: the leadership of the French section demanded the submission of at least 30 signatures as a condition for the recognition of the CLC as a tendency. Instead of correcting this mistake by one of its sections, the IMT extended this mistake on the international level.

7. The formula saying that by forming the Mezhrayonka we wanted to get the guarantee of "equal rights" with the two big blocks IMT and LTF is ambiguous. We made sure to get the rights of a tendency at the World Congress. We did not ask for an equalization with the IMT and LTF nor did we get it. We did not misjudge the qualitative difference in quantity.

At the discussion on Armed Struggle in Latin America for instance the IMT and the LTF each had 11 speakers, and "all the other together" had 5. Since 2 Japanese and 1 Argentine (who weren't in any tendency) wanted to speak, the Mezhrayonka just conceded the right to have 2 speakers to defend their counter-resolution in the discussion (the only written counter-resolution to that point at all). We accepted this. But we cannot consider this proportion as an exaggerated concession to us.

To sum up we think that:

a. the presentation of the Mezhrayonka in the Statement of the Majority Tendency is misleading, since it abridges the question in a way that the real course of events can not be seen anymore, and

b. this presentation is little educative for the cadres of the 4th International in that it deals with the formation of a tendency in the way of a "privilege" and its recognition as a "concession." In this statement we see the danger to narrow the possibilities of forming a tendency in the future and to increase the conditions for a tendency to be recognized—of course always with reference to the "present rapid growth of the International."

Membership Assembly of the
Kommunist Tendency (GIM) June
9, 1974

Steering Committee of Tendenza
Marxista Rivoluzionario (Italy)

Justine-Krasno-Lemalouf, former members of the Steering Committee of Contre le Courant Tendency (France), dissolved by the French Central Committee

* * *

APPENDIX

To the Comrades of the Compass Tendency in the GIM

Dear comrades,

During its session at May 29, 30 the USFI discussed your letter from May 2nd. The USec cannot fulfill your

request to publish your Document on Latin America in connection with the publications of the World Congress. The USec thought that, considering the modest size of your tendency on international level, such a publication would constitute a precedent which in view of the existing growth of the International and the unlimited freedom of tendency within its ranks would pose unsolvable problems in the future. In case you come to know that your document is not available in a particular section, we would join you in the request to ask the respective section to publish your document in an internal bulletin.

Fraternal Greetings,
For the USFI
Walter

IEC Majority Tendency's Reply to the Statement by the Minority Faction

[The "Statement of the Majority Tendency at the Conclusion of the Tenth World Congress of the Fourth International" (March 17, 1974), and the "Statement of the Leninist Trotskyist Faction" (April 3, 1974) are published in IIDB Vol. XI, No. 5, April 1974.]

We will limit ourselves to a clarification of the facts in regard to allegations made in the declaration by the IEC minority faction which do not, in our view, correspond to the truth.

1. It is false that "according to the reports presented to the mandates commission," a total of 5,277 comrades voted for the positions of the IEC majority and 5,663 voted for the positions of the IEC minority. No report was made to the mandates commission on the votes cast in Argentina. The figures cited in the minority declaration are partly based on a report made to the sub-commission on Argentina which was never submitted to the mandates commission nor verified by it.

We categorically challenge this figure. According to the rules on counting votes drawn up by the United Secretariat, the number of members who had the right to vote was to be frozen in October 1973. *After* this date, representatives of the IEC majority tendency were able to verify the attendance of PST members at its meetings. Even allowing for normal absences, they arrived at a figure almost one-third lower than the one presented by the PST delegation in the sub-commission on Argentina. If the verified figure is used, even supposing that *all* members without exception voted for the positions of the minority faction, the votes supposedly obtained by the IEC minority faction are reduced to the proportion of 40 to 60 which we used in our initial statement.

2. Even on the basis of the number of PST members who were more or less verified—not to speak of the number of members claimed in the sub-commission on Argentina—the calculation of votes for the minority positions implies that practically all the members participated in the voting that took place in the course of the meetings (which is highly unlikely), and that the minority faction received more than 99 percent of the votes, since with less than one percent of the votes the majority tendency would have had the right to one mandate—which it obviously did not obtain. Such a surprising (to say the least) "voting result" did not occur in any of the sizeable sections or sympathizing organizations of the International, which says a great deal about the nature of the organization, the discussion, and the vote...

3. Not having candidate members "vote" and take a position on 150 documents after a few months (and in the case of several sections or sympathizing organizations whose majorities supported the IEC minority faction, after a few weeks of membership in the party!) seems to us more democratic than the opposite practice. The difference here is between a purely formal conception of internal democracy and a meaningful conception.

4. It is not true that the youth organizations "generally" would have expressed a view favorable to the IEC minority faction. The youth organizations in Japan and Belgium, as well as the groups of young people in France, to cite only three cases, surely cannot be included in this category; and they are hardly among the smallest groups sympathizing with the Fourth International.

5. The statement by the minority faction presents the figures on the vote used to determine the proportions between majority and minority in a peculiar way. The statement correctly notes that the political resolution of the majority tendency received 52.6 percent of the votes, but forgets to add that its own resolution received only 42.9 percent of the votes. The relationship between 52.6 percent and 42.9 percent is clearly a majority-minority one, not at all a "marginal" relationship. But through the excessive weight of the mandates given to the PST, over which there was no control and which were sharply contested—the minority distorts the real relationship of members jointly *verified by the two contending tendencies in the ranks in all the major organizations*. That relationship was roughly 60 to 40.

6. Finally, it is not true that the proposals for an organizational agreement submitted to the Tenth World Congress resulted from the "initiative" of the IEC minority faction. These proposals were first discussed in the parity commission preparatory to the congress which was constituted at the proposal of a comrade of the IEC majority tendency, and in working them out the initiative certainly did not come exclusively or principally from the IEC minority faction, to say the least!

Submitted August 8, 1974

Rejoinder by the Leninist Trotskyist Faction

Concerning the points made in the *IEC Majority Tendency's Reply to the Statement by the Minority Faction*, we make the following observations.

1. The IMT claims that the membership figures presented by the Argentine PST was not verified by the mandates commission. This is true, but the lack of verification was not limited to the PST. The mandates commission did not verify *any* membership figures. Under the "Agreement on Measures to Help Maintain the Unity of the Fourth International" it was agreed to accept the membership figures and consequent number of voting delegates as presented by each section or sympathizing group.

But the arithmetic of the IMT is faulty, even using their own figures. The IMT claims that if a "verified" figure—"verified" by the IMT—of the membership of the PST is used, "the votes supposedly obtained by the IEC minority faction are reduced to the proportion of 40 to 60 which we used in our original statement." The IMT says this "verified" figure for the membership of the PST is "almost one-third lower" than that claimed by the representatives of the PST. Since the PST claimed 3,589 members who voted for the LTF, the "verified" figure would be more than 2,393 and the total number voting for the positions of the LTF would be at least 4,467. The proportion between the IMT and the LTF—leaving aside the third tendencies, those who did not or could not vote—would be 54 to 46, not 60 to 40. This, we repeat, is according to the IMT's "verified" figure.

If we accept as correct the figures of a 60 to 40 ratio for those who voted for the positions of the IMT as against those of the LTF, we are led to the conclusion that the figure for those voting for the positions of the LTF must have been 3,518, since 5,277 voted for the IMT. In this case, the PST must have only 1,444 "verified" members, since 2,074 voted for the LTF outside Argentina.

Either way, it appears that the IMT leaders take the view that one IMT supporter is worth two or three Argentine Trotskyists.

In any case, if there are to be belated challenges to the mandates claimed by any sections or sympathizing groups, in violation of the "Agreement on Measures to Help Maintain the Unity of the Fourth International," the challenges cannot be limited to the case of the PST. Grossly inflated figures were presented by the Red Faction and the Bolshevik Faction in Argentina, by the POR in Bolivia, and the PSR in Chile. But if—as was stipulated in the "Agreement on Measures to Help Maintain the Unity of the Fourth International"—we accept the mandates and membership figures presented by the sections and sympathizing groups, we find the following: of the total membership of the sections and sympathizing groups, 40 percent (5,277) voted for the positions of the IMT, 43 percent (5,663) for those of the LTF, 2 percent (245) for other tendencies, and 15 percent could not or did not vote. The actual mandated votes at the world congress, which were accepted unanimously, would

remain unchanged.

2. The IMT notes that almost all members of the PST voted for the positions of the LTF, and questions the validity of the vote in the PST on this basis. The IMT argument leaves out of account that in every country where a split in the Trotskyist forces has occurred, each side in such splits has voted in its overwhelming majority for one or another of the major groupings in the international. This is not surprising, because the issues in dispute in the international have been reflected in every case in the political issues that have led to splits in these countries. Thus, in the Argentine Red Faction and Bolshevik Faction, in the Canadian RMG, the Mexican GCI, the Peruvian FIR (Combate), the Spanish LCR-ETA(VI), the Australian Communist League—not a single vote was cast for the LTF while there were unanimous votes for the IMT. We should also note that there was not a single vote for the platform of the LTF in the following sections or sympathizing groups according to the information supplied to the mandates commission: Italian, Swiss, Japanese, Austrian, Luxembourgian, Bolivian, Irish, Dutch, Lebanese, Israeli, Iraqi, and Ceylonese. Most were unanimous for the IMT—the Swiss, for example, one of the larger sections in Europe. This says a great deal more about the "nature of the organizations, the discussion and the vote" in these groups than in those countries where the forces of Trotskyism are split.

3. The question under this point is avoided by the IMT. The fact is that candidate members in many sections cannot vote, and did not vote on the questions in dispute, yet they were counted as full members for purposes of deciding the number of mandated votes from each section. This grossly inflated the number of mandated IMT delegates to the world congress. Consider the Walloon section, for example, which cast 34 percent of the votes for the IMT at the world congress. In Wallonie only about 42 percent of the membership voted for the positions of the IMT, while 38 percent were candidate members who could not vote, more than 15 percent abstained or did not vote, and the rest voted for a third tendency (the LTF received a very small number). The upshot was that the number of voting delegates supporting the IMT from the Walloon section at the world congress was *more than double* what it would have been if those who voted for the IMT in the section were represented by the ratio of one delegate to every 50 supporters—the basis for representation at the congress.

4. "Groups of young people in France" are not the same as functioning independent Trotskyist youth organizations. The "groups of young people in France" did not have access to the discussion, and expressed no opinion on it. Of those youth organizations whose members did discuss the issues and took positions, a large majority of their members supported the LTF.

November 13, 1974

Point 36 of IMT Resolution 'Argentina: Political Crisis and Revolutionary Perspectives'

[Point 36 of the majority resolution "Argentina: Political Crisis and Revolutionary Perspectives" is published internally only, in accordance with a motion adopted by a majority of the United Secretariat in May 1974.]

36. The World Congress draws a balance sheet on the organization recognized at the Ninth World Congress as a sympathizing organization. It can only be an extremely critical one.

First of all, the *La Verdad* group has publicly attacked several sections in Latin America in its press, and especially some leaders of the International who were guilty of defending the orientations decided on by the last World Congress.

Secondly, *La Verdad* has made clear its fundamental misunderstanding of the necessities of armed struggle at the present stage of the class struggle in Argentina, engaging in a political line that is in the first place purely syndicalist, and secondly, electoralist—for example, its election campaign in which it maintained complete silence on the necessity to destroy the bourgeois state apparatus.

Prepared to pay any price within its legalist perspective it reached an agreement, on the basis of a centrist political line, for political and organizational fusion with the Coral faction of the PSA (Argentine Socialist Party), a small left Social-Democratic current with no influence in the working class. The new party, the PST (Socialist Workers Party), confronted Peronism with a combination of purely propagandist positions and clearly opportunist attitudes. For example, it appealed to Peron to "put himself at the head of struggles"; it demanded that

slates of FREJULI, the bourgeois Peronist party, be made up of "80 percent workers candidates"; it demanded that Campora, the bourgeois, form a government "with a majority working-class composition"; it carried on a respectful and responsible (sic) dialogue between Coral and the bourgeois finance Minister Gelbard, etc., etc.

The daily practice of the PST reflects a tail-endist and legalistic concept of building the party. It dodges the problems of armed struggle, of the violent destruction of the bourgeois state, of the formation of workers militias, not only in terms of present tasks but even in its programmatic formulations, as, for example, in the La Verdad-PSA fusion protocol. In its press it conducts no systematic propaganda for arming the workers, not even for workers self-defense. It uses ambiguous formulas in its press that give the impression that the proletariat could win simply through propaganda against the army, directed to soldiers and noncommissioned officers, without necessarily forming armed detachments of the proletariat and without armed confrontations with the bourgeois repressive apparatus.

The PST has several thousand members and organized sympathizers. Most are students and workers who sincerely want to struggle for socialism and who sympathize with Trotskyism. Consequently, the World Congress favors maintaining fraternal links between the Fourth International and the PST as a sympathizing group. But the International cannot grant recognition as an "official" section to an organization with a political line and practice that are so far removed from the principles and tradition of our movement.

Concluding Paragraphs of the LTF 'Counterreport on Armed Struggle'

[The following final two paragraphs of the "Counterreport on Armed Struggle in Latin America" by Joseph Hansen, presented to the world congress on behalf of the Leninist Trotskyist Faction, are published internally only in accordance with a motion adopted by a majority of the United Secretariat in May 1974.]

We come to another very important point. The resolution on "armed struggle" opens the way to all kinds of deviations of the most dangerous kind. For example, the leaders of the International Executive Committee Majority Tendency may contend that it has no connection with their position on armed struggle in Latin America, yet members of their tendency in Spain hailed the assassination of Carrero Blanco, and the *Red Weekly* of January 11, 1974, published a headline: "Spanish Trotskyists give total support to Carrero Blanco assassination." Naturally, no Trotskyists were involved in that assassination. The declarations of support, however, involved

the most serious departure from the *programmatic* position of the world Trotskyist movement on armed struggle.

I said that this resolution marks the completion of the turn adopted at the Ninth World Congress, the turn toward guerrilla war. This is not quite accurate. It can also be said to have opened a new stage. If adopted, it would place the Fourth International in a rather ignominious position—standing on the sidelines hailing the "minority violence" committed by others. Could this position be maintained for long? I don't think so. The pressure would mount to go still further in departing from the programmatic position of Trotskyism on this question. I hope that the comrades will draw back from this road before it is too late. If they do not, our movement will face the most disastrous consequences. To turn resolutely away from this fatal perspective, the resolution on armed struggle must be defeated.

Minutes of the International Executive Committee

February 15, 1974

Full members present: Rudi, Walter, Roca, Adair, Petersen, Abel, Crandall, Roman, Fourier, Georges, Aubin, Friedrich, Karl, Mintoff, T.T. Roy, Mikado, Claudio, Fideli, Sakai, Kihaza, Jaber, Key, Martinez, Tuco, Frey, Jensen, Duret, Atwood, Barman, Celso, Galois, Johnson, Pepe, Stateman, Therese, Antonio

Alternate members present: Fred, Brewster, Williams, Fireman, Lee See, Carlos, Domingo, Sylvia, Chandra, Edgardo, Ronald, Raoul, Juan

Control Commission members present: Bundy, Eduard, Hoffman, Karl, Tantalus

Chair: Claudio

Agenda: 1. Election of the United Secretariat, 2. Statement on British miners strike, 3. Statement on Chile

1. *Election of United Secretariat*— Reporter Walter
The incoming United Secretariat will differ from the pre-world congress Secretariat in two respects: 1. tendencies will be formally represented; 2. it must represent a big step in the direction of establishing a resident secretariat. The IEC majority must have a larger than proportional representation in order to have a working body. The exact number of LTF comrades can be somewhat flexible depending on finances and how many are resident.

Proposed that the United Secretariat be composed of 14 IMT, roughly 5 LTF, and Karl for the Kompass Tendency in the GIM.

Nominations for the IMT: Fourier, Georges, Roman, Domingo, X (to be designated later by Walloon section), Roca, Walter, Claudio, Jones, Ghulam, Duret, Jensen, Rudi, Mintoff

Request by Celso for recess to allow LTF to consider its nominations. Had prepared list of 10 nominations assuming proportional representation. Need caucus to revise list. Also asks IEC majority to caucus and in light of discussion to reconsider decision not to have

proportional representation on United Secretariat.

Recess

Election of United Secretariat continued— Reporter Celso. In view of insistence by IEC majority on residency or ability to meet on call as central consideration in composition of United Secretariat, and not knowing exactly how many places are open to the LTF,

Nominations for the LTF:

if one place: Marcel (resident)

if two more: Martinez and Johnson (can be resident within six weeks)

if two more: Adair and Friedrich (resident in Europe and on call for all meetings)

if two more: Y and Z (like Walloon section, need time to consult and decide exact individuals who will try to be resident)

if three more: Celso, Pepe, Therese (not resident)

Request by Walter for recess to allow IMT to consider nominations.

Recess

Motion by Walter: to elect a United Secretariat composed of Fourier, Georges, Roman, Domingo, X, Roca, Walter, Claudio, Jones, Ghulam, Duret, Rudi, Mintoff, Karl, Marcel, Martinez, Johnson, plus two American leaders as observers (not necessarily resident but must be top leaders). To leave places for two additional American leaders as observers, if resident (but must be top leaders). If final two American observers are added, IMT will add one more member.

For: 25; Against: 16

Control Commission: For: 4; Against: 0

2. *Motion* by Celso to refer statements on British miners strike and Chile to the United Secretariat.

Carried

Meeting adjourned.