

IMT meeting--Caroline's notes

Nov. 1, 1977

Present: Robs, Livio, Jaber, Roman, Duret, Aubin, Eric, Mikado, Jones, Hovis, Riel, Benny Brett, Tom, Pola, Jacqueline, Pierre, Francois, ~~Angela~~ Brian, Alain, Ernest, Fred, Miguel, 2 from Holland, plus 2 ~~others~~ from Luxembourg.

Observers: Paul, Caroline, Connie, Jack, Joe, Alan, Enrique, Also.

1. Motion to invite non-IMT members of [can't remember if it was U Sec or of IEC].

Carried unanimously.

2. Membership of the IMT Steering Committee.

Motion by Jean Pierre: Until Livio expresses a clear position on the IMT Self-Criticism, he cannot be a member of the IMT.

This is a major problem in Latin America. It raises the question of the character of the IMT. He asks for clarification from Livio.

Rob: We had a previous problem like this with Matti. Some comrades proposed we kick him out of the IMT. But others said no, we're a tendency so anyone can say they're a member of the IMT.

Livio: I simply reserved my position on the new IMT statement 'Self-criticism' for some weeks. Then I told comrades that I accepted it. I have participated all along in the IMT Bureau. There's no reason to change now. Maybe it was wrong for the IMT to have accepted me, but I'm a member. I consider that the resolution of the 9th world congress was wrong.

He should be a member if he agrees with the self-criticism.

Rob Proposes Livio should clarify this in written form.

Livio I will write down my position.

Rob I should note here that I have decided that I stand against the last statement of the IMT [the one about 'Self-criticism']. So formally, I should not be a member of the IMT. But if this were not a dissolution meeting, I would like to propose that the IMT change its platform by withdrawing that document.

draft resolution--Duret

International and political context of dissolution proposal.

Political situation

--New possibilities in Europe with crisis of the reformist parties.

--Crisis of Maoism.

--Developments in Mexico and Colombia

Even these developments, we must respond to central tendencies, national tendencies, which are not free from factional distortions.

2. Changes in the International and its sections.
  - first implantation in the working class
  - growing mass work
  - development of leadership layer with common history and experience
  - development of our organizations in Latin America
    - Mexican peasant struggles and our involvement
    - PST(Colombia) election campaign
    - IMT's self-criticism
  - change in the United States
    - the turn of the SWP
    - the fact that the U Sec has had its first real discussion of the American question, one of the great political questions. The difficulty here is to give an answer to the problem of the response by the American working class. And the answer to this problem must not just be one of analysis, but must be also in practice. This is the main reason for our battle for the integration of the SWP in the international.

There has been a delay in our initiative to dissolve the IMT. This was due, first, to inertia, and, second, to the factional character of the debate on Portugal, Angola, and the OCPRI.

#### II. On the balance sheet of the LTF.

It is not believable that LTF made no mistakes in 8 years of faction fighting. It lost two-thirds of the votes it had at the last world congress. It lost the majority of the original signers of the call for the faction.

The balance sheet published by the LTF is its last failure. The fundamental crisis of the LTF is its lack of capacity to recognize its own evolution in connection with real life--for example, its taking a position on Angola only after the war was over.

On Institutionalization. LTF tried to defend democratic rights while sticking to a bourgeois-democratic program. It didn't take account of the different function of democratic rights for the bourgeoisie and for the working class: for the working class they are the means to struggle; for the bourgeoisie they are the means to dominate the workers.

The slogan for defense of institutionalization bred illusions in the Argentine army. We see the same problem arising in Peru today, where comrades say we should defend bourgeois-democratic institutions.

These are central questions. They show the merit of the IMT. The LTF made a cover-up for mistakes by the Argentines on this question.

On Portugal. The central question was the nature of the period that opened in 1975 and the dynamic of the forma-

IMT meeting....3

tion of organs of workers power. The question was: was the axis of our approach to be all power to the constituent assembly, or the centralization, extension, etc., of the self-organization of the workers and peasants? The governmental question was secondary to this.

It was impossible to simply call for a united front with the SP.

What is the balance sheet of the GAS, the LTF group in Portugal?

On Spain. No one can say the IMT didn't pay enough attention to Spain.

Quotes Mary-Alice world movement report from several years ago, saying it was not an accident that a clear split occurred in Spain. Quotes Camejo on the "high political level" of the Spanish LC comrades.

The LTF leadership also understood the importance of Spain. Mary-Alice's report in 1976 pointed to the need for a broad political discussion on Spain. The LTF didn't underestimate Spain, it followed Spain carefully; and it is in this light that we must look at what happened and balance sheet of LTF.

At the last world congress there was the debate over the Carrero Blanco assassination. But who was correct? --Those who said that the LCR's position on the Blanco assassination was determinant of the LCR's future development, or those who said it was not the determinant factor?

The LC had a totally wrong understanding. It said the CP wanted to save the dictatorship; that the workers commissions were structures of the dictatorship; it didn't understand the role of the CP or of the USSR. It's not an accident that the OCRFI is making successes in Spain. The boycott position is the logical consequence of LC's policies.

At the United Secretariat discussion of the trade union question in Spain, the LTF wanted to limit the discussion to simply which union to work in, instead of dealing with the underlying conceptions of the LC.

The balance sheet of the LTF on Spain is a grave one.

On the IT case. When I was in the United States for the SWP convention I noted there is a total incomprehension by SWP membership of why we gave such importance to the IT case. The procedure in expelling the IT was a breach of the SWP constitution. There was no fair trial. The charge of forming an "IT party" implied that the charge was political. No IT member had the opportunity to deny or explain what they had done. The only charge against them was their

IMT meeting....4

The IT expulsion was accompanied by a class characterization as well. Refers to a report by Joe in which he supposedly says the whole line of the IMT is petty-bourgeois.

IT expulsion reflected a process of sectarianization of the SWP.

On organizational questions. The LTF has fought for the integration of the Moreno tendency. They fought Moreno's practices leading toward a secret faction.

But we can't discuss this problem only in a factional context; that is not educational.

The LTF has responded to this problem in a hyperfactional manner.

### III. Balance sheet of the IMT

Whatever were our lack of precisions, our line was based on the new dialectic of the three sectors of the world revolution. This is a heritage of the whole international.

#### ~~name~~ Four acquisitions of the IMT:

First: our understanding of the nature of the period and the crisis of capitalism and the bureaucracies. If anything, we underestimated the depth and length of the crisis.

Second acquisition: Our understanding of the modification of the relationship of forces in the working class. We might have exaggerated this a bit, but things like Krivine's recent discussion with French and Italian CP leaders show we were largely correct.

Third acquisition: We understood the actuality of the Transitional Program as a whole. That is, the central place of workers control (who could doubt this after the events in Portugal and France?), self-organization, and new forms of union organization, factory committees, etc.

Fourth acquisition: Our understanding of the central role of dual power. This concern of ours is confirmed in Trotsky's writings in Crisis of the French Section.

This is the balance of the IMT in Europe.

On Latin America. The IMT positions on Europe were in no way an extension of our line on Latin America. In fact our line for Europe was what enabled us to understand our errors in Latin America.

Our mistake in 1972 was to create the IMT on the basis of defense of the 9th world congress line, and not on a critique of that line. We did correctly criticize the Moreno line (its policy in Uruguay, and its call for 80 percent workers on the Peronist slates), but not the 9th world congress line.

IMT meeting....5

We continued this mistake by not making a criticism at the 10th world congress. The Argentina and Bolivia resolutions of the 10th world congress were written to be able ~~to~~ to be interpreted in two different ways, with two different lines. Line by line, ~~the~~ content could perhaps be defended, ~~but their~~ <sup>their</sup> but they were false in terms of what they proposed as the main tasks of the sections. They were wrong in the same way as we would have been wrong if we had only stressed the problem of dual power in the European resolution.

There was a double factional logic at the 10th world congress: there was the compromise inside the IMT, and there was the overall negative logic of the factions.

The explosion of the LTF with the leaving of the LC and the PST also ~~the~~ reflects the logic of forming blocs.

On the question of unity of the international. The IMT has fought for unity, for the necessity to integrate all components of the international. Pays tribute to "personal role of Ernest in this area." We fought the idea in many Latin American sections that the IMT was the "real international" and that the LTF was the main obstacle to building the international. These conceptions dominated many of our meetings.

We opposed any class characterizations.

This explains why all IMTers are still in the IMT, (unlike the LTF). The fusions in Mexico and Spain are inexplicable without understanding this battle. This explains why now there is a whole layer of IMT leaders who are working for unity.

This does not mean that the IMT hasn't oscillated between tendency and faction operations. We made an error, for example in regard to the PST. We made an error in not taking the initiative in dissolution. The platform of the IMT (the new one) was not conducive to education. Jones was partly correct in his warnings on this. It was wrong to redefine a tendency by automatic reproduction of the tendency. We should have taken new platform through the normal bodies of the international.

But we can't draw a balance sheet on the basis of organizational errors that some comrades have felt bad about. These were the result of the factional logic and the relative isolation of the center.

It's a dangerous argument to say that the main motivation of maintaining the IMT has been the existence of the LTF. To say this, you must then prove a bloc exists. This charge feeds splittist trends, and goes against all the teachings of the IMT.

Discussions in the United States.

To calm things down, we said we would personally defend in the bureau that there should be an exchange of articles between IP and Inprecor.

New phase in the international. We must assure the integration in the international leadership of the main leaders of the sections. The present situation is unacceptable. Need immediate changes.

There is a danger if the national leaderships, which have been largely educated outside of the international debates, are marginalized from the functioning of the center. New generation of leaders are different from past generation, who were educated in the international debates. The danger is of national Trotskyism.

Nature of the Center. We need both a team of permanent international leaders, plus the integration of section leaders who will be replaced periodically. Plus we need sectoral coordination, and broad participation in United Secretariat meetings.

The debate on democratic centralist norms is important.

World Congress. Objective situation calls for short-term world congress. Membership of sections need it. Need new IEC to reflect new leadership. Should be within one year, maybe with only a few-points agenda.

Need an organ of the international. This is one of our instruments against national Trotskyism.

On Bolshevik Tendency. BT has recruited new currents who were outside the international, such as the Socialist Bloc. We need to integrate them. At the same time we must criticize their method of class characterization, their methods of functioning, and their political line.

Proposal for adoption of written resolution.

Discussion

Alain: The report is quite different from the resolution. Political balance is difference. We should drop the resolution, and discuss a written version of the report.

Pierre F.: I agree. The report is more balanced. The resolution could give rise to misunderstandings.

David (Holland): Puts forth four sets of amendments. Resolution should raise question of democratic centralism. Events from 1970 shouldn't be included as part of our balance sheet,

since we were only formed in 1972. We need to fight the marginalization of national sections. Somebody referred to a danger of cynacism toward the international leadership. It's not just a danger; it exists, and I'm part of it.

Brett: I don't ~~agree~~ disagree with ~~the~~ anything in the resolution except the list of contributions of the IMT. The resolution doesn't indicate what we really think the fight was all about. It's apologic, but not really critical about anything. Nor does it defend the politics of the IMT. The only substantial thing in it is on the debate inside the IMT over unity of the international. We should adopt the report instead. But this means adopting a document which we won't have a chance to see and discuss the formulations of. Withdraws his amendments if the report is substituted for the resolution.

### Counterreport by Jones

Both the report and resolution are factional. I urge a vote against both. This is reflected in the structure; it began with listing our differences with the LTF, and then came to our objective tasks. It leaves out the fact that the IMT has been the majority. We must start from objective needs. One of the main things keeping the IMT together has been opposition to the LTF.

There was a major turn in the world situation in 1968. We had to expect errors to be made in responding to this turn, even if our general line was correct. And we had to expect differences. The task of leadership was to make sure the errors were not prolonged and that the differences were overcome constructively. What happened was the opposite.

A general line was adopted, which I agree with: the turn in the objective situation and the strategic line which flowed from this. Dual power became an objective task before the working class. In the context of developing prerevolutionary crises, we needed the crowning demands of the Transitional Program concerning dual power. The debates on Argentina, Angola, Spain, and Portugal ~~are~~ touch different aspects of the debate over the nature of the period. This debate has a new reflection in the debate with the Eurocentrists [I wrote Eurocentrists, but did he say Eurocommunists?].

Errors made. We saw that the relationship of forces in the workers movement (the "mass vanguard") called for a generalized change in our ~~the~~ tactics in this period. The formula "social phenomenon" to describe the mass vanguard can be misleading. It gets across the amplitude of the phenomenon, but is not exact. The crucial thing is whether these forces are politically breaking with the reformists. All our tactics in elections, etc., depend on whether we think there is a force politically breaking with the reformists. The LTF doesn't understand this.

But this change in tactics was confused with the question of a qualitative change in the relationship of forces between the vanguard and the ~~the~~ reformists in face of the masses. This explains, for example, our differences over the importance

of the CP-SP government slogan. It was a wrong interpretation to think that we should have changed our basic united-front approach as expressed in the CP-SP government slogan. This wrong, ultraleft conception is gradually being dropped, as illustrated in the LCR debate on the CP-SP slogan in France, and the debate in Canada on the NDP.

These errors could have been corrected more quickly. Why weren't they? One problem was programmatic--in relation to democratic centralist norms. It was also related to an organizational aspect. A factional, tacticist policy is still reflected in the unity policy in France, and in relation to the OCFI.

The essential basis of the "hards" in the IMT was that on important questions of tactics, the LTF and SWP had placed themselves outside the international. This resulted in splits of sections. A correction has been made in regard to the splits of sections, but not in regard to the OCFI.

The second aspect of organizational functioning was the substitution of individual, personal ties for regular functioning of leadership bodies. This ~~was~~ was reflected in the eternal screamings, and Ernest's nodding of his head, and in not electing certain people to leading bodies. It was also reflected in the questions about who is in the IMT, and in the conception of the leadership of the international as a club of friends.

The genuine dissolution of the IMT won't come through a formal vote, but only through a hard political struggle.

As a result of these things, there was a long delay in correction of the errors and a collapse in the prestige of the leadership of the international.

Consider the situation of new members coming into the international in 1969-71. The leadership enjoyed a big prestige. But what advice did these comrades get? That they should engage in factional hysteria which ended in splits. Personal networks assured them that the real position of the IMT was contrary to its formal positions, and that a whole series of ultraleft errors were known to be wrong but ~~didn't~~ were not corrected.

There was the failure to defend the rights of minorities in the international. A permanent atmosphere of hysteria against the LTF had the effect of inhibiting their presenting their positions. There were failures to translate documents. This culminated with the ban on French LCR members from attending the 1976 convention of the SWP. The big default here wasn't with the LCR leadership, but in the fact that nothing was done about this gross act by leaders in the United Secretariat. The leadership lost all authority through this. The leadership of the international is obligated to defend the rights of all members, not only of its tendency.

The authority of the leadership can only be won by clarifying certain political questions. We need discussion



of democratic centralism first, before we discuss violations of international democratic centralism. If not, the real differences with the SWP won't be discussed objectively but in a witchhunt atmosphere. Before any discussion of the crimes of Joe Hansen, we need a discussion of what kind of international organ we need.

On OCFI. As Duret said, we need to integrate our understanding of the need for unity of the Fourth International with an approach toward the OCFI.

On Europe, we need a thorough, lengthy discussion, not based on past documents or drafts. I oppose any move to a ~~rapid~~ rapid world congress.

The proposed resolution doesn't show any understanding of these fundamental questions; it only takes up this or that specific question. Only if we approach the discussion in the way I outline can we have a real discussion of the remaining differences in an objective, nonfactional way.

I propose we: 1) dissolve the IMT; 2) vote against the proposed resolution.

#### Discussion

[This has gotten so long, that from now on I'm going to be selective and not type everything I wrote down--CL]

David: On what Jones said, we can't confuse specific mistakes in functioning with the general course of the IMT. I agree the prestige of the leadership has gone down drastically in past years, but this was because they made some grave mistakes, not because they're dishonest. To charge hysteria and conscious nonopposition to ultraleft mistakes is to obscure the real discussion we need.

Ernest: (whole intervention) We shouldn't be sidetracked by Jones's intervention. But he made a grave political mistake-- the first he's made in several years: We never gave that definition of the New mass vanguard as being all those who have broken politically with the bureaucracies. That's the definition the LTF attributed to us, which we have never shared. Behind it is a propagandistic, manichean concept of the working class: there are the pure ones, and then there is the big reactionary mass, from the left centrists to the right wing. This leaves out stages in the development of class consciousness. And it leaves out the uneven and combined development of class consciousness.

We can only understand the new mass vanguard as a layer that on certain issues breaks with the bureaucracies, without necessarily breaking political with reformism as a whole. That's why you can have people who are part of the vanguard and are still part of the CP or SP. For example, when \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ said strikes are a weapon of the big trusts in 194\_, all the workers followed them. Today, 20-25% of the workers say no to this kind of thing. They are

IMT meeting...10

the vanguard.

This has nothing to do with being for or against the slogan for a CP-SP government.

The real discussion was over whether repeating "for a CP-SP government" over and over again by a small organization of maybe 200 members would affect anything in the class struggle, and whether we should be satisfied with this propaganda slogan, or whether we should combine this kind of propaganda with objective initiatives in the class struggle.

The IMT self-criticism was necessary but late--everyone agrees on this. But part of the responsibility lies with the LTF and how it conducted the debate. In the founding document of the IMT, "In Defense of Leninism..." there is a clear declaration that if the discussion would have been limited to the problem of guerrilla warfare and Joe's first article, it would have been over even before the IMT was founded. Ninety percent of members of the IMT Steering Committee at the time of its founding understood that the guerrilla line had been a mistake. But other things became involved--the general problem of armed struggle, and European perspectives.

As Duret said, we applied the opposite method in Europe as in Latin America. That is, not to give the main importance to politico-organizational considerations; to break with propagandism; to integrate the question of the relationship of forces into our strategy and tactics. That is, the relationship of forces between the classes, between the working class and the bureaucracy, and between our party and other political forces.

Our error was not to make the distinction between the general need for armed struggle in terms of self-defense, and the possibility for weak Trotskyist organizations to go it alone in that field. This was the opposite of what we did in Europe.

Even the way the 10th world congress posed this problem--which was theoretically correct--was wrong because it put between brackets the strength of our forces.

On the international. All rhetoric about unity and the need to build up the center, without concrete proposals for resources and comrades is just hot air.

Jack listed some explosive issues. The most explosive issue is the issue of international democratic centralism. Why? Because it has clear programmatic implications, not just tactical implications. The question of acceptance of the discipline of the world congress decisions on all sections, where the world congress has the right to discipline, is linked to the basic Trotskyist analysis of the nature of imperialism. The only alternative is socialism in one country and national messianism.

IMT meeting....11

Rosa Luxemburg made the correct prediction: If you don't accept international discipline, the workers are going to end up shooting at each other. We already have examples of this, in Angola, and on the Vietman-Cambodia border.

Alain: ....

Resolution should explain the political defeat of the LTF which caused it to explode before it dissolved. We should ask the LTF where it stands on these two points [I didn't catch the two points--CL] in order to avoid self-criticisms in the corridors.

The resolution should also include: 1) the ques- tion; 2) should take note of fusions of various organizations; 3) should demand recognition of the international leadership-- this is in relation to the Argentine PST, which characterizes the international leadership as centrist, which implies an entry perspective.

The problem is not a lack of prestige of the international leadership. There is a certain disinterest and lack of involvement in the international by the membership, and the sections are developing independently. The center, because of lack of resources, has been unable to undertake central initiatives....

It's impossible to have leaders who are active both in the international and in their section.

We must change the nature of discussions in the United Secretariat. Before, the discussions were faction discussions. Now there are mainly informational reports, but not elaboration. ~~Proposes~~ Proposes better preparation of discussions, and discussion first with comrades of the sections before U Sec discussions, which should be on the basis of texts. This implies we take up fewer questions in the U Sec.

Miguel (Spain LCR): Agrees with Duret's report, especially with the assessment of the 10th world congress resolutions on Latin America. As political resolutions, they were incorrect.

We all see that real dissolution doesn't end today, but starts today.

The four contributions of the IMT should be stressed, because ~~they~~ even though we made many errors, they helped us understand the objective situation and relate closer to the class struggle. The big weakness of the LTF was that it was alien from this feeling for the class struggle.

Without overestimating the extent of agreements between the IMT and LTF--fundamental differences can again arise between these two basic components--there are signs that we can reach agreement on certain fundamental questions and tasks.

IMT meeting....12

The real problems are just beginning. We're just beginning to leave behind us the paper politics that Ernest spoke of (propagandism). The real problems of our attitude toward bourgeois institutions will arise when we get comrades for the first time into municipal governments or parliaments.

In regard to the dangers of national Trotskyism--we need a leadership of the whole international, not of a tendency.

It's true that the IMT has educated a layer of comrades in the ~~and~~ necessity of unity of the international. That's one thing that the LCR has been educated on. We're proud that comrades of the TO [Workers Tendency] have said this to us. This attitude was not a product of "national Trotskyism," but a product of discussions with the international leadership, which convinced us.

Brian: ....

We can't avoid mentioning the last IMT declaration. We are obligated to explain what has happened since then. The only thing that happened was the dissolution of the LTF. Duret says it's wrong to say the IMT only responds to what the LTF does. This is true, but we must be able to explain what changed.

We lost the initiative on dissolution because of our defensive response in our last declaration. A political characterization of the LTF as tailendist, etc., was included. We didn't take into account the different elements in the LTF, for example, the weight of the SWP. The turn of the SWP toward the working class is a factor lying behind the convergence. Also, in relation to the broad vanguard, there are exciting elements in the SWP line today which incorporate our conception of the broad vanguard--for example their campaign inside NOW. The idea of building a class-struggle wing in the women's movement leads to the possibility of a common line in Britain with the Tendency on women's work.

There is a problem with Jones's schema of a division between a strategical and tactical understanding of the turn in 1969. He didn't mention the debate that took place in Britain on the line of the European Perspectives Document. There was no "real IMT" ~~organization~~ who understood this question perfectly. Both the French and Spanish comrades have made self-criticisms of ultraleftist actions, but the question is, did they have to leave the IMT or not to make these corrections?

On the organization question. It's one thing to criticize certain aspects of malfunctioning. But once you say "clique," you have a different debate: you are faced with the need for a fight against a finished process. I don't deny that Jones picks up on certain real problems, but his explanation is 100% wrong.

IMT meeting....13

Loyalty and enthusiasm for the FI is as big as ever.  
The problem is lack of material means of the center.

A debate on democratic centralism is not going to  
electrify the ranks of the international.

The problem of disinterest in the international debates  
is partly due to a lack of information. Therefore I can't  
understand the proposal for the timing of the world congress.  
The resolution says we still haven't dealt with a whole  
number of political problems--election policy, the crisis in  
the CPs and SP, etc. The international leadership has not  
begun discussing these problems. A condition for holding a  
world congress has got to be how fast we can involve the ranks  
of the international in these debates.

Robb: ....

Some things in the report by Duret have to be confirmed,  
for example concerning the 10th world congress. There was  
a nuance here between what Duret and Ernest said. I don't  
agree that the armed struggle document was theoretically  
correct. To say that is only to say that it was ~~partially~~  
partially correct. But as a political resolution it was  
deadly wrong.

Take an analogy: What if Roberto of the Spanish CL  
presented a resolution in favor of the dictatorship of the  
proletariat. Even though it would be theoretically correct,  
would Ernest vote for it?

We can't say that this armed struggle document didn't  
have an impact on the daily life of our organizations in  
Latin America....

Jean-Pierre: ....

It was a mistake for us not to have dissolved earlier.  
Jones's points at our last meeting were correct, and should  
go into our resolution.

The Europe line was not an extension of the Latin America  
line; rather the experience in Europe made possible the change  
of line in L.A. That is, the experience that began after  
May 1968.

Barry told me in Mexico last year that he didn't think  
the IMT would ever make a self-criticism. But we don't have  
to be fooled by the LTF's version which gives the ~~most~~ utmost  
importance to the IMT Self-Critisms. For many of us, this  
was only the first step forward, toward the possibility of  
putting forth a positive orientation. In this process we  
will be able to deepen the self-criticism.

The resolutions of the 10 world congress contained ele-  
ments of criticism of the 9th congress line, but to say the

least about the resolutions on Argentina and Bolivia, they were the result of a compromise linked to factional dynamics. A compromise that led to a factional bloc. Although there are some criticisms of the 9th world congress line, they lack clarity and are false on many aspects. The very fact that the FI put forward and adopted a resolution on armed struggle in 1974 was an error and a political concession to alien ideas. It's better to say this and recognize it.

Whatever our criticisms of the BT, the international leadership has a big responsibility toward this tendency, which is clearly a minority. It's our duty to make all efforts to integrate these comrades, even against the wishes of the BT leadership. Priority must be on political debate. I'm against any administrative measures.

The BT is a contradictory, complex reality. Many older comrades have tended to analyze it as a current around the Argentine PST leadership. This is true in part. But today it is much more. It has grown, and has won new forces to the Fourth International. The BT recruits, on the one hand, to build the Fourth International, and on the other hand, to organizational and political concepts that we disagree with.

I think the BT doesn't understand the programmatic basis for the unity of the international. It is a faction with some public aspects. But this is the product of a political approach, not a maneuver. We should not respond with our own factional behavior.

Jones: Challenges right of Joanna to speak. This is an example of strength of personal ties. She is not elected by, or responsible to, anyone.

Vote: Only Jones opposes her being present and speaking; Brian opposes her speaking but not being present. Joanna withdraws from speakers list.

Pierre F. : Objects to phrase "decision of the LTF and IMT to dissolve." There were two different decisions to dissolve, not one.....

Roman: To dissolve before a world congress is abnormal.

But we should have taken initiative. We should have seen that, after the break-up of the LTF, the SWP had 3 options: 1) stay isolated in its national boundaries; 2) integrate itself in the center; or 3) pull a maneuver with the Lambertists. We fought for the second alternative.

One of the gravest errors of the SWP is to make silence into a method of government in the international. I've never seen such maneuvers and lies in dealings with other groups as I've seen the SWP do.

Until the very eve of the SWP convention we didn't know what road they were going to take. So to say we should have dissolved earlier is to rewrite history. It would have been irresponsible to have dissolved knowing what we knew then. So we pulled a trick, but not an abnormal trick.

IMP meeting....15

Aubin: We made our self-criticism on I.A. because we really want to wipe out something that was very damaging to the international.

....

I don't agree with Alain that we should now ask the LPP for a balance sheet on Spain, Portugal, etc., after they have dissolved. We simply note that in their balance sheet they don't make any balance sheet, and comrades will draw their conclusions from this.

Dannon said that it was the duty of leadership to lead. When we adopted our new platform, the IMT should have launched a campaign for dissolution.

Reference to irritation with the "hot and cold regime" of the SWP.

Jacqueline: ....

Because of the situation in Southern Europe--the March 1975 elections in France, etc.--we need a discussion now in the sections leading to a world congress soon. We can't rebuild a new international leadership without a debate going through the whole ranks.

On women's work, we see the low capacity of the international leadership to intervene. This reflects the lack of discussion on this question throughout the whole international leadership.

Brett: ....

If we don't explain that it was a mistake for the IMT not to have dissolved earlier, we can't explain the mistake of the last IMT declaration, which comrades are just receiving and reading now. And if we don't explain that mistake, we can't explain the act of dissolution itself. We can't say we're fighting a revisionist tendency that has been totally wrong on strategy, and then say we're dissolving. Comrades will think it is a maneuver.

Mikado: Israeli LCR Central Committee IMT decided that last IMT declaration was not acceptable. A tendency cannot change its own basis. This goes contrary to every norm.

The "detente" in the international has already has a positive effect in relation to outside forces coming toward the international.

We need a clarification of democratic centralism to show that the existence of differences doesn't necessarily mean you need tendencies, and that factions do not necessarily mean war.

Fred (Austria): Should add to the report that the European Perspectives Document underestimated the need for continued united-front approach to CPs and SPs. We should admit that if the EPD adopted by the 10th world congress were presented to the European sections today, it would not be accepted.

Duret summary:

Delay in correction of errors was due to the situation of permanent factionalism and too fragile relationships with the sections. This situation has changed--for example, see how quick the Spanish LCR was able to make correction on the FUT campaign.

Agrees with Jones we need fundamental discussion of democratic centralism, the kind of international magazine we need, and approach to the OCFI. I disagree with him on existence of a clique. I disagree that dissolution of the IMT will require a big struggle. I'm sure some of Jones's words went further than he really thinks.

Ernest says armed struggle document was throetically correct. But it was wrong as a political orientation.

Agrees that the real dissolution only starts today. If dissolution is not accompanied by rapid steps forward, it can lead to bad developments. We must find a short-term solution to the problem of the international magazine, even if this solution is not seen as lasting forever.

Disagrees with Alain on relationship between sections and center. Not true that comrades can't be in the international leadership and also maintain ties to their section leadership. This depends of the method of functioning of the sections.

....

Motion: to integrate the report and resolution, and approve general line of resolution and report together.

Motion by Jones: 1) that it was wrong not to dissolve at the time of last IMT steering committee meeting; and 2) last IMT declaration should be withdrawn.

Vote on Jones motions together:

For: Brian, Jones  
Against: 6 (including Ernest, Alain, Pierre F, Livio, Howis)  
Abstentions: 13  
Not voting: Miguel

Motion by Roman: not to include in the report or resolution any self-criticism about dissolving earlier.

Vote: For: 5  
Against: 16  
Abstentions: 2



IMT meeting....17

Motion (by Ernest?): to submit to the IIDB a reply to Barnes and a reply to the BT platform, to be written and signed by several IMT bureau members as ~~individuals~~ individuals.

Vote: For: 19  
Against: 1 (Jones)  
Abstentions: ?

Vote on general line of report and resolution.

Livio asks to divide the vote, since he wants to support the report but abstain on the resolution.

For the resolution: 14  
Against: 1 (Jones)  
Abstentions: 5 (incl. Francois V., Eric, Livio)

For the report: 20  
Against: 1 (Jones)  
Abstentions: Eric

Editorial committee elected: Ernest, Aubin, \* Brett, Duret, Pierre F., Alain, Brian, Roman, Riel...?

Motion to dissolve: unanimous.