Political Committee, LSA-LSO
334 Queen Street W
Toronto 133, Ontario.

To CC members: May 15/72

Dear comrades,

The enclosed statement of the LSA/LSO Political Committee, "The United Secretariat Stand on the Sallustro Kidnaping" is FOR THE INFORMATION OF C.C MEMBERS ONLY.

The statement is our response to the following motion of the United Secretariat, excerpted from the minutes of the April 15 - 16, 1972 meeting.

"Motion by Pierre:

The United Secretariat of the Fourth International disapproves of the publication in the Militant and Labor Challenge of resolutions adopted by the leaderships of the Socialist Workers Party and the League for Socialist Action/Ligue Socialiste Ouvriere concerning the kidnapping of Sallustro by the Argentine ERP, the armed organization led by the Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores (PRT), Argentine section of the Fourth International.

Such public declarations could well encourage sections to follow this example of public attacks against other sections, which would be highly damaging to the whole International.

In addition, these resolutions do not express any solidarity towards these comrades, at the moment when a fierce campaign is underway against them.

The United Secretariat of the Fourth International resolves not to publish these two resolutions in the International's organs, or in organs expressing its positions.

This resolution is not for public circulation.

Vote: For: 6 (Petersen, Walter, Livio, Kurt, Pierre, Delfin)

Against: 5 (Adair, Pedro, Juan, Hans, Therese

Consultative: For 1 (Biel)
Consultative Against: 1 (Grandall)

Carried"

Comradely

Gary Porter

Organizational Secretary.

Encl:

THE UNITED SECRETARIAT STAND ON THE SALLUSTRO KIDNAPPING

Statement by the Political Committee of the League for Socialist Action-Ligue Socialiste Ouvriere, May 22, 1972.

At its April 15 - 16 meeting the United Secretariat, by majority vote of 6 - 5, took a decision to disapprove the publication in The Militant and Labor Challenge of statements outlining the positions of the political committees of the Socialist Workers Party and the League for Socialist Action-Ligue Socialiste Ouvriere on the Sallustro kidnapping in Argentina.

Having considered the United Secretariat motion, the Political Committee of the LSA/LSO states the following:

(1) We the assertion that the Militant and Labor Challenge statements are "public attacks" against another section: neither statement "attacked" the ERP-PRT. They criticized (by upholding the established Trotskyist position on terrorism) a serious error committed by the ERP-PRT. They differentiated the positions of the SWP and of the LSA/LSO from that of the ERP-PRT on the question involved - in our case a very important action in view of the FLQ events in Quebec in October of 1970.

(2) We the claim that "these resolutions do not express any solidarity towards these comrades, at the moment when a fierce campaign is underway against them": We protest this outrageous assertion, one which is patently false and will be clear to all Trotskyists who are able to read our statement and that of the SWP. Both statements clearly attacked the Lanusse regime as being responsible for the violence in Argentina and solidarized with the victims of the repression. The LSA/LSO statement drew attention to the world-wide solidarity campaign now underway to defend the victims of the repression, a campaign in which we are considerably involved in Canada.

What can be the purpose of injecting such false accusations into the discussion of the ERP-PRT kidnapping, if not to prejudice the minds of members of the Fourth International against criticisms raised both by the SWP and ourselves.

(3) The LSA/LSO statement on the ERP-PRT kidnapping was not only rooted in the long-held, principled position of Trotskyism on terrorism, but attempted to convey to the Argentinian comrades and the world movement our recent experience with similar actions carried out by the Front de Liberation du Quebec in October of 1970.

We said: "The ERP action, like that of the FLQ supporters in Quebec, reduces the masses to the role of spectators. It avoids the necessary consistent work of bringing the masses into struggles around a program linked to their most urgent economic, social and political needs.

"Our recent experience in Quebec convinces us all the more that rather than involving the revolutionary forces in mass struggles, such actions separate the revolutionaryes from the masses, thus posing a block on the path to building a revolutionary party...."

We had every reason to expect that the United Secretariat would, at the first opportunity make a similar statement, particularly in view of the position adopted by the United Secretariat on the FLQ action in 1970. We quote:

> "While sympathizing with the nationalist and anti-capitalist sentiments of the FLQ, revolutionary socialists do not think that in the present context of Canada such actions are the correct means to bring about a mass struggle for an independent socialist Quebec."

Since the United Secretariat statement on the FLQ kidnappings in October 1970 nothing in the resolutions or declarations of the leading bodies of the Fourth International have sanctioned actions which substitute the actions of small, isolated groups for actions by the masses. None of the resolutions of the Ninth world congress do that either.

(4) We have put forward our position. The question which much of the world movement is now asking of the majority of the United Secretariat is: "What is the position of the leading body of the International?"

Instead of taking a clear position, instead of re-affirming the principled position of Trotskyism against adventurism, the majority of the United Secretariat evaded the question at the April 15 - 16 meeting. You neither approved nor disapproved the kidnapping and execution of Sallustro. You abstained from taking a stand. You voted down, 6 to 5, a motion to issue a public statement along the lines of the positions of the SWP and the LSA/LSO.

On top of its own indecision, the United Secretariat majority voted to disapprove the public statements of the LSA/LSO and the SWP. This can only lead the world movement to conclude that the United Secretariat majority approves the action of the ERP-PRT; and that, furthermore, it approves the public declarations in Rouge, La Gauche, and Red Mole which hail and approve the kidnapping.

(5) The decision of the United Secretariat majority to give specific instructions that the SWP and the LSA/LSO statements not be published in "the International's organs or in organs expressing its positions" only re-inforces our fears that a new line, an adventurist line departing from the traditions and program of Trotskyism, is being pushed in the movement. Was the ERP, in carrying out the kidnapping and execution of Sallustro, acting in accordance with the line of the majority of the United Secretariat? The conduct of the United Secretariat majority would indicate an affirmative answer to that question.

Those who disapprove of the ERP-PRT action must remain silent. Those who approve it are free to establish such an adventurist line throughout the world movement in their press. Meanwhile, the United Secretariat demurs.

In Canada we have already had a first hand experience with revolutionaries - certain members of the Young Socialists-Ligue des Jeunes Socialistes - who are convinced that the ERP-PRT action was an application of the line of the Ninth World Congress and of the majority of the United Secretariat. So convinced are they that such is the case, they decided to carry out a boycott of the issues of the sections press (Labor Challenge and Liberation) which carried the LSA/LSO statement on the kidnapping. These members of the Unified Minority Tendency of the YS/LJS

(who then constituted a majority of the Halifax and Fredericton locals of the YS-LJS) tried to justify their boycott out of "loyalty" to the line of the International - the boycott being a public attack on the Canadian section, a violation of the relations established between the section and the YS-LJS and codified in their constitutions, and a violation of the democratic centralist norms of the YS-LJS.

In view of the above considerations, the Political Committee of the LSA/LSO finds completely unacceptable the April 15 - 16 resolution of the United Secretariat. We re-affirm our criticism of the ERP-PRT action within the framework of internationalist solidarity with its revolutionary fighters.

LSA/LSO Political Committee,
May 22, 1972.