

SEP 30 1970

XS: J-mA, Joe, Ben, Ben, Gus

September 23, 1976

X letter only: Nelson, NO

New York

Dear Caroline:

Here is the first installment of items I am translating from Bulletin #47. These are all the items under the heading "SWP Congress"; they have not been checked for accuracy, except that I've gone over them twice myself.

Here are two applications (in one letter) for the LTF. They agree with our line on Angela now, as we've given them the document and discussed with them about it. These are two comrades that Gus spent a lot of time with this summer.

Please ask Jack where the passage is in Cannon that briefly refers to Trotsky's position against soldiers trade unions. Neme needs the material and we can't seem to find it.

On the bulletins I wrote you about before: If it is possible, we want 100 copies of all the new LTF texts. If Mary Alice's text on women's liberation is not to be printed right away, could you bring us 25 extra copies of the old ones. We could also use some xerox copies of the French version, which we can pay you for (about 10 should do it).

Please tell everyone there that except for a few minor problems things are going well here. Everybody's getting their feet wet in the debates (including me-- our first debate will be Friday night and there's only four of us in our section), and we've actually got a majority in one of the sections. Best of all, our comrades are really blessing, taking new responsibilities, and acting like real leaders. Whatever happens, we've won that much. We have good, young people in the Tendency who are also coming forward in the commissions and really helping out. Overall, things look good.

Also please tell the Militant how much we liked the article on the teacher's convention. It helped us here to think out how to formulate the idea of advancing the CP-SP governmental slogan in the trade unions.

Comradely,

Becky
Becky

SWP Convention, From CRS Bulletin #47, p.10

111

Resolution by Tinville (adopted)

The French section of the IV International decided not to be present at the SWP convention, not because of political differences with the SWP (LTF) leadership, but because of the political meaning that this convention took on in relation to the International. The fact is that the SWP invited organizations without asking the opinion or consulting with the sections of the corresponding countries: for France, LO and the OCRFI. This is in flagrant violation of a previous decision of the United Secretariat, which itself resulted from previous contacts made by the SWP with the Lambertists. More serious, for the first time the SWP invited ^{as such} the OCRFI, the ^{Lambertist} Lambertist international appendage. It must be recalled that the Lambertists and the OCRFI think that the FI was ⁿ "destroyed" by the present leaders of the United Secretariat, that the organizations of the FI ~~deserve to be called~~ neither Trotskyist or revolutionary, that they are simply the rear-guards of Stalinism, and ~~that~~ as a result, the OCRFI's only policy is limited to the publicly affirmed desire to open the breach in

the FI. Thus, the invitation to the OCRFI as such, without even asking the United Secretariat's agreement, constitutes a factional bonus for the Lambertist maneuver. This is all the more clear, as the resolution of the United Secretariat that was passed on July 3-4 notes, because the invitations are "a political act, since they exclude the Spartacists, the ~~Healyites~~ ^{Healyites,} and others who politically attack the SWP... The United Secretariat notes that by ~~the~~ ^{this} political act, the SWP chose not to invite ~~the~~ ^{an organization} such as the RMOC, which politically attacks the SWP, but chose to invite the OCRFI, which attacks the majority of the sections of the International as counterrevolutionary..." In other words, the selective political character of the invitations is obvious. It is a matter of a reaffirmed desire to act in ~~practice~~ ^{practice} as an open faction, and is added to the refusal to contribute to the resources at the center, the defacto nondistribution of Imprecor (the official organ of the United Secretariat) in the USA, a unitary policy with different organizations while "violating the rights of

national sections to decide their national tactics, as well as the rights of the international leadership's requests" (resolution of the United Secretariat of 7/3/76), ~~and~~ ^{and} sending a staff member to France who is to this day controlled neither by the United Secretariat or the French section...

Faced with this factional policy, we must both develop the debate of ideas and fight every factional maneuver in the FI. It must ^{again} be added ~~again~~ that the conditions for the debate to develop is that ~~that~~ ^{the} militants and sections build the International.

This is why the Political Bureau had decided that the French section would not be present at the SWP convention. This is not a question of a general measure, but a conjunctural ^{one} measure aimed at the SWP convention, that was considered to be an act detrimental to the International. The Political Bureau of course left and leaves all comrades free to go to the USA, to meet the members and leaders of the SWP, to participate in meetings with them (while asking to be first informed).

the basis of
 It is on ~~this basis~~ these considerations that
 the Central Committee ratifies the Political Bureau's
 decision to not send a delegation from the French sec-
 tion of the Fourth International to the SWP convention,
 but considers that it was possible for members of the
 LCR who were present in the USA to attend the convention
 as individual observers.

Resolution by Dominique (rejected)

the same
 The text is ~~that~~ as that for the Tinville
 resolution except in the last paragraph, which is shor-
 tened to, "It is on the basis of these considerations
 that the Central Committee ratifies the Political
 Bureau's decision."

Resolution by Thalou (rejected)

The decisions of the United Secretariat should be
 respected by all sections, conforming to the statutes
 in force
~~of~~ in the International; among others, those
 vis-a-vis centrist organizations, whether they claim
 to be Trotskyist or not. →

When an international organization is concerned, a policy for the whole of the International must be elaborated, adopted and respected.

The United Secretariat decided that the relationships with the OCRFI would pass through it, and the relations of a section with groups in other countries (not attached to the FI) would be regulated by it, in agreement with the sections concerned in the respective countries.

The SWP voluntarily broke with this decision by directly inviting the OCRFI and foreign groups and only afterwards giving the information to the United Secretariat. In so far as the United Secretariat had elaborated and adopted a policy on this subject, we condemn the SWP for not having respected it, in conformance with the statutes of the International.

It is ⁱⁿ our interest to respond to the OCRFI and LO offers for discussion in a centralized way: therefore it is suitable to ~~condemn~~^{condemn} all deviations that depart from this necessity. Even if we continue to

debate the validity of the policy that we are applying with the perspective of modifying it, ~~we~~^{this} must unfold within the framework of the International's boundaries.

The decision of the French Political Bureau to again resort to a boycott of the SWP convention, as it did last year, is wrong, all the more so as the United Secretariat did not do it. It smacks of the methods of governments who recall an ambassador or commercial attaché in case of disputes! It does not enable us to advance in the political debates or the resolution of organizational questions.

The supplementary Political Bureau decision of July to ban every militant of the French section of the Fourth International from being present as individuals is not at the same level. At this specific level, it is scandalous, and reflects factional blindness. The introduction of such "lettres de cachet" augurs poorly for pursuing the discussions. Against this, it is necessary to fight for comrades to ~~travel~~^{circulate} in the International, to take contact whenever possible (vacations,

trips) with other sections of the International, as we have always advised.

Explanations of votes

Hoffman

We will have the courtesy not to contest the competence with which Jack Barnes has taught us the methods of Chicago gangsters, racketeers and blackmailers (see "Documentation Internationale," no. 3, where Jack Barnes compared the methods of the French leadership to those of specialists in racketeering). It is thanks to this lesson that I, for my part, refused to ^{put} lay a finger into this web of extortion [blackmail?], while ^{I voted} ~~noting~~ for the Political Bureau resolution that prohibited ^{all members} ~~any member~~ from taking off for ^a factional convention where the SWP was pretending to arbitrate the "French question" by confronting us with those bitter slanderers and adversaries of the Fourth International, the "Lambertists." The ban against our members participating, innocently or not, in a definitely splitting operation in no way involves the general rights about international

contacts between militants of different sections and sympathizing groups. Yet, it is the case that regulation of contacts, which should be most flexible in a healthy International, can only be severely controlled in a period where the most factional and scandalous practices (many ~~trips~~ factionally paid for trips aimed at fighting against the international leadership, the use of these trips to create split groups, etc...) are a denial of democracy, in that honest militants by definition do not have the same possibilities to get about. Because of this fact, I cannot vote for a resolution that contains even the smallest reservation about the Political Bureau resolution.

Nemo

For the conditions of debate in the International, I am ~~pleased~~ pleased that ~~the~~ the Central Committee has reconsidered the decision of the Political Bureau to ban individuals ^(members) from attending the SWP convention. On the other hand, it is incorrect and irresponsible that on the occasion of a one hour debate, limited only to

the Political Bureau's decision and based on partial information, the Central Committee has characterized the SWP policy by formulating the very serious accusation that the convention constitutes a "factional bonus for the Lambertist maneuver," that takes "its political meaning... in relationship to the unity of the International." This directly echoes a Political Bureau text ^{that was} issued on August 13 and distributed in the cells, ^{that} which in a general way accuses the SWP of a "reaffirmed desire to constitute ~~it~~ ^{itself} as an open faction, one foot in and one foot out of the International," and to ^{make it} "use the International to ^{build} construct another." These are really abusive interpretations of the initiatives taken by the SWP at the time of its own convention and are serious ^{indictment} judgments that contradict all the positions taken by the SWP. These positions ^{make it} are very clear ^{that} about the political objectives of the SWP's initiatives as a national section, as well as the orientation proposed to the whole International vis-a-vis the repeated requests for the opening of debates formulated by the OCRFI and

LO correspond to the point of view of the ^{construction} construction and strengthening of the ^{IV} International.

The Central Committee asserts its intention to develop the "debate of ideas" as a gauge of the unity of the International. I officially renew the request that best goes in this direction: that there be published in the Internal Bulletin all the information that is indispensable in order that the militants can, with full knowledge of the facts, evaluate the orientation to adopt vis-a-vis LO and the OCRFI, the SWP's proposals in this matter, and the real aims of its recent initiatives. In particular this concerns the important documents that lay out the relations that have developed since 1973 between the OCRFI, the United Secretariat, and its national organizations: correspondance, resolutions (of the United Secretariat majority and minority), the measures taken to apply them, etc. It is equally indispensable that ^{the} ~~the~~ recent response of the SWP to the United Secretariat majority's resolution relative to the last SWP convention be made known to the members.

It is only on this basis that the debate that was undertaken in a hasty and incidental fashion at the Central Committee can be taken up in a responsible ^{manner.}

Dumas

I ~~am~~ ^{abstain} on the resolutions concerning the SWP

convention presented by Tinville and Dominique because:

1) I am not convinced of the interest of a boycott of the SWP convention. The leadership of the French section, whose majority supports the IMT's positions, would no doubt have had an interest in ~~its~~ defending its political positions before the 1200-1500 participants at the SWP convention, as the United Secretariat did.

2) The SWP convention is public, and it ~~seems~~ ^{seems} difficult to limit the presence of members of the IV International when the political criteria for attending the convention that are applied by the SWP leadership are broader vis-a-vis "contacts" of the organization.

Appendix

Appendix 1: Resolution by the Political Bureau (early July). To be inserted.

Appendix 2: Political Bureau Circulaire explaining the resolution (early August)

Following
After the motion voted by seven comrades from the Levallois cell (Section 92-2), and questions asked by some French comrades who have made the trip to the USA and want to attend the SWP convention, the Political Bureau comrades who are present in Paris decided to make the following points:

1) The French section of the Fourth International decided not to send a delegation to the SWP convention, not because of political differences with the SWP (LTF) leadership, but because of the political function of this extraordinary ^{Committee} in relation to the unity of the Fourth International. In fact, the SWP invited some organizations without asking the opinion or even having informed the sections of the Fourth International in the

respective countries--for France, LO and the AJS-OCI,
 in spite of a previous unanimous decision by the United
 Secretariat. More serious, for the first time the
 SWP invited ^{a unit} the OCRFI itself (Organization Committee
 for the Reconstruction of the Fourth International),
 the Lambertists' international appendage. It must be
 recalled that the Lambertists and the OCRFI think that
 the FI was "destroyed" by the present leaders of the
 United Secretariat, that the organizations of the FI
^{deserve} ~~merit~~ ^{to be} ~~neither being~~ ^{called} ~~Trotskyists~~ ^{nor} ~~or~~ ^{even} ~~revolutionary,~~
 that they are simply the rear-guards of Stalinism,
 and that as a result, the ^{OCRFI's} ~~only~~ policy is
 limited to the publicly affirmed ^{desire} ~~to~~ open the
 breach in the FI. Thus, the invitation to the OCRFI
 as such, without ^{even} asking the ^{opinion} ~~advice~~ or having informed
 the United Secretariat, constitutes a factional bonus
 for the Lambertist maneuver. ~~It is a~~ ^[It is a] ~~reaffirmed~~ ^{reaffirmed}
 desire to set up an open faction, ^{one foot} ~~one~~ ^{inside,}
 one foot out of the International, added to the refusal
 to pay dues to the center, the defacto nondistribution

of Imprecer (official organ of the United Secretariat) in the USA, a unitary policy with different organizations independant of the United Secretariat and its sections, and sending a staff member to France who is controled neither by the United Secretariat ~~or the~~ French section to this day...

In the face of this factional policy, we must both develop the debate of ideas and fight against every split maneuver in the FI. It must be added that the condition for the debate to develop ^{is able to} is that all the members and sections build the International and not use the International to build another.

Bureau:
2) This is why the Political Bureau

---banned every comrade of the French section from attending the SWP convention, which constituted a bonus to the ^{split} factional maneuver ~~of the~~ SWP and the split policy of the Lambertists. The SWP and its international faction are thus placed in front of their responsibilities: do they intend to build the FI with us, or "reconstruct" the International with the Lamber-

tists, or ^{build} construct their own International with one ^{and part} part from the FI and ~~one~~ from the OCRFI?

---But obviously the Political Bureau has left all comrades free to ^{go} go to the USA, to meet with the members and leaders of the SWP there, to participate in meetings with them, etc... Therefore it is absurd to pretend that we have shackled free discussion and free travel by members in the International. We have only banned participation in a public act against the unity of the International. The Political Bureau asked to be informed of comrades traveling abroad, which unfortunately was not done by the comrades who took off for the LTF meeting in the USA. This inadmissible "lack of deference" has, alas, a logic that we again warn the LTF comrades about: that of putting a priority on their own factional activity and discipline ^{in relation} to that of the organization. It should be developed as well as the ^{necessary consequences} necessary consequences, from the

OCT 2 1976

September 29, 1976

New York

Dear Caroline,

Here is the second installment of things from CRS Bulletin #47, the declarations of resignation from the IMT by Matti, Thaleu and Griet, and the IMT response. Apparently the Central Committee members who are around Matti were divided on the resignation. Chambeyron has decided to remain in the IMT, Matti, Griet and Thaleu resigned, and there were two others who had never been in the IMT.

There is one other thing to note from CRS Bulletin #47 (which I will not be able to translate). On the resolution for the student movement, three resolutions were presented to the Central Committee--one for the majority, one by Matti-Letourneau, and one by Thaleu-Griet. This means that the Matti group split over whether or not to enter the MAS (the PSU-CFDT student formation). This was one of our differences with them in the area of mass work. Neme and Krasno voted for the Thaleu-Griet student text, which opposed the MAS entry. Strangely enough, Thaleu and Griet are the two comrades most opposed to any further rapprochement with the LTF--but we found ourselves in general agreement with their line. You should also note that Godchau abstained in the vote because he was opposed to massive entry (he also abstained on the SWP convention vote because he thought that the French section should have sent someone to the convention).

I have interrupted the Dominique-Garcin translation to do the Matti document.

Comradely,

Becky
Becky

P.S. There was an article in both Rouge and IO about the new developments in the case, and they have had quite an impact. For the first time, there is real interest among the comrades here in the case.

OCT 2 1975

IMT MEETING

1) Declaration (voted unanimously minus one abstention by Chambeyron)

2) Declaration by Griot and ^{Thaleu} ~~Matti~~

3) Declaration by Matti

Declaration

The members of the Central Committee of the LCR who are members of the IMT listened to the oral report by ~~Matti~~ 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 that ^{cannot be reconciled} ~~have no common measure~~ with the differences that can healthily 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. Outside of the directly preparatory phase for the world congress, the permanent existence of the IMT will not be justified in spite of the political differences, on condition that:

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

--That the July '75 and February '76 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 immediate reunification be undertaken with no other precondition but respect for democratic centralism, conforming to the unanimous recommendation of the 10th World Congress.

In summary, as comrade Matte no longer agrees with the IMT, he no longer sees the reason for its existence; he is asking that it dissolve itself. It would be more

coherent for him to draw the consequences of his positions, ask that all the tendencies dissolve, and himself withdraw from the IMT.

Declaration by Thaleu and
Thaley Griot

We joined the ~~IMY~~^{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 "constituent" texts of the IMT (the European document); then 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 especially condemn the nonparticipation of the SWP comrades in the leadership bodies and 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 LCE 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 ^{centralized nature of} appreciation of the international minority ~~minority~~ of the situation in Portugal on several points;

on all the points on Angola; and ^{on} about the political practice of the SWP in the United States itself (in

so far as we knew about it, that is to say, very ~~little~~ ^{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 tendencious, sectarian, ^(C.M.S.) 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 OCRFI. We also con-

demn the split ^{practice} ~~pra-~~ of the Merene faction (who left the LTF).

In this framework, we believed it possible to disagree with the IMT's positions inside of it, without being obligated ~~also~~ to "choose camps," the alternative to ~~this~~ being the LTF. We think that it is possible to not accept

the new European document that was prepared for the
 present
 11th World Congress in its present form (see "Documenta-
 tion 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 admit there is a different
 position than what has been developed (Portugal and
 Europe). This is characteristic of the absence of all
 deep political debate, aside from purely tactical discus-
 sions vis-a-vis the IMF that dragged out meetings.

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

Declaration 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 a non-democratic 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 bases of ^{reference} ~~f~~ for the tendency.

This letter was ^{never} ~~not~~ published; nor were the texts (all or part of Internal Bulletins #'s 32, 35, and 42 from France) distributed as I asked in the European sections.

A tendency like the IMT, that is stably maintained after a congress, and for which the leadership renews its bases of reference 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 ~~deb~~ ^{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 push beyond the existing "blocs," and to respective balance sheets of the IMT and the LTF since the last congress (whose dissolution would have more effect for ending all factional maneuvers than creating and maintaining these bodies does). The discussion inside the International would be that much more easy and fruitful.

But there are also fundamental questions that, (limited to some episodic at the level of the French IMT ~~(whose meetings were~~ 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.

00000
Already,

Already, I had 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 ~~fact of the~~ nonpublication of 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 such, this draft refuses to recognize that the method ~~may~~ of the preceding European document ("to win hegemony over the broad vanguard") was wrong, and does

not take account of the debates in the sections on ^{the} ~~the~~
questions of workers united front, governmental slogans,
the Transitional Program, mass work, the CPs active
collaborationist
class collaborationist policy of a popular front type,
the social democracy, ^{and} the way to fight the various cen-
trist groups that are obstacles to the construction of
revolutionary parties. The draft draws no real ^{lessen} ~~of~~
from the Portuguese revolution and the successive errors
of ^{the} ~~the~~ IMT (in relation to the MFA, the united front,
the question of the government, the FUR...) or those of
the LTF (question of the Constituent Assembly, apprecia-
tion of the SP, role of the ["]committees"). This draft
does not take into account the serious ^{political} ~~pol~~ error
of the vote for Carvalhe and all its significance
in relationship to the "broad vanguard."

The draft is not acceptable. Consequently, the
maintenance of an IMT that is divided almost everywhere
into three or four tendencies--whose differences acutely
refer to international questions--is ^{artificial.} ~~artificial.~~ No
consensus reduced to such a degree of generality that
it does not lay out an orientation for the members can

10 10 10

justify the maintenance of one 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. Perhaps what is being formed is 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 this 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 one new day clarify ^{old} differences and bypass them. This, for the strengthening of the unified Fourth International and the combat it leads.