

IMT

note: on the double-standard argument

IMT charges LTF with doing things in contradiction with

LTF organizational procedures —

Not true. But, even if LTF did such things,

Does IMT think that this is wrong? If so, then

this is a condemnation of what IMT does —

— two wrongs don't make a right —

Hugo -

need to answer

1) IT had no trial

2) IT has self-criticized $\circ\circ$ Why not
let them back in

IMT

①

pp 2-3

~~movement~~
 Movement can be built only through the sections
 - must vigorously oppose splits
 Canada
 USA

4 change of parallel IMT bodies = questioning substantive
 5 right to form tendencies

then tries to shift ground - ^{They} no longer deny structure - (now that they are caught red-handed)
 - ~~but~~ when move on to argue the right to consult does exist

(secret faction)

|| they admit now, things that we charged before, that they used to deny

5-6 OK for IMT to argue against a split by IT and keep such discussions secret
 = ≠ a coverup

6 LTF does the same
 mtgs prior to Udec

7 documentary evidence of a faction center
 - who decides - allocation of funds
 correspondence, etc

I.P. - decision to publish in Spanish
 decision to add to staff - from other countries

8- attack on PST - ^{for} defense of the institutions of bourgeois democracy
 LTF should have disassociated immediately
 instead, it sought, behind backs of the elected leaderships,
 to patch up ^{the} internal differences.

IMT

practice of LTF vis a vis threatened splits

9 1. Canada - Canadian nationalism

Jack - flew up

led to formation of Dawson faction

[contrast JB - organization met with both sides
vs. Ernest - document - secret]

Dawson had decided to split
we never informed

[irony: Ken Lewis up in Canada meeting with the splitters]

2. Mexico

never informed U.Sec or other

10

SWP - probably exercised a restraining influence

PST - less probable that they acted in the same way

3. Tony Roberts

10

they assume we know beforehand of his split

[note: we condemned them it occurred]

4. IT

11

decision made by SWP on June 20 to expel
but SWP leadership never brought it up
before the U.Sec.

11 - double standard = LTF wants one standard for itself, but constraints on IMT

11-12

IT didn't split - was expelled

no trial // IT didn't have a chance
to defend itself

13

fusion maneuvers of BMG, RMC, S.U.

IT mistake not to inform, but all for
good intention

through this is a thread running through IMT notion of FI intervening all the time

IMT

LTF does it too

13-14 1. Britain - ^(Tendency contacted) RSL
 even to speak before an aggregate [Tony Roberts
 - Germany - Pierre Frank]

14 2. PST contacting Bolivian persons + groups [in Argentina]

14 3. Blanco - in Portugal contacted groups outside FI
 gave a friendly interview to the French Lambertistes

14-15 IT did have irresponsible statements but made "an appropriate self-criticism" IT really was a [secret] faction
 - IT ^{now} prepared to accept SWP discipline - not for tactical reasons, but because they believe in building the SWP
 - it is wrong to expel IT for opinions expressed

15-16 IT selling of Inprecor + other = merely following example of British Tendency
 - without asking advice or permission - began selling IP at al Pattiinder
[Fact Finding commission report
 IEC mtg; Uisc]

17 IT - factional exclusion from assignments
 factional recruitment policy

17-18 SWP war speech
 place all resources at disposal of plotters of a faction

18 Quotes L.T. - New Course
 Stalinists asked all members to inform of any secret groups or faction
 Trotsky replied - seek first the conditions that brought members to form secret groups

IMT

(4)

17 - need an int'l control commission -
members all over the world have no means to check any & sundry accusations

18 - reject special w.c.

19 - such a w.c. could well result in a split

it is an attempt to use organizational grievances to
nullify political verdict of 10th w.c. — leadership

20 to call a w.c. on non-political matters

20 grievances against LTF

- refusal to send main leaders
- maintenance of LTF post w.c.
- stop dues & other support

21 LTF initiated every step that intensified factionalism

22 no LTFers have been expelled,
but one IMT group has been

IMT - points relevant to Bulletin #3

p 5 - IMT ^{"warned"} ~~advised~~ the IT against any course or step that could lead to their expulsion from the SWP.

J-6 - simply a matter of best way for a legal tendency to function

12 - IT denies ever having split or having had the intention of splitting

IT expelled for violating discipline !! but not trial
articles 29h and 43 of FF statutes

13 - D.M. at IT convention } = only charges
BMG, RMC, SU x

IT acted incorrectly in not fully informing SWP
but, under advice of ~~IMT~~ IMT that IT has made self crit.
& changed their course

14-15 ≡ some SWP charges against IT are not real breaches of discipline

- 1) IT: irresponsible statements by individuals are only opinions
 - a) have been retracted
 - b) are only opinions // can't expel comrades for opinions

IT now says they are willing to accept SWP discipline
-- not for tactical reasons --
but because they believe in building the SWP

2) IT was really a tightly knit faction
its activities (Finances, old Mol ~~so~~ sales, etc.) are unhealthy

(2)

IMT - points relevant to Bulletin #3

17- IT was only doing what British Tendency does
- highly irregular -
contributes to a tense atmosphere

e.g. IT has documented { factional exclusion of IT from assignments
- factional recruitment policy

17-18 war speech

voted to place all resources of SWP at disposal of LTF

what moral authority could SWP leadership have had

irony \equiv - p. 18: ¹⁹comrades all over the world "have no means to check any and sundry accusations against this or that comrade or group of comrades"