

14 Charles Lane  
New York, N.Y. 10014

December 23, 1976

No. 2

To the Steering Committee of the Leninist Trotskyist Faction

Dear Comrades,

Enclosed are the following items:

- 1) A letter from Otto, for the United Secretariat Bureau, forwarding a motion by the French LCR to the SWP Political Committee, and a reply to the LCR Central Committee from Jack Barnes.
- 2) An October 19, 1976, letter from Ricardo to the United Secretariat.
- 3) A December 15, 1975, letter from Hugo to Orestes.
- 4) Letters from Galois to Ricardo and to Capa and Orestes, dated November 29, 1976.
- 5) A report on a trip to Japan and Hong Kong by Jim Green.
- 6) A November 26, 1976, letter from Jim Percy to the United Secretariat.
- 7) Three articles reprinted from the November 25, 1976 and December 16, 1976 issues of Direct Action.
- 8) Statements by Griot, Matti and Thalou, translated from the LCR (France) Internal Bulletin No. 47.
- 9) An October 15, 1976, letter from Colleen Levis (LSO), and Léon Peillard (GMR), to the United Secretariat.

Comradely,

*Caroline Lund*  
Caroline Lund

C O P Y

C O P Y

C O P Y (#1)

Brussels  
November 17, 1976

Political Committee, Socialist Workers Party  
New York, N. Y.

Dear Comrades,

Attached please find two motions for your information. The first is a motion adopted by the Central Committee of the Ligue Communiste Revolutionnaire, French section of the Fourth International. The second motion was adopted by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International at its November 13-14, 1976, meeting.

Comradely,  
s/ Otto, for the Bureau of the United Secretariat

\* \* \*

TRANSLATION

Motion of the Central Committee of the LCR, French Section of the Fourth International, Concerning SWP/OCI Contacts.

The CC of the LCR protests the fact that a delegation from the Political Committee of the SWP, passing through Paris, saw fit to go to the headquarters of the OCI and while there to discuss the Amiens affair with leaders of that organization, before meeting with the LCR leadership and without even informing them or asking their opinion on the advisability of such a discussion. All this is contrary to motions adopted by the United Secretariat (see Documentation Internationale No. 6 -- November 1976 the French IIDB ). The CC encharges the Political Bureau to request an explanation from the leadership of the SWP for such conduct.

\* \* \*

Motion of the United Secretariat

The United Secretariat approves the request made by the French LCR Central Committee and strongly recommends to the SWP Political Committee to reply to the request. The United Secretariat further recommends to the SWP to comply with the recommendations made in the motion "Relations With Trotskyist Organizations or Groups Claiming to Be Trotskyist, which are Outside the Fourth International" adopted at the July 3-4, 1976 meeting of the United Secretariat.

\* \* \*

COPY

COPY

14 Charles Lane  
New York, N.Y.  
December 17, 1976

Central Committee of the LCR,  
French Section of the Fourth International

Dear Comrades,

The Bureau of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International has forwarded to us your motion stating among other things that "a delegation from the Political Committee of the SWP, passing through Paris, saw fit to go to the headquarters of the OCI and while there to discuss the Amiens affair with leaders of that organization, before meeting with the LCR leadership and without even informing them or asking their opinion on the advisability of such a discussion."

The facts are different. Three members of the Socialist Workers Party visited the OCI headquarters to discuss with Comrade Lambert his speaking at a protest meeting to be held in London over the frame-up campaign being waged by the Healyites against leading Trotskyists, the Socialist Workers Party, and the Fourth International. This was in accordance with the decision made by the Bureau of the United Secretariat to support the protest meeting, and the wish of the leadership of the IMG to know definitely whether Comrade Lambert could be counted on to be one of the speakers.

The speaking engagement was arranged satisfactorily with Comrade Lambert. In the course of the conversation, he gave us a copy of a letter sent to the editor of Rouge concerning the Amiens affair, in which the OCI leadership denied any responsibility for the reported incident.

The three members of the SWP reported all of this at once to a leading member of the LCR in Paris. No norms of democratic centralism or decisions of the United Secretariat were violated.

So far as the Amiens incident was concerned, we urged the LCR to conduct an objective inquiry into the facts, offering our opinion that the LCR should take the initiative in seeking a joint effort with the OCI to ascertain the truth. We also urged the LCR to publish a political response to the letter of the OCI proposing a common slate in the seventh arrondissement of Paris, so as not to leave the initiative on this matter solely in the hands of the OCI.

Comradely yours,



Jack Barnes  
For the Political Committee  
Socialist Workers Party

cc: United Secretariat

COPY

COPY

COPY

TRANSLATION

October 19, 1976

Mexico, D.F.

Dear Comrades of the United Secretariat:

I hereby protest the fact that this body has never taken up the request sent by the Political Committee of the former Liga Socialista. The PC request regarded Comrade Greco's stay here in Mexico; carrying on subversive work and even coming to the point of proposing a split in the LS.

The work carried on by the PST: sending its agents to cause splits is known to all. Here, Comrade Moreno on several occasions recommended, through his intermediary, Greco, the expulsion of comrades in the leadership. Up until now the proof has been of a testimonial kind. However, I have just found the enclosed letter from Comrade Moreno to Greco in which he recommends the expulsion of Cristina. This measure was rejected by the majority of those of us who headed the Tendencia Militante.

Greco has already left Mexico, but thanks to the fact that the U.Sec. did not take the written request of the ex-LS into account--nor the oral request to Comrade Jean Pierre--this comrade leaves here as a member of the PRT with the option of returning within six months still a member of the PRT.

Right now we have another emissary of Morenoism in Mexico. He is a comrade who comes from the Socialist Bloc and his stated purpose is to sell books and carry out tendency work for the International Bolshevik Tendency.

It would please me to know the thinking of the U.Sec. on these transfers Moreno is given to making. Is this the normal functioning of the Fourth International?

In my opinion, the U.Sec. should call a halt to the tendencial and anti-party maneuvers Morenoism is carrying out. But, despite the obviousness of these maneuvers, this has never been taken up in an international body.

In order to make sure that this case is definitely taken up by the U.Sec. I am sending a copy of this letter, and the letter from Moreno to Greco, to the LTF.

Fraternally,  
s/Ricardo

COPY

COPY

COPY

(#3)

TRANSLATION

Buenos Aires  
December 15, 1975

My dear Orestes:

In a letter to Ricardo, I spoke about my ups and downs with the secretary and the doctor, also about my painful symptoms which, frankly, disappear with cortisone so that I am now feeling quite well.

I made every possible effort to come--I wanted to come--I was enthusiastic about your work, the work all of you are doing. I am surprised at the way our methodological, principled, tactical approaches coincided. The other day when I spoke to Ricardo by telephone I was knocked for a loop because you had worked out the same tactic as we, down to the details. Take the lid off at the right point on the agenda. Today I found out that if the point is not on the agenda, you will do it when the leadership is elected. Magnificent. With one addition which I forgot to include in my memorandum; that is, in the draft of the resolution that liquidates Josefina it is useful to point out that you kept the secret for an opposite reason than she did. You did it to avoid mixing up the political discussion with any emotional questions, like Ricardo's case. This could turn some comrades against her political positions. Now that the two political discussions are finished the moment has arrived, dah dah de dah, to make the truth about what happened known to everyone, nationally and abroad.

OK, enough of politics. We miss you (read: I miss you). It would be good if some incoherent person showed up amongst my intimates--after so many months. I am clearly referring to you, my dear Orestes. All joking aside, you acted like what you are, as Garcia Lorca would say, like a Bolshevik.

I hope to see you soon, to shake your hand and congratulate you, if Ricardo wins the congress, naturally. If it doesn't turn out that way, the stream of foul insults will be heard in Alaska and even on the moon.

When I know the results of the congress I will write very specially to Felipe and Mariano. Since they have so much to do with this colossal leap forward for our entire tendency and world party. Because Mexico in this case is not Mexico; it is our whole international movement. Your move to Mexico is due to them, as is the confidence we have in you, likewise the insistence on the decisive role of Ricardo as leader.

I have no doubt that all of you together will eliminate the acute pettybourgeoisitis, national and foreign, that wants to infect you. Eduardo has with him a long memorandum which he will show to

Ricardo, Mariano, Felipe and all the other comrades they indicate, along with you. It repeats many of the tactics and positions you have already taken. Don't get annoyed by the repetitions nor decide that they amount to pedantry. It was necessary as a memorandum for Eduardo.

The congress of the Mexican comrades will take place at the same time as our CC, or NC, as it is called in the new statutes. It just occurred to me to propose Ricardo, Felipe, Mariano and you as honorary members of the presiding committee. It will be the best way of recognizing all that you are doing and the fact that you are in the front line, in the vanguard of this struggle for a combat international and national combat parties, with militants who are champions of intervening in the process of the class struggle.

If anything I have said seems off base to you, I mean in the memorandum and the two letters, let me know by telephone when Eduardo calls me. Tell Ricardo and the other comrades in the leadership to do likewise. Don't be afraid to point out any errors to me. We will use the telephone to the utmost to exchange ideas.

Meanwhile, caro [dear] Orestes, the most fraternal greetings from your friend and companero as always,

s/Hugo

COPY

COPY

COPY (#4)

November 29, 1976

Dear Comrade Ricardo,

Your letter of October 19, 1976 was brought to the attention of the United Secretariat meeting of November 13-14, 1976, and it was agreed that the Bureau would write to Comrades Moreno and Orestes. A copy of that letter is enclosed.

Unfortunately, your earlier letter of May 17, 1976, on behalf of the Political Committee of the former Liga Socialista was misplaced and was not brought to the attention of the United Secretariat at that time.

In your October 19, 1976 letter you mention an oral request made to Jean-Pierre. Can you please tell us the precise nature of this request?

Revolutionary greetings,  
Galois, for the United Secretariat  
Bureau

COPY

COPY

COPY

November 29, 1976

Dear Comrades Capa and Orestes,

Enclosed is a letter dated October 19, 1976 that the United Secretariat received from Comrade Ricardo of Mexico, and a copy of the enclosure he sent us, a letter from Buenos Aires, dated December 15, 1975 from Hugo to Orestes. This correspondence was brought to the attention of the United Secretariat at the meeting of November 13-14, 1976.

Before proceeding further, we would like to ask you if you can confirm the authenticity of the December 15 letter. Can you please send us the memorandum mentioned in the letter. Do you have any comments to make on the letter, or on the points raised in Comrade Ricardo's letter?

Revolutionary greetings,  
Galois, for the United Secretariat  
Bureau

cc: IEC members in Mexico

REPORT ON JAPAN AND HONG KONG  
by Jim Green

(#5)

October 3, 1976

JAPAN REPORT

In all I spent a total of five days in Tokyo. During that time I had lengthy discussions with Comrade D. and a meeting with the "International Commission" of the JRCL.

The main debate now in the JRCL is over the question of a governmental slogan. The JRCL comrades have already translated and sent material on this question. If you read it you can see that they have taken a partial step towards a more concrete application of the workers and farmers government slogan. They call for a SP/CP government based on the "workers united front." Of course no such united front exists and so it still remains abstract. Moreover they say that what they are calling for cannot be compared to the electoral strategy of calling for a vote for Labor such as is done in Britain. They don't explain exactly why this is the case.

The question has led to a lot of discussion and debate. The JRCL is under a lot of pressure from the "new mass vanguard" organisations who would regard this very modest step as a sellout. The sectarianism of the ultras here surpasses anywhere else I think. But perhaps because these organisations are so extreme and employ violence and so on it may be easier for the JRCL to move toward a correct line of approach SP/CP.

A couple of incidents will illustrate the sort of debate around the electoral question. In the Kansai region, there was a by-election and four candidates were standing. Firstly the Liberal Democrats. Secondly the SP in a block with Komeito (the right-wing Buddhists) with a joint candidate. This ticket was supported by the Buraku activists (Japan's lower caste) and our comrades had been doing a lot of work in this movement. Thirdly a candidate of the ecology movement and fourthly a CP candidate. The Political Bureau was able to choose correctly out of this bunch but the Kansai region leadership opted for the ecology movement candidate. The PB generally put forward the correct class against class argumentation.

(An interesting point here is that the PB let the Kansai region view be implemented. It does show a flexible approach to democratic centralism on a local level. I pointed out to Hino how much more necessary this was on an international scale. I will come to this again later.)

Since that by-election there is now another in an area where we are rather weak. It is the first chance to concretely test out the new governmental slogan. At any rate it is clear that here we are moving to apply it less abstractly and more in terms of the real possibilities.

What is at stake here is a big shift in the orientation of the JRCL and a corresponding rethinking on many international questions. If they are able to develop this approach they could emerge as the only group to the left of the CP and SP that is able to make any sort of approach to the ranks of the mass parties. They still have a long way to go. But they are trying to be consistent and are making criticisms of the IMT's European document in terms of their approach to a governmental slogan. So a certain clarification of their international positions is also at stake in this discussion.

I had a two hour discussion with Hino that illustrated this. I asked him what contributions the JRCL leadership was considering making for the world congress discussion. Among other things he said they would write a critical article on the new IMT European document which took up the point of the dual power schema. They feel there is a counterposition of proletarian democracy to bourgeois democracy in the abstract instead of the use of a concrete governmental slogan. Well, it's clear where this can lead. I tried to draw Hino out on the Portuguese question and the LTF's alleged menshevik two-stage theory.

He was a little defensive around this point of name calling. Apparently there were worse formulations in Sakai's original report on Portugal (such as "Stalinist-like" or along these lines) that were amended out by the other comrades. But I think I made some progress in explaining what the LTF was doing in calling for a CP/SP government. Big differences still remained on the nature of Stalinism and the "good guys vs bad guys" schema and the SP mobilisation. For Hino, the CP was playing some sort of progressive role even if not revolutionary. But the tone of the discussion was good and collaborative.

Other points that Hino said the JRCL wanted to intervene on were: On the European Perspectives Document, the failure to take into account Eastern Europe. On the Political Resolution they predict they will have differences on E. Asia, and a balance sheet of Indonesia. They will translate Kihara's resolution on E. Asia adopted by their conference this year. Also they will write a balance sheet on Vietnam. To top it off Sakai will write an article on problems of international organisation.

On this latest point, they think that regional leaderships are needed -- i. e., in Europe and Asia. They raised the question with Rousset who didn't agree with them. I discussed this mechanical view with Hino and tried to explain just where we were at in building the FI and this, of course, led into the OCRFI discussion.



Then I reported to the International Commission right after this talk with Hino. At first only Hino was present -- so my report was taped -- but then Sakai arrived, then Oda and later also Takayama, editor of their paper.

I reported on the OCRFI question and the Italian, Portuguese and Mexican elections. Sakai made it clear that he supported the schematic stages theory of building the FL. Hino did not comment during the report and discussion but before had seemed quite open to our position.

The JRCL have not taken a position on the Carvalho vote question. They are confused. Sakai repeated some IMT arguments but more as a matter of form and always saying they were undecided. On Mexico and Italy they also seemed undecided and did not comment and I sensed some uneasiness about the IMT's actions here.

I questioned Sakai about India [ See report on the Convention of Communist League in India in mailing of September 22.] and he acted embarrassed and claimed the comrades there had a lax attitude to security.

Hino and Sakai also said that the IMT still needed to "write a real self-criticism" on Latin America. They said they supported the concept of a new mass vanguard but not the dual power schema.

\* \* \* \*

#### HONG KONG REPORT

October 3, 1976

I spent approximately a week in Hong Kong and during that time I had meetings with the Provisional National Committee of the Revolutionary Communist Party, with LTF members in the Revolutionary Communist Youth, and with the LTF as a whole.

To the PNC and the youth LTF comrades I gave substantially the same report -- on the development of the situation with the OCRFI and the question of elections in Italy, Mexico and Portugal. I reported to the LTF meeting on the SWP convention and the LTF steering committee meeting.

A convention of the RCY is scheduled for late October. It will discuss perspectives, especially in regard to the other youth organisation, the Young Socialist Group (YSG). The YSG has about 18 members of whom 15 are active. The RCY has 10 and 3 more will join from the YSG soon, apparently.

A convention of the RCP is scheduled for November. A document on a revolutionary program for China is out and also

an organizational report (perspectives). There seems to be unanimity on the first amongst the leadership but there may be disagreements on the second.

All the LTF comrades agreed, I think, with the position of the LTF on the OCRFI. In regards to the elections questions, no position was expressed by most of the comrades.

In the past year there has been a growth of 4-5 new comrades to the RCY and a couple to the RCP. The comrades raised US \$2000 for their magazine but have not had to pay it to the government yet and hope they won't need to. Circulation of October Review is about 5-600 and Left Bank, now called New Thought, about the same or a little more.

The main area of mass work for the comrades on a day-to-day basis is the housing question but the thrust of the organization in the last year has been more on internal development.

\* \* \* \*

COPY

COPY

COPY

(#6)

Socialist Workers Party  
Australia

November 26, 1976

United Secretariat  
Brussels

Dear comrades,

This is to inform you of a fusion that has **taken** place between our party and three former leaders of the Communist League.

The ex-CL group was made up of IEC member John McCarthy, Peter Robb and Marcia Langton.

The resignation of these three from the CL may well be followed by other comrades with whom we will attempt similar fusions.

Enclosed is a copy of the fusion statement and an article by John McCarthy from our paper Direct Action.

Of course we will send you copies of the draft resolutions adopted unanimously at our plenum as soon as they are available.

Comradely,  
s/Jim Percy  
National Secretary

Reprinted from Direct Action, November 25, 1976, Australia.  
by John McCarthy.

On Saturday November 20, three ex-members of the Communist League, John McCarthy, Marcia Langton and Peter Robb, after a series of discussions with the leadership of the Socialist Workers Party, decided to fuse with that party. (See above.)\*

Both the Communist League and the Socialist Workers Party are sympathising organisations of the Fourth International. The Communist League had developed out of a split in the Socialist Workers League, forerunner to the Socialist Workers Party, in August 1972. Since that time the two organisations had maintained a separate existence, a fact which had weakened the influence of the Fourth International in Australia. The recent fusion is a significant if tentative step towards the resolution of this problem.

The three ex-members of the Communist League were all members of its national committee. McCarthy had been the recognised leader of the organisation and Peter Robb had been editor of Militant, the newspaper of the Communist League.

The three ex-members of the Communist League had left the organisation after coming to a realisation that it was no longer heading in a direction that would lead to the development of a strong and united party of the Fourth International in Australia. The immediate cause of their resignations was the sabotage of the adopted perspectives of the Communist League by a minority of the organisation which had opposed the line of the June 1976 conference of the Communist League, and which had pursued a course of dead-end factionalism which could only have led to the sectarian degeneration of the organisation.

The fusion, while not so significant in numerical terms, has an enormous political significance. Besides representing an important step towards the unity of the Trotskyist movement in Australia it brings into the Socialist Workers Party individuals with different and rich experiences and some standing in the mass movement.

Marcia Langton is one of the best known activists in the Black and anti-racist movements in Australia. She initiated the Land Rights Campaign in Queensland in 1969 and was an activist in the anti-war and civil liberties movements there in the late sixties. More recently she has been involved in the Land Rights campaign centred in Sydney and is a director of both the Aboriginal Medical Service and the Aboriginal Housing Service in Sydney. At present she is working at Black Theatre and acts in the Theatre's current production Here Comes The Nigger. Langton is a member of the Black Women's Action Group and is an editor of the Aboriginal newspaper Koori-Bina which has a wide distribution among Blacks throughout Australia.

John McCarthy has been a supporter of the Fourth International since 1969 and was previously an activist in the anti-war and student movement on Queensland University. He worked for the Aboriginal Medical Service before taking on a full-time position for the Communist League as its national secretary.

Peter Robb first came in contact with the Fourth International through the work of its French section, the former Ligue Communiste, in 1972. He joined the Trotskyist movement in 1974 and has worked on various campaigns in defence of Latin American political prisoners.

As with the fusion of the Tasmanian Socialist League with the SWP a little over one year ago, this fusion demonstrates the degree to which the SWP has matured in its understanding of what is required for the building of a revolutionary party in Australia. Fusions like these represent a more than numerical accretion of forces in that they show in practice how the revolutionary party of the future will come into being, with more and more groups of revolutionaries coming to the conclusion that the program developed and fought for by the Socialist Workers Party shows the way forward to the resolution of the historic crisis of leadership of the working class.

The fusion comes at a turning point in the history of Australian capitalism. Following November 11 last year there has developed a broadening radicalisation of the Australian population which provides the framework for the continued growth of the Socialist Workers Party and the Fourth International in Australia.

\* refers to Fusion Statement of SWP and ex-CL Group reprinted from Direct Action for this mailing.

\* \* \*

COPY

COPY

COPY

Reprinted from Direct Action, November 25, 1976, Australia.

FUSION STATEMENT OF SWP AND EX-CL GROUP

On Saturday, November 20, three former national committee members of the Communist League, John McCarthy, Peter Robb and Marcia Langton are fusing with the SWP. These comrades had earlier resigned from the Communist League concluding that it was no longer progressing towards the building of a revolutionary party capable of uniting all the forces of Trotskyism in Australia.

This fusion is a principled one in that it is based on the agreement of the former members of the Communist League with the general line of articles in Direct Action on the Australian situation. Tactical differences remain as do differences on international questions but these were not seen to be of such significance to prevent a fusion.

The fusion is based on a realisation of the needs of Trotskyism in Australia for a strong and united party. The fusion is to be carried out in accordance with Trotskyist tradition. Members of the ex-CL group will be on the national committee and political committee of the SWP and the editorial board of Direct Action as well as having responsibility for major areas of work. Individuals of the ex-CL group continue to adhere to the International Majority Tendency of the Fourth International and will have all the rights of a minority in a Leninist organisation.

Of course, all the individuals of the fused organisation undertake to build the SWP as the party that can help to resolve the crisis of leadership of the Australian working class.

We appeal to the remaining members of the Communist League to join the fusion as the only way forward at the present time. Continued factional warfare can only weaken the forces of Trotskyism in Australia at a time when the class struggle has reached new heights and the opportunities for building the revolutionary party are expanding.

John McCarthy

Marcia Langton

Peter Robb

Jim Percy for the SWP

Endorsed by the national committee of the SWP on November 20, 1976.

\* \* \*

## National committee members Mike Keenan and Dave Armstrong

# More Communist League members join SWP fusion

By Alec Marin

On Friday December 10 the fusion took place of two further leading members of the Communist League with the Socialist Workers Party.

They are David Armstrong and Mike Keenan. Both were founding members of the Communist League in 1972 and long-standing members of the organisation's national committee.

Their joining forces with the SWP followed the fusion on November 20 of three other former leaders of the CL, John McCarthy, Peter Robb and Marcia Langton, and the joint call to remaining members of the CL to participate in the fusion process as the way forward to unite the Trotskyist movement and build the revolutionary party in Australia.

David Armstrong and Mike Keenan endorse the fusion statement published in *Direct Action* No 144 on November 25. Following the breakdown of democratic

centralism inside the CL, they have joined the SWP on the basis of their support for the Fourth International and agreement with the general line of articles in *Direct Action* on the Australian situation—above all on the need to build a united party of the Fourth International in Australia.

David Armstrong joins the Sydney Branch of the SWP and Mike Keenan, who will also be on the national committee, joins the Melbourne Branch. Both comrades, through their years of adherence to the program of the Fourth International and their experience as militant trade unionists, bring valuable qualities to the task of building the revolutionary party in Australia.

David Armstrong came to revolutionary politics through his experience in the anti-war movement in the late sixties. He joined the CL at its foundation in 1972 and was active in the Australian Workers Union, the Storemen and Packers

Union and the metal trades. For the past two years he was a member of the national committee of the CL.

In 1975 he was a founder of the Unemployed Group in Sydney, and later in Melbourne was active in the campaign to defend East Timor against the Indonesian invasion.

Mike Keenan became a revolutionary through the understanding of US imperialism he gained as a member of the US military in Vietnam. He participated in some of the first discussions to organise resistance by Vietnam veterans in the US to the war.

In 1970 he joined the Young Socialist Alliance, the youth organisation in political solidarity with the Socialist Workers Party in the US, which is in political solidarity with the Fourth International but is prevented by reactionary legislation from joining.

A founding member of the CL in Australia and a member of the national committee from the beginning, he was also a member of the political committee and of the editorial board of *Militant*.

For two and a half years he was active in the NSW Builders Laborers Federation, until forced out along with other militants by Federal secretary Gallagher's takeover of the branch.

Five former members of the CL's national committee have now fused with the SWP, which represents a notable advance for revolutionary forces in Australia. All five are confident, moreover, that this process of principled unification into a single revolutionary party can be consolidated still further.

As militants of the SWP they call on those members of the CL who remain to continue the fusion and work in the most effective way toward the Australian revolution.

TRANSLATION

FROM THE FRENCH LCR INTERNAL BULLETIN, No. 47

IMT Meeting

- 1) Statement (voted unanimously minus one abstention by Chambeyron)
- 2) Statement by Griot and Thalou
- 3) Statement by Matti

Statement

The members of the Central Committee of the LCR who are members of the IMT heard Matti's oral report proposing the dissolution of the tendency. Now,

1) Since the world congress, the political differences have not diminished; just the opposite. Most of the debates in the bodies of the International (United Secretariat, IEC) have confirmed the permanence, the depth, and the seriousness of the differences in orientation, which cannot be measured against the healthy differences that can exist and be debated inside the IMT.

2) The initiative for the formation of a faction and permanent tendencies in the International was the LTF's, under the pretext of defending itself against so-called split maneuvers. Since then the LTF's factional practices have only multiplied. The permanent existence of the IMT would not be justified outside of the period directly preparatory to the world congress, in spite of the political differences, if:

--The LTF dissolves and the sections composing it fulfill their obligations to the regular functioning of the International (especially dues).

--That the June 1975 and February 1976 resolutions, particularly those on the IT in the USA and Mexico, be truly applied.

--That practices such as the factional invitations to the SWP convention be ended.

--That where two sympathizing groups exist, a process of reunification be immediately undertaken with no other precondition but respect for democratic centralism, conforming to the unanimous recommendation of the 10th World Congress.

In summary, as comrade Matti no longer agrees with the IMT, he no longer sees any reason for its existence; he is asking that it dissolve itself. It would be more consistent for him to follow the consequences of his positions, ask that all the tendencies dissolve, and himself withdraw from the IMT.

Statement by Griot and Thalou.

We joined the IMT in the framework of the preparation for the 10th World Congress, and have participated in it as fully as possible. The concrete course of the political situation led us to find ourselves in disagreement with the "defining" documents of the IMT (the European document); then on the Portuguese and Latin American questions.

We understand, but deplore, the division of the International into unchangeable blocs. We are certainly for the dissolution of the tendency and faction, but we are conscious that this is purely formal if we do not condemn, in particular, the failure of the SWP comrades to participate in the leaderships and to assume their normal financial responsibilities.

We particularly condemn the factional practices of the LTF (Spain, Latin America). We condemn the fact that the minority groups (the LC for example) do not accept membership in a united section of the FI, respecting the democratic centralism of the national section. We disagree with the international minority's appreciation of the situation in Portugal on several points; on all the points on Angola; and on the political practice of the SWP in the United States itself (in so far as we know about it, that is to say, very little in view of the small amount of information permitted to us by the factional practice of the blocs, and in view of the especially tendentious, sectarian, and even scandalous education given to the French organization about SWP policy). In the same way, we condemn the factional policy of the SWP toward LO and the OCREFI. We also condemn the split practice of the Moreno faction (which left the LTF).

In this framework, we believed it possible to disagree with the IMT's positions inside of it, without being obligated to "choose camps," the alternative being the LTF. We think that it is possible to not accept the new European document that was prepared for the 11th World Congress in its present form (see "Documentation Internationale," no. 2) and to propose another balance sheet on Portugal.

But the French leadership of the IMT, forcing us to "choose our camp" does not allow for a different position from what has been developed (Portugal and Europe). This is characteristic of the absence of all fundamental political debate, aside from purely tactical discussions vis-a-vis the LTF that dragged out the meetings.

Without in any way prejudging our further course, and thinking that the debate preparatory to the 11th World Congress is possible on new bases, we are constrained and forced not to "choose" the "other camp," but to leave the IMT.

Statement by Matti

When the IMT leadership committee added to the reference texts of the tendency the various documents adopted on Portugal by the majority of the United Secretariat, as well as the Mandel-Maitan-Frank responses to the IP articles, I sent a letter to that body protesting against this decision, and in particular noted that it had been made in an undemocratic way, without taking into account the debates on this very important point that were going on in the various sections.

This letter asked that the debate be organized, that the documents be circulated between the various sections, and that the tendency leadership suspend the decision to change the defining documents of the tendency. This letter was not published; nor were the texts (all or part of Internal Bulletins #'s 32, 35, and 42 from France) distributed in the European sections, as I asked.

A tendency, like the IMT, that is stably maintained after a congress, and whose leadership revises its defining documents two years later on new questions without an organized debate, takes on both a non-democratic and factional character.

By functioning like this, the IMT has weakened its authority to denounce the LTF's factional practices.

On the eve of the 11th World Congress debates, the recomposition of the positions of tendencies and factions existing inside the International, the important changes that intervened at the February 1976 IEC in relationship to the Portuguese revolution -- all this should move us beyond the existing "blocs," and toward respective balance sheets of the IMT and the LTF since the last congress (their dissolution would have more effect for ending all factional maneuvers than creating and maintaining these formations does.) The discussion inside the International would be that much more easy and fruitful.

But there are also fundamental questions that, at the level of the French IMT (limited to some episodic meetings that were unprepared most of the time, rarely dedicated to fundamental debates, and almost always dominated by the fight against the LTF's factionalism) pushed me to pose the question of its balance sheet and dissolution.

I had already asked for such a balance sheet from the French IMT leadership. This has never been done. Nor was this the case at the August 29 meeting that took place from 9-11 p. m. As a result of this, I left the French IMT.

In addition to the functioning of the IMT and the disagreement I have with the policy in regard to the LTF (which is taking on irresponsible and scandalous aspects, like the decision to ban all French members from attending the SWP convention, or the decision to ban a member of the Political Bureau of the French section of the Fourth International from attending the Central Committee meeting of the LC, even in an individual capacity,) and in addition to the failure to publish various minority texts inside of the IMT on Portugal, the new problem posed by the publication of a second "European Document" must be emphasized.

As it stands, this draft refuses to recognize that the method of the preceding European document ("winning hegemony over the broad vanguard") was wrong, and it does not take account of the debates in the sections on the questions of workers united front, governmental slogans, the Transitional Program, mass work, the CP's active class collaborationist policy of the popular front type, the social democracy and the way to fight the various centrist groups that are obstacles to the construction of revolutionary parties. The draft draws no real lesson from the Portuguese revolution and the successive errors of the IMT (in relation to the MFA, the united front, the question of the government, the FUR, . . .) or those of the LTF (the question of the Constituent Assembly, its appreciation of the SP, the role of the "committees"). This draft does not take into account the serious political error of the vote for Carvalho and all its significance in relationship to the "broad vanguard."

The draft is not acceptable. Consequently, to maintain an IMT that is divided almost everywhere into three or four tendencies--whose differences bear acutely on international questions--is artificial. No consensus reduced to such a degree of generality that it does not lay out an orientation for the members can justify the maintenance of the same tendency for so many years.

The IMT should dissolve itself and other tendencies should be formed clearly on exact points that are being debated for the 11th World Congress--even if this means formation of a third tendency (around the PST) and a fourth. . . The defense of the unity of the International demands a special priority for the political debate, rather than its crystallization into blocs for which the factional struggle takes absolute precedence over real discussion of the differences. The 11th World Congress should not be a repeat of the 10th in any way. The important events of the class struggle, and particularly those of the Portuguese revolution and the rise of the working class in Europe, should clarify old differences in a new light and bypass them. This is necessary for the strengthening of the unified Fourth International and the struggle it wages.

\* \* \* \* \*

COPY

COPY

COPY

(#9)

Montreal, Quebec  
October 15, 1976

United Secretariat of the Fourth International

Comrades,

We have not received the Bulletin de discussion internationale /French edition of the International Internal Discussion Bulletin/ since the last world congress in February 1974. We have written about this several times unsuccessfully.

Nor have we received internal bulletins from the Ligue Communiste Revolutionnaire. /French section of the Fourth International/.

Therefore, we request that you take the necessary measures to correct this problem without delay, in order to assure that all the members of the International in Quebec may have access to the discussion bulletin and to the preparatory discussion for the next world congress.

The LSO would like to receive 75 copies of each international internal bulletin published in French since the Tenth World Congress, and the GMR would like to receive 85 of each.

Trotskyist greetings,  
s/Colleen Levis, national secretary  
of the Ligue Socialiste Ouvrière/League for  
Socialist Action in Quebec

s/Léon Peillard, for the Political Bureau  
of the Groupe Marxiste Révolutionnaire

cc: LCR Political Bureau