

POLITICAL COMMITTEE MEETING No. 11, March 10, 1977

Present: Berman, Blackstock, Breitman, Garza, Hawkins, D. Jenness, Jones, Lovell, Lund, Miah, Seigle, Sheppard, Stapleton, Waters, Wohlforth

Guests: Brundy, Heisler, Jaquith, Matson

Chair: Breitman

AGENDA: 1. West Coast SCAR Steering Committee  
2. Salt Lake City  
3. Disclosure Suit  
4. Recent Developments in the Puerto Rican Socialist Party  
5. Hedda Garza Letter

1. WEST COAST SCAR STEERING COMMITTEE

(Zimmermann invited for this point)

Miah reported.

Discussion

2. SALT LAKE CITY

Seigle reported on proposal to admit K.B., D.G., B.O., G.S., and R.V. as constitutional members in Salt Lake City and to constitute a branch in Salt Lake City.

Discussion

Motion: To approve.

Carried.

3. DISCLOSURE SUIT

(Hughes and Zimmermann invited for this point)

Zimmermann reported (see attached).

Discussion

Motion: To approve.

Carried.

(over)

4. RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN THE PUERTO RICAN SOCIALIST PARTY  
(Ariza, White, and Zimmermann invited for this point)

Garza reported (see attached).

Discussion

Motion: To approve.

Carried.

5. HEDDA GARZA LETTER

D. Jenness reported on meeting with Hedda Garza concerning November 8, 1976, letter proposing fusion of the former New York RMOC group with the SWP.

Motion: 1) The May 4, 1975, decision of the National Committee stated the procedure to be followed in regard to all applications for membership from former members of the Internationalist Tendency. 2) In accordance with the National Committee decisions, all applications for membership from former IT members are to be considered individually. 3) To refer all such requests for membership to the appropriate unit of the party. 4) To ask former RMOC members applying for membership in the SWP to make available to the SWP all internal documents and correspondence of the RMOC.

(See attached correspondence.)

Discussion

Motion: To approve.

Carried.

Meeting adjourned.

## New Stage in the Fight Against Campaign Disclosure Laws

by Matilde Zimmermann, March 11, 1977

Our national fight against the campaign disclosure laws is reaching a critical turning point, with the Federal Election Commission (FEC) preparing to initiate "enforcement proceedings" against us. This procedure could lead to civil penalties (a fine of up to \$25,000) as well as criminal prosecution by the Justice Department. The purpose of this report is to bring comrades up to date on the fast-moving developments in this case, and to prepare the party for the major defense effort we will have to launch as soon as the FEC makes its move.

We filed a federal suit in 1974, saying that the campaign disclosure laws are unconstitutional as applied to us because of the harassment that our party and campaign supporters have suffered. Since that suit was filed, two important developments have substantially strengthened our case.

The first is the massive evidence of FBI crimes, and the public support for our fight against government spying and harassment, that have resulted from our PRDF campaign. The second is a Supreme Court ruling (in the case brought by James Buckley and Eugene McCarthy) stating that if a party could show a "pattern" or "probability" of harassment, it would have to be exempted from the disclosure provisions.

The wording of that Supreme Court ruling is important for our case:

"Minor parties must be allowed sufficient flexibility in the proof of injury to assure a fair consideration of their claim. The evidence offered need show only a reasonable probability that the compelled disclosure of a party's contributors' names will subject them to threats, harassment or reprisals from either government officials or private parties. The proof may include, for example, specific evidence of past or present harassment of members due to their associational ties, or of harassment directed against the organization itself. A pattern of threats or specific manifestations of public hostility may be sufficient."

In January of this year, the federal court hearing our suit in Washington, D.C., in light of the Supreme Court ruling in the Buckley-McCarthy case, sent our case to the FEC. The court gave the commission six months to develop a factual record on our charges of government harassment. The FEC's findings were then to go back to the federal court for a ruling on the constitutional issue.

Now however, the FEC is trying to turn the tables on us, to seize the offensive and transform us from plaintiffs in this constitutional challenge into defendants.

This is what the FEC is doing: They claim that they have no mechanisms for complying with the federal court's instructions to develop a factual record on our claims of harassment. They claim that the only way they can proceed is to set in motion their enforcement procedures against us. This procedure begins when they send us a letter charging that there is "reason to believe" that a violation of the law has occurred.

What's even worse, the FEC has rejected our demand that the standard of proof we have to meet be the wording of the Supreme Court decision cited above. Instead, they seize upon certain words in the January lower court order referring to "present harassment resulting from disclosure." This is far narrower than the Supreme Court's opinion that "a reasonable probability" of harassment or a "pattern of threats" would be sufficient grounds for exemption. Since we have not disclosed any contributors' names for three years, we could hardly base our case on "present harassment resulting from disclosure."

The way the FEC is planning to proceed against us is unacceptable, illegal, and dangerous. It flies in the face of the Supreme Court ruling. They are proceeding against us exactly as if we had never filed a lawsuit. They are trying to change us from being plaintiffs in a lawsuit -- a strong lawsuit -- to being defendants in an administrative proceeding where you start with a presumption of guilt, and where the FEC acts as both prosecutor and judge.

They have tried to argue that they have no choice, and that the "reason to believe" letter is only a formality to allow them to take up our case. However, such "formalities" normally lead to enforced compliance, a fine, and/or criminal prosecution.

The Socialist Workers Campaign Committees, the plaintiffs in the suit, have instructed the ACLU attorneys to go back into federal court to try to block the FEC use of enforcement proceedings. A motion on this will be filed on March 15.

At the same time that we fight this in court, we must begin preparations for a large-scale public defense against this vindictive prosecution by the government. We must let the FEC know that a prosecution against us will be met with a massive response from all those who are supporting our PRDF suit against government harassment, and who will rally to our defense in the face of this new form of government harassment.

Although we will not move publicly until we actually receive notification from the FEC that they have begun proceedings against us, we should be sure that all comrades are aware of the situation we face, and that friends and supporters of our rights are brought up to date on what we expect to happen.

When we do receive the letter from the FEC, we will want to move immediately into action, with news conferences both nationally and in local areas denouncing the FEC's attempt to force us

to turn over the names of our contributors. We will want to organize protest telegrams to the FEC from prominent individuals all over the country. And we will want to explain the issues in this case, and the illegal and vindictive nature of the proceedings against us, to as many people and organizations as we can.

We believe that, given what we have accomplished in our nearly four year campaign around the PRDF suit, and the increased consciousness about government harassment, a prosecution against us will not be a popular move. Our job will be to organize the broad support that exists for our fight against restrictions on our rights, and to force the FEC to back down.

## Recent Developments in the Puerto Rican Socialist Party

Caterino Garza, March 10, 1977

Some of the problems of the Puerto Rican Socialist Party have begun to come out since the November election. The PSP received about 10,000 votes and its principal vote getter, Carlos Gallisa, who had been in the legislature, received about 70,000. The 70,000 for Gallisa were not sufficient to return him to office. He originally was elected on the ticket of the Pro-Independence Party in 1972. The election results were less than had been projected.

The problems first became manifest when an article by Juan Mari Brás, the PSP secretary general and candidate for governor appeared in a November issue of their paper, Claridad. He listed about 10 faults with the party and the need to correct them and to evaluate leadership performance, including his own in the preceding period. The pages of Claridad were to be opened to contributions by campaign supporters and other pro-independence currents. Particular stress was made in the November article about the PSP's cavalier attitude towards democracy, which, the article stated, was certainly not in keeping with the traditions and aspirations of Puerto Ricans who are strongly for democratic rights.

In November there was also a plenary meeting which included the leader of the U.S. section, José Alberto Alvarez. I was in Puerto Rico at the time and met with Juan Mari after the plenary. Among the points we discussed were the financial problems of Claridad and his interest in "Euro-Communism." Mari Bras pointed out that the paper had needed 20,000 readers and a capital of about \$250,000 to succeed, but despite the fact that neither condition existed they had launched the daily Claridad. Their \$175,000 deficit was a financial drain on the party and they might have to give it up. At the beginning of the year, about February, they ceased publication of the daily and reported that even the weekly was threatened.

At the end of February they reported they were giving up for a month their weekly bilingual edition which is circulated in the U.S. They wrote that they are reorganizing finances and inquiring of their readers as to what they would like to see in the bilingual paper when it renews operations in April.

Since November Claridad has reported a number of things about the PSP. A commission was established to evaluate the functioning of members of the Comision Politica (C.P.), the equivalent of our Political Committee. Even Juan Mari was to be evaluated. He declined to be part of the body engaged in the evaluation. After that process was over only 3 of 9 members of the C.P. were returned. Those included Juan Mari, Pedro Baiges Chapel, and another individual I don't know anything about. Baiges Chapel was one of the early founders of the MPI, predecessor to the PSP along with Mari. Among those gone are people most closely associated with pro-Moscow sentiments and many of the younger elements in the leadership. They did not report which people were added to the C.P.

In addition, the January 19 issue of Claridad renewed some of the earlier organizaional criticisms raised by Juan Mari, and self-criticized the PSP for violating trade-union autonomy. Some of its members it charged had acted like "labor commissars." The PSP criticized itself for behaving arrogantly and trying to force its ideas down the throats of other tendencies and individuals. Another self-criticism was the bureaucratism of the leaders who they say spoke only to other leaders and Claridad charged that the apparatus had become overly large and aloof from its members and from the masses. It admitted the PSP had been sectarian but was going to rectify those errors and the reevaluation of the leadership was part of the process.

Other articles along this vein have appeared. One by their former trade union secretary had been submitted in October and suppressed. Now in the interest of history it was published to demonstrate that they were a democratic organization. That letter criticized their trade-union policy of orienting towards leadership and leadership positions instead of towards rank-and-file workers.

The March 8 Claridad carries an article by Juan Mari bridging the position of armed struggle with the policy of winning the masses. It does not repudiate armed struggle but points out that the masses must be won first and they determine what force to use. However, to speak of armed struggle today is out of place he says. This reflects the fact that apparently one of the issues being debated in the organization is the question of armed struggle. It was clearly a major question at the recent Puerto Rican Solidarity Committee Conference in Chicago.

The response within their ranks is unknown to us. We do know that they have been losing some members both in Puerto Rico and the U.S. However, there has been no split and no outstanding leader of the PSP has left it. The most prominent person to leave is Ramón Jimenez, leader of the struggle to save Hostos college. Jimenez explained in a conversation with me that he left because he did not believe that independence was the principal issue around which Puerto Ricans here should be organized. He feels the Puerto Rican community is unorganized and can be organized about its immediate problems. To that end he has put together a coalition to fight against cutbacks. The coalition has projected a rally for April 15 in New York City. The coalition meets every Saturday and we have some people working with it. Meetings are of about 50 or 60 people with little or no PSP participation.

Comrades report exceptional friendliness by rank-and-file members of the PSP, especially students. This has been the case in Boston, Newark, Binghamton, and Albany.

In the meantime events have been taking place to which there has been little or no reaction by the PSP or any other Puerto Rican group.

1. The proposal and debate around the 51st state has not been answered by any action although Claridad has of course responded.

In Puerto Rico a coalition to fight back has been boycotted by the PSP and by the Puerto Rican Independence Party.

2. An opportunity to gain publicity for the 5 Puerto Rican nationalists has generally been overlooked. Carter's inauguration and policies have lent themselves to intervention and the Puerto Rican radical movement has tailed off or not reacted. The result has been that bourgeois Puerto Ricans have become the primary spokes-people for the release of the Five. Just this past week four former governors of Puerto Rico and the present governor sent a letter to Carter asking that he release the Five Nationalists.

3. Grand jury and police harassment of pro-independence supporters has not been answered. The imprisonment of Nemikin and of Cueto has not met any massive significant response. There has been no attempt to expose the FALN issue and it is having an affect on supporters of independence. P.S.P.ers have been imprisoned in Puerto Rico on frameups and aside from coverage in Claridad little has been done.

We should also note moves by leading PSPers to disassociate themselves from Soviet repression and an attraction to developments in the European Stalinist parties.

The SWP's response so far has been to have three forums on the 51st state. One in Boston, one in Newark and this coming Friday one on the Lower East Side. In addition the Upper West Side is holding a forum on how to fight the repression of the independence movement.

We also had about 15 comrades attend a benefit for Claridad at Casa de Las Americas in N.Y.C. About 200 PSPers were there including Juan Mari who had come for a discussion with his people. We were the only tendency to make a showing and our comrades mixed and talked to their people and generally had a good time.

At that party I made an appointment to talk to José Alberto Alvarez their main leader in the U.S., but it was subsequently cancelled. Previously NSCAR had invited them to send a speaker to the NSCAR rally for Mashinini in New York, but they didn't respond.

López also informed us that they were looking to drop some of their responsibility in the Puerto Rican Solidarity Committee although they would accept positions on the national board. When questioned about the sectarian and ultra-left resolution to be adopted at the PRSC Conference in Chicago in February he replied the PSP was supporting it because the other resolution was even worse.

The PSP didn't even mobilize its people for the recent rally at Lincoln hospital in the Bronx, a rally they had helped to organize

along with us. It appears they are involved in preparations for their congress in the U.S. which has been postponed from April until October. The PSP in Puerto Rico projects a convention for 1978.

Along with the internal discussions inside the PSP, there has been a friendlier attitude by PSP members towards party members. This has facilitated the opportunity to have political discussions with far more of their members and to work together in common activities.

One area of work in New York where some of their members are working with us is the March 12 women's liberation actions. The PSP has endorsed the action and will have a speaker. Involvement in women's liberation activity will further stimulate the discussion already going on inside the PSP as to their policy on this question. In the past they've tended to downplay the importance of the right to abortion, the ERA, and other key issues in the women's liberation movement.

#### What Should We Do?

1) Give special attention in the Militant and our forums to defending the PSP and other Puerto Rican militants under attack by the government, particularly these grand jury "fishing expeditions."

2) To find ways to comment in the Militant on political questions being discussed inside the PSP.

3) To systematically organize our contact work with PSP members, periphery, and members who've just dropped out. At the present time party members know more members and have friendly relations with PSP members than any time previously.

4) To continue our policy of inviting PSP leaders to speak at certain forums and of inviting them to join with us in our major campaigns -- South Africa, women's liberation, election campaigns, etc.

Comrades are urged to send reports to the national office about local developments in the PSP and our relations with them.

REPORT ON NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF PUERTO RICAN SOLIDARITY COMMITTEE

by Mike Taber

The Second National Conference of the Puerto Rican Solidarity Committee, held February 19-21 in Chicago, was attended by over 200 people, of whom 93 were voting delegates. The PRSC has about 400 members and 20 chapters nationally, made up almost entirely of radicals, and overwhelmingly white in composition. Thirty-six organizations were present at the conference as observers including many left tendencies. In addition, several leaders of the left in Puerto Rico were present including Pedro Grant and Juan Velez from the Puerto Rican Labor Institute and PSP, Luis Angel Torres from the Movimiento Socialista Popular and the Frente Revolucionaria Anti-imperialista, and Eneida Vasquez from the Puerto Rican Peace Council.

The discussion at the conference centered almost exclusively on approving a statement of purpose and a program for the PRSC. There was virtually no discussion on projections for concrete activities. A draft statement of purpose and program was presented by the outgoing National Board that reemphasized the stated purpose of PRSC to become a "broad mass anti-imperialist movement." Counterposed to these drafts were counter-documents by two groupings: one by the San Francisco chapter reflecting the view of the Prairie Fire Organizing Committee, and the other by a group calling itself the March 1 Bloc. The positions of these two groups tended to overlap, and between them they appeared to have the support of about 1/3 of the delegates.

The March 1 Bloc included the Nationalist Party, the Colectiva Don Pedro Albizu Campos in Chicago, the Union for Puerto Rican Students at the University of Illinois, the Sojourner Truth Organization in Chicago, and elements from the Chicago Committee to Stop the Grand Jury, the Midwest Committee to Free the 5, and some members of the FUSP and Lawyers Guild in Chicago. It appeared to be led by Jose Lopez, a Puerto Rican activist in Chicago under Grand Jury subpoena. The main purpose of the March 1 Bloc was to push for PRSC to adopt a clear position in support of armed struggle for the Puerto Rican movement as both necessary and inevitable, and in that context to support the FALN. They also attacked what they termed PRSC's "watering down" of its program to accommodate liberals, wanted a clearer definition of imperialism and its affect on the U.S. working class, and proposed PRSC become more involved in issues facing Puerto Ricans in the United States.

Much of the conference had an extremely factional character. This even spilled over at the public rally where a number of speakers made numerous references to the debate. However, while the counter-documents of the March 1 Bloc and the San Francisco chapter were not adopted, there was not a great deal of political clarification.

A number of amendments incorporating most of the positions of these two groupings were adopted including an amendment proposed by the March 1 Bloc on armed struggle that gave explicit support to armed struggle, the need for revolutionary violence, and the need to combine legal and illegal means in the struggle. This was adopted overwhelmingly. Jose Velasquez from the PSP several times mentioned the PSP's support of the need for "prolonged armed struggle," and this was echoed by others.

There was quite a bit of discussion on the need not to turn PRSC into a political party. However, much of the discussion revolved around adopting precise analyses of the worldwide and national political situations more in keeping with a party, than a coalition organized around ending U.S. domination of Puerto Rico.

While the PSP played a major role at the conference, there was a lot of discussion about the need to broaden PRSC to encompass other forces on the Puerto Rican left. Some forces within PRSC look to the FRAI or the Nationalist Party, and supporters of both of these were included on the new National Board.

Most of those attending the conference were not affiliated to any major left tendency. Many were supporters of the Guardian or the PSP, or activists in other movements. The CP has only a token involvement, and Workers World Party only now seems to be stepping up its involvement. One of their members told me that they were planning to discuss the extent of their involvement, and were especially interested in seeing if one of their members would be elected to the National Board (which happened).

There was quite a bit of "self-criticism" about the work of PRSC over the last period. This included lack of a "strategical orientation," uneven work, an "all or nothing combat mentality," and a general levelling off of membership. However, no proposals were made to deal with these problems. In general, the conference seemed to reflect a certain crisis of perspective for many of the forces involved in PRSC and this is likely to continue.

#### Delegate Breakdown

(2 delegates for first 10 members, 1 for each ten after that.)

|                 |   |                     |             |
|-----------------|---|---------------------|-------------|
| Amherst         | 6 | Portland            | 3           |
| Boston          | 5 | St. Louis           | 3           |
| Brooklyn        | 6 | San Diego           | 2           |
| Buffalo         | 1 | San Francisco       | 14          |
| Chicago         | 8 | Seattle             | 4           |
| DC              | 3 | Springfield         | 1           |
| Los Angeles     | 6 | Madison             | 1           |
| Upper West Side | 7 | Davenport           | 1           |
| New Haven       | 4 | New York            | 1           |
| Philadelphia    | 3 | Houston and Atlanta | not present |

Note- The membership according to these figures should be close to 700 when the real figure is 400. This is probably due to local chapters inflating their membership to get more delegates.

COPY

COPY

COPY

14 Charles Lane  
New York, N.Y. 10014

March 15, 1977

Hedda Garza  
New York, N.Y.

Dear Comrade,

The Political Committee discussed your letter of November 8, 1976, and heard a report on your meeting with Linda Jenness and Marcia Gallo.

The National Committee of the SWP adopted a report on May 4, 1975, which outlined a procedure for considering applications from former IT members. In case you have not seen it, a copy of the report is enclosed. In accordance with the decision of the National Committee, former members of the RMOC who have broken with that organization and want to apply for membership in the SWP will be referred to an appropriate branch unit. They will be encouraged to participate in activities organized by the branch so the membership can make an objective evaluation and recommendation on each application for membership.

The Political Committee has asked Linda Jenness to meet with you and discuss the initiation of this process.

We would like to request that you make available to us your file of internal documents and correspondence of the RMOC and its various local units.

Comradely,

/s/ Mary-Alice Waters

Mary-Alice Waters  
for the SWP Political  
Committee

(over)

COPY

COPY

COPY

New York, N.Y.

November 8, 1976

Socialist Workers Party  
National Office

Attention: Political Committee, SWP

Dear Comrades:

After many weeks of discussion on a national level, the New York RMOC voted last night to apply for fusion with the Socialist Workers party as a local unit. We felt that since no clear and consistent position on the SWP was forthcoming on a national basis we would act locally on this matter and attempt to encourage other areas to do the same.

We believe that the SWP is a revolutionary Trotskyist party, that we have no principled disagreements with its program, and that we should scrap all efforts to build any new section in sympathy with the FI in this country.

We are prepared to enter into discussions on this proposed fusion and how we can best cooperate to bring it to fruition.

Our ranks include former members of the Socialist Workers party and/or Young Socialist Alliance (some formerly Internationalist Tendency members, some not), as well as some more recent recruits.

Please let us know when it would be convenient for us to meet with appropriate comrades in order to discuss this matter.

Comradely,

/s/ Hedda Garza

Hedda Garza--for the New York  
RMOC

COPY

COPY

COPY

Hedda Garza

New York, N.Y.

January 30, 1977

TO: United Secretariat

Dear Comrades:

This is to inform the United Secretariat that an application for immediate membership in the Socialist Workers party has been made by the comrades listed below. All of these comrades were former members of the Internationalist Tendency of the SWP or YSA, and all of them were expelled from the SWP and/or YSA in July 1975. At some point in the past year and a half, they all joined RMOC. Most of them applied for readmission (or admission) to the SWP within a few months after the expulsion, but none of them were readmitted.

In May 1976, a meeting of the RMOC Steering Committee took place in Chicago. It was agreed that RMOC should apply for fusion with the SWP. It became increasingly clear, however, to some of us, that RMOC would have to take a position on the character of the SWP. On September 23, the Los Angeles RMOC comrades sent a letter to the steering committee members in which they characterized the SWP as "...neither revolutionary nor Trotskyist..." The RMOC comrades in New York met to discuss this letter and sent a reply to Los Angeles on November 8, breaking its ties with RMOC. They also voted to apply collectively to the SWP and to urge other comrades nationally to join with them.

On January 14, I met with Comrade Linda Jenness of the SWP to discuss our application. I informed her of the above facts and sent her a copy of the New York letter to L.A. (attached). Comrade Jenness asked me if the comrades who had individually applied in 1974 were withdrawing their individual applications, and I told her that since it was over two years and they had not been readmitted, they were substituting their collective application instead. Comrade Jenness informed me that she would contact me after the Political Committee of the SWP discussed the matter.

This letter, then, is to officially inform the USEC that the comrades below are no longer members of RMOC, do not agree with the L.A. characterization of the SWP, but believe that the SWP is the revolutionary party in the United States and are accordingly requesting membership or, in the case of former members, readmission collectively to the SWP. When we hear from other comrades, we will send you their additional names.

Comradely,  
/s/Hedda Garza

New York: Bill B.; Charles P.; Dan C.; Bob W.; John E.; Hugo;  
Ernest L.; Charles R. Houston: Bruce C.

(over)

COPY

COPY

COPY

New York, N.Y.

November 8, 1976

To L.A. RMOC and all National Coordinators

Dear Comrades:

I am writing this letter in response to the communication from Los Angeles of Sept. 23. It also includes a brief report on the meeting between Jones of the IMG and several New York comrades.

Aside from general political discussion, Jones expressed the opinion that the RMOC had no business requesting fusion with the Socialist Workers party when it held the position that the SWP is reformist or right centrist or non-Trotskyist, etc. No organization in its right mind would fuse with another organization holding such a position.

We informed Jones that the RMOC had no such position--in fact, that it had taken no official position at all on the SWP. Jones responded that it was necessary to take a clear position before any fusion efforts could be made and that the RMOC comrades should make their main task that of working with the SWP on their petitioning drive and election campaign. The New York comrades agreed with Jones' points and we scheduled a mobilization for petitioning. Unfortunately, it was not carried out.

It was also clear that Jones believed that the reason why RMOC (or any other organization of its type) could not grow was primarily due to the fact that there is no PRINCIPLED difference between itself and the SWP. In other words, there has been no crossing of class lines, no betrayal of the working class (as in the case of Workers World party on the Hungarian and Czechoslovakian issues). Most of us agreed completely; a few comrades had reservations. This in no way implies that Jones (or any of us) thinks that the SWP is the perfect party, or that the treatment of the IT was anything less than horrendous, etc., etc., but it means that there is no principled basis for creating an alternative section in the U.S.--completely apart from the difficult objective situation, so-called betrayal by the IMT, etc.

Considering the discussion at our conference in May, it seemed clear that at our fall conference an unequivocal statement had to be issued in the name of the RMOC on the character of the SWP--that it is a revolutionary party, regardless of our criticisms and differences. This would have been followed by serious fusion efforts which under those circumstances would have been undoubtedly supported by the IMT comrades.

Instead, with no sign of earthshaking events happening since the May Conference, the Los Angeles comrades decide to inform the rest of us that "it is time to say openly what most of us have believed for a while now--certainly since Portugal, namely, that the SWP is neither revolutionary nor Trotskyist--generally or specifically; that it has definitively degenerated into a hardened, monolithic left Social Democratic

organization; that it is beyond redemption, that it has, indeed, become a powerful obstacle to the formation of a Trotskyist movement in this country. A corollary of this is that, by bolstering this anti-Trotskyist gang and collaborating with it in smashing a pro-FI tendency, the IMT leadership has performed a terrible disservice to the world movement..."

I am personally stunned by this declaration, since we heard no hint of it at our May meeting when we discussed fusion, I cannot even begin to understand why the comrades encouraged and supported fusion when they had held such a position "for a long time." Frankly, I feel that I was dragged into a deceptive, dishonest discussion, and I sincerely wish that the comrades had spelled out their real thinking six months ago in Chicago.

The letter from L.A., as well as the article "Some thoughts on our Present Situation," by Eliot Rosewater, make it abundantly clear that the RMOC not only no longer exists as a national organization but that I can no longer affiliate with it in any way.

I intend to put this letter up for a vote today in New York and to make a proposal that the New York comrades request fusion with the SWP on a principled basis, as a fusion with a sympathizing section of the Fourth International (if not for the Voorhis Act), not as a wrecking operation into a social democratic non-Trotskyist party.

I can only express sorrow and disappointment at the lack of honesty with which this whole matter has been conducted.

Comradely,  
/s/ Hedda Garza

P.S. At our meeting tonight, the New York comrades voted to support the contents of this letter. They also requested to have it circulated to the membership of the former RMOC nationally so that all those who chose to disassociate themselves from the L.A. positions can do so. It is obvious to us that our status in the F.I. will be in jeopardy if there is any indication that we go along with such a position. The comrades also voted to begin fusion steps with the SWP in New York.

P.P.S. We are also enclosing a contribution from Roger for printing in the Bulletin.