

Report on the Fourth International, by Ross Dowson

As published in "Reports & Statements adopted by the Summer 1971 Plenum of the Central Committee of the LSA/LSO" [League for Socialist Action-Ligue Socialiste Ouvrière]

This plenum of the central committee of the LSA/LSO meets not quite a year after our last convention. At that convention comrade John Steele who with Sheila Jones Steele had spent some time working in the International Marxist Group of Britain and in the international center, gave the international report. The text of comrade Steele's report was published in a bulletin containing all the other major texts of the convention. This report did four things: (1) it gave a sketch of the response of the world wide Trotskyist movement to the new wave of radicalization that has been sweeping across the world from Indo-China to the workers' states through the European continent and the Americas, including the U.S. and Canada, with particular notice to the student struggles and the new stage in the national liberation struggle of the Québécois; (2) it reported on the discussions taking place in the world movement which reflect these new opportunities; (3) it outlined the views of the LSA/LSO on some of the key issues arising in the discussion – in particular the positions voted for by our delegates to the world congress, the ninth since the founding of the Fourth International in 1938 – or the third since the reunification of the Fourth International in 1963; (4) it outlined the direction of the contribution of the LSA/LSO to the building of our world party in the next period.

Another part of comrade Steele's report contained some information and an interpretation of recent developments in our British section, the IMG [International Marxist Group]. We Canadians, on the request of the International because of the high priority of British work has for the world movement, and our unique relationship with the British experience, had from the time of the unification in 1963 up until that year, allocated considerable resources and some of our top cadre to help the development of the British section. Among that cadre were John and Sheila.

Comrade Steele reported on developments in the IMG which resulted in the projection at their congress of two perspectives - one by the majority and another by a minority. All the documents have been made available in *International Information Bulletins*. He expressed the opinion that most comrades in the Canadian movement would sympathise with the minority perspective and stated that the dispute was a serious one because it "may involve some rather deep questions around the problem of ultraleftism, how to relate to the youth radicalization, how mass parties can be constructed, and in the final analysis the meaning and validity of the transitional program."

Comrade Steele's report was adopted without one comrade voting against it. Some comrades expressed uneasiness about the comments on developments in the IMG and abstained. A tendency in the Montreal LSA/LSO largely concentrated in the youth, but with one voting delegate at the convention, also abstained. The vote was: for: 44 delegates, 19 fraternal; against: 0 delegates, 0 fraternal; abstentions: 4 delegates, 2 fraternal.

Comrade Mill made the following statement on behalf of the Montreal tendency:

"We cannot vote against the report because we agree completely with the new and enormous opportunities and tasks before the Fourth International and with the necessity for greater participation by the Canadian section in the Fourth International. But we cannot vote for the report because 1) of our disagreement with the document "The World Wide Youth Radicalization" supported by the majority and 2) Because of the lack of documentation and precise knowledge of the positions of the British we cannot accept as a whole the severe criticisms of the IMG in Britain presented in the report."

It should be noted that the tendency's definition of the areas of abstention clearly put it in support of the positions that our delegates at the world congress spoke and voted for on Latin America and on China. We of the Canadian section at our last year's convention were unanimous on these most hotly contested matters at the world congress - a full year and a half after that congress.

The Montreal tendency did not vote for Comrade Steele's international report; it abstained because it disagreed with the document "The World Wide Youth Radicalization", a document that had been presented to the world congress by a unanimous International Executive Committee of the F.I. and which in the light of verbal contributions to the world congress by the comrades of the French Ligue Communiste, was not put up for a vote but was tabled for continued discussion. Since then the French comrades have submitted a document, appearing I think in the *International Information Bulletin* (#2, April 1970) expounding their views on the student radicalization. Our U.S. co-thinkers in the YSA [Young Socialist Alliance] have replied through a presentation by Caroline Lund at the YSA 1969 convention.

LJSers [members of the Ligue des Jeunes Socialistes, in solidarity with the LSO] associated with the Montreal LSO tendency presented a document in reply to the YS/LJS leaderships' documentation on the student radicalization and our participation in it. It was discussed at the YS/LJS 1969 convention and rejected by the delegates. The next world congress will have the responsibility of drawing up a balance sheet on the student radicalization in the light of the 1969 discussion and subsequent developments.

We think that developments right across the world have vindicated the line of the World Wide Youth Radicalization and our support of it, including events in Ceylon where our comrades, for a variety of reasons, missed the youth radicalization, exemplified by the JVP, which was tragically smashed by an unholy alliance of the heads of the workers' states including Peking, and world imperialism and their satellites including Pakistan, behind the Bandaranaike counter-revolutionary terror.

The other reason given by the Mill tendency for its abstention on our last international report was because of that section dealing with the developments in the IMG. The tendency stated lack of documentation and lack of precise knowledge of the positions of the IMG majority as the basis for its abstention. Since then all the documents of the IMG congress have been printed and we have had further experiences with our IMG comrades, which brings me to point 4 of comrade Steele's report to our last congress which you will recall committed us to greater involvement in the work of our movement.

We have done what the last LSA/LSO convention instructed us to do.

When the IMG decided that it no longer required Canadian aid, at considerable cost we transferred comrades John and Sheila from London to the International centre. At a later stage, at considerable expense, we brought these comrades back to Canada and for a period, what with the added expenses of our executive secretary attending various meetings in Europe, were compelled to cut back on our regular financial commitment. This commitment is now back up in a reasonable bracket and our movement has responded vigorously and generously to supplementary financial appeals from the International centre such as the Bengal appeal.

Even more, as a demonstration of the seriousness of our commitment to building the Fourth International, as an integral part of and in addition to our responsibility to build the Canadian section, we sent our executive secretary to work in the centre for a period of four and a half months.

This put considerable strain on our Canadian operation and certainly weakened it from the point of view of the coordination of the work of our pan-Canadian forces and the development of our pan-Canadian strategy, as Comrade Dowson, up until that time had been the only comrade ever assigned to that area, and we were compelled, not unsuccessfully in our opinion, to find a type of substitute operation. We think complaints from the various branches, legitimate in most respects, should be tempered in this respect — we are dead serious as to our commitment to the International.

I think that our contribution to the world movement over that four and a half months was a very positive one as were the contributions of comrade Fidler, the managing editor of *Labor Challenge*, and comrade Beiner, the organizer of the LJS. We sent both of these comrades to Europe where, over the period from July 17 to 25, they participated in the European (French) cadre school and the United Secretariat meeting, and later they familiarized themselves with other facets of our European work while they took their vacations there.

Possibly one of the most important aspects of the Fidler/ Beiner contribution was, as one of them phrased it, upon their return, ‘We put Canada on the map’: A common experience of all Canadian comrades who have gone to Europe is that the overwhelming majority of our European co-thinkers do not know that Canada exists or think that it exists — in some respects as many U.S. senators think — as the 51st state of the U.S. union. They are unacquainted with the rich experience of our Canadian movement and the characteristics of the social structure and class struggle of Canada, that clearly mark it off from the U.S. experience.

They are unaware of the union-based labor party, the New Democratic Party, and how this shapes the class struggle particularly in English Canada, and the rich experience the Canadian Trotskyists have had in orienting to such movements, including our entrism experiences in the NDP's predecessor — the CCF [Canadian Commonwealth Federation]. Some of these experiences were adopted by our British section in the days when Healy played a positive role in the development of British Trotskyism. They are, despite their, acquaintance with the sensational, the disastrous adventurism of the FLQ, largely unacquainted with the national question in Quebec and our extremely fruitful discussions on the national question as it is expressed in Canada, and the organizational structures that we have adopted to fuse the Québécois struggle

with the revolutionary struggle in the rest of Canada – our independent Quebec national organizational structure, within a united pan-Canadian section. They are unacquainted with the rich experience we have gained through the Young Socialists/Ligue des Jeunes Socialistes – a student youth organization, democratic centralist, independent, but in political solidarity with the LSA/LSO, which publishes its own press and which has already largely established its hegemony over those sectors of Canadian youth who are socialist and are consciously involved in the struggle for a socialist Canada.

They are unacquainted with the Native movement and the Black movement which is markedly different from that in the U.S., and the anti-U.S.-imperialism sentiment that is wide spread across Canada. They are unacquainted with the women's liberation movement which in Canada preceded the development of that mighty force for the socialist revolution now underway in the United States, and with our rich experiences with ultraleft and sectarian currents in this movement. And they are unacquainted with the Trotskyist tradition in Canada. Last week, at the Waterloo Educational Conference attended by over 450 persons, we celebrated 50 years of unbroken continuity of the revolutionary socialist movement in Canada. And they are unaware of the role we've played in realizing the unification of the major force of world Trotskyism in the 1963 congress of reunification.

Comrades Fidler and Beiner made two major contributions on the Canadian experience of building the revolutionary vanguard party to our European comrades who assembled at the French cadre school. They also made an unplanned contribution to the Latin American discussion that comrade Maitan opened up there with a five hour dissertation which they considered to have been of a highly factional character.

One of the difficulties in building our International and realizing a fruitful exchange of experiences is the problem of language. Our Quebec Francophone comrades are possibly the best placed in the non-European world to learn from the work of our co-thinkers, particularly the Ligue Communiste, and at the same time because of the publication of *Libération* and Éditions d'Avant-Garde to transmit the Canadian experience to our Francophone European comrades. The development of Éditions d'Avant-Garde must not only be looked upon by the Canadian Trotskyists as essential to the development and armament of the Québécois, but as a contribution to building the Fourth International.

During my 4 and one half months stay in Europe I participated in all the meetings of the United Secretariat and also the meetings of the bureau of the Secretariat. I also had the opportunity to attend the Congress of the Ligue Communiste, the Congress of the British IMG, the Congress of the German section of the Fourth International, the congress that led to the fusion of the Jeune Garde Socialiste with two other groups to form a united Belgian section, and the European workers' conference in Turin which brought leading Trotskyist trade union activists from across Europe to exchange experiences. I gave greetings to the British IMG congress in the name of the LSA/LSO/YS/LJS. I also made a short address, in the absence of the British comrades, to the Turin conference on behalf of the British labor movement in combat against the Industrial Relations Bill, with the most massive and militant actions since the 1926 general strike. I also attempted to keep our world press, *Intercontinental Press*, *Labor Challenge*, *Young Socialist*, and *Libération*, informed on events there which I thought to be important. I was unable to attend

the founding congress of our Luxembourg section, a special conference of our Swiss comrades or attend the Swedish cadre school because of an overlap. The Swedish congress is taking place now during our plenum. I had made arrangements with a leading Danish comrade to go to Denmark and to speak on campuses and at section meetings and possibly Sweden, however the Danish section proved unable to carry them off.

The most striking aspect of my experience was to both sense and witness the tremendous enthusiasm that exists throughout Europe's youth, largely students but also apprentices and younger workers, for the Fourth International. European youth, just as the youth who are coming to the U.S. YSA and the Canadian YS in the process of their radicalization, find the banner of the Fourth International and our European sections tremendously attractive.

Our movement in Europe as elsewhere across the world has every opportunity to transform itself into a genuinely rooted force in the vanguard of the forces for the proletarian revolution.

I attempted to transmit and to give insight into this powerful attractivity of the Fourth International in an article I wrote on the demonstration organized by our French comrades and *La Lutte Ouvrière*, and supported by other European sections, in commemoration of the Paris Commune. Several Canadians participated in this demonstration under a makeshift banner of the LSA/LSO-YS/LJS.

If there were time I would give a short summary of the response to this demonstration by the European press – ranging from *Le Monde* through to *The Guardian* [Britain]. I was of course not able to read other language press, but suffice it to say that this action under the banner of the Fourth International shook them up. They conceded that a new force had entered onto the public arena, that Trotskyism is not only a powerful pole of attraction to the youth of Europe, but is becoming highly attractive to other layers of the population, including growing numbers of the industrial proletariat.

I would like to say a few words of overall impression of our European movement that I gained over my 4 and a half months stay there. As in the case with the Canadian movement, the processes of the new radicalization, upon which our European comrades are building their movement, have put us under colossal pressures of a generally ultraleftist character. As with our own movement, and in some areas of Europe even more markedly so, for some sections are being built almost from scratch, there is a great lack of experienced Trotskyist cadre that knows how to intervene in this radicalization at the stage it is at, that knows how to take it forward through actions that sort out genuine cadre material, or on the other hand, knows how to meet the revolutionary anticipations of some sectors that are clearly ultraleft and how to grasp them and forge out of them, create out of them, new Trotskyist cadre, seasoned fighters who know how to act with caution and responsibility, as Leninists, who can build a combat party of a Bolshevik type.

I would refer to two areas.

It is my opinion, gained from the congresses I attended and from limited discussions with leading comrades, that the dynamics of the women's liberation movement, which is as yet only in an

embryonic form in most sectors of Europe, is not fully grasped by our European comrades, and in some sections where we made some promising starts as in England, we have adapted to sectarian, ultraleft pressures that take us out of this radicalization process. It also appears obvious to me that the failure of the last world congress to adopt and implement the line projected in the World-Wide Youth radicalization document has resulted in some considerable confusion and no doubt in a number of chances missed to build our movement with the forces that are most capable of being indoctrinated with our tradition at this time and can lead us to integration with the industrial proletariat.

The last congress of the Ligue Communiste, although only a few months earlier our comrades played an exemplary role in some massive student struggles, did not structure a Trotskyist youth organization. The reasons advanced will sound strange to the ears of anyone with our experience. They are not that there is no basis for such an organization, that there are no common student interests with which to structure such an organization. On the contrary. The majority thinks such a move would be so successful as to overwhelm the Ligue's cadre and undermine its work of implantation in the ranks of the industrial proletariat,

The political resolution presented by the leadership of the IMG to its last congress proposed the liquidation into, or fusion with, the IMG of what seemed in some ways a very successful youth organization initiated only a year or so ago – called the Spartacus League. A last minute change of opinion by a component of the leadership resulted in the proposition being tabled for reconsideration.

The newly constituted Belgian section of which a major component is the Jeune Garde Socialistes decided to maintain the JGS largely in name only, "instructing the incoming central committee to elaborate its concrete form." While the recent decisions of our German comrades in this respect are a little obscure, it seemed apparent that their decision to build what they call a youth cadre organization is an organization which bears little or no resemblance to either the YS, YSA or Spartacus League, but amounts to the transformation of the youthful forces that we have from a youth organization into the party itself.

Where is the discussion at in our world movement?

At none of the congresses of the various European sections that I attended was there any discussion on the key questions that came before the last world congress. To my knowledge there were no contributions, on any of these questions in the preparatory discussion materials of any of the sections.

In so far as they came up before the congresses at all, they were in the form of a report, usually of a short duration presented by an official representative of the United Secretariat at the opening of the congress, and not discussed at all by the delegates.

Without exception, the congresses I attended were concerned only with national questions and even then largely of an organizational character. The Ligue Communiste is scheduling a special congress later this fall to discuss the international questions. The IMG of Britain is, I believe, slated to do the same.

Another serious problem, largely due to our lack of resources, is standing in the way of the development of the international discussion. It is one that has proven particularly painful to the Canadian section. For instance, as you are all aware, comrade Hansen's contribution to the Latin American discussion was available here in April of this year. But it seems clear that our francophone comrades in Montreal will be deprived of joining the discussion until well into September – more than six months behind our anglophone Quebec comrades. The French version of that document would have been delayed even more but for a colossal effort of our Montreal and central office comrades who, on a crash basis, devoted over 300 hours to its translation so it would be available for the discussion at the European (French) cadre school. Even so this key document was not available for this key gathering of our European cadre.

At the time of our last convention here in Canada we learned that our French comrades had not then – a full year and half after the world congress – been able to read many of the major documents of that world congress as they had not been made available. Our French comrades decided to allocate forces to come to grips with this problem but last reports show that the delay in making the Hansen document available is not at all exceptional and this problem, crucial to a democratic discussion, has not yet been solved.

We know that Comrade Hugo Blanco, who now supports the minority viewpoint on the Latin American dispute, at the time of the last world congress was unacquainted with the documentation of the minority. A few weeks ago we learned from several Mexican comrades who visited us here in Toronto, that some of the key materials of the 1969 world congress, not to speak of documents that have since appeared in English, are not yet available to them.

Any congress for which all the key documents in all the major languages, particularly French and Spanish are not available, and considerably in advance of the congress, could not be recognized as having any authority whatsoever by our movement, and we will have to help in any way we are able to rectify this situation.

Where is the International discussion at, given the availability of materials?

On the China dispute, still up for discussion at the coming Congress, there were differences revealed at the last one of a significant theoretical character. They involved not only an evaluation of the Cultural Revolution but an assessment of the Mao cult and the regime, the nature of its foreign policies and implicitly the question of the danger of ultraleftism to our world movement.

The differences were somewhat obscure until one examined the changes that had been made to the original submitted text. When comrades get the opportunity they should reexamine these changes. They will find that at least on two occasions the majority in the leadership removed sections that recent developments have proven to be entirely correct – that the Maoist concept of peaceful coexistence is not one whit different from the counter-revolutionary concept of the Kremlin oligarchy and that its appearance to the contrary was determined primarily by the hard fact that U.S. imperialism presented to the Mao regime and not by any important difference in the nature of these Stalinized regimes.

It is apparent that Mao's betrayal of the Ceylonese and Bangla Desh struggles was designed to open the way for a deal with Nixon which all observers see involves a possible sellout by Mao of the Vietnamese struggle, if he can get away with it.

All the recent developments demonstrate the weaknesses in the majority position and confirm the correctness of the position with which we identified at the last world congress.

On Latin America it is apparent that developments have not gone the way projected by the majority – neither in Peru, nor Chile, nor Bolivia. You will recall that the majority position is that severe repression throughout Latin America actually ruled out construction of revolutionary vanguard parties of a Bolshevik-Trotskyist character – that the ruling class ruled out the possibility of the adoption of less repressive regimes and therefore there was no alternative but to immediately prepare for the launching of rural guerilla warfare for a prolonged period and on a continental scale..

Some have now suggested that the question is whether you are for or against armed struggle – revolution or reform – which, it is transparently clear, can hardly be a subject of debate in the ranks of the world party of socialist revolution.

In the debate we (said) that armed struggle in the form of guerilla warfare – either urban or rural – is a tactic to be decided by a concrete analysis of the objective situation and must come out of and not be a substitute for building the Leninist combat party. The most serious weakness of the debate so far is the fact that the Latin American comrades themselves have yet to seriously enter into it.

Comrade Hansen pointed out early in the discussion that the strategy of guerilla warfare on a continental scale cannot be reasonably limited to the Latin American continent – that it will quite logically find its proponents extending it to encompass other areas of the globe. This theoretical speculation found its confirmation very shortly in Canada – with the kidnappings in Quebec by the so-called FLQ.

Our British comrades, despite the great amount of material analyzing the full implication of these events that we immediately sent into our international press, supplemented by on-the-spot Militant reports, carried a major article in their fortnightly with their own analysis. It cut right across both our evaluation (which was shared by the Montreal tendency) as well as the line of the statement issued with great expedition by the United Secretariat, in its support of this almost classical case of terrorism. Naturally enough, this being a matter of grave concern to Canadian revolutionists, we wrote a restrained and educational response in our press. Our British comrades protested shortly after at a United Secretariat meeting and asked that we circulate a reply that they would submit for internal distribution. We readily agreed and will do so as soon as we receive their rejoinder.

Shortly after, Comrade Tariq Ali was interviewed on a cross-Canada TV network. The hostile interviewer prodded our comrade into making statements which in our opinion can only be interpreted as defending, if not advocating individual acts of terror. While Tariq was clearly

identified as a leading supporter of the Fourth International, we have not commented on this violation of our Marxist-Leninist view.

It is hoped that those comrades who felt uneasy about those sections in Comrade Steele's report dealing with developments in the IMG have since read the documents of their 1970 congress. Hopefully, the documents of the 1970 congress will be available for comrades' examination. I think that even the most superficial examination of the major documents adopted at that congress will convince any experienced Trotskyist that the IMG has evolved further in an ultraleftist direction.

I would refer to the reversal of their position on women's liberation. Up until the eve of the congress, the IMG's efforts in this field were developing extremely favourably in the direction of mass work. This has now been abandoned in favour of building socialist women groups. Comrades would do well to study the circumstances around the "capture" of a broadly based women's liberation paper by the IMG, for the whole incident may well surface here in Canada and be used against our movement by our opponents, who often maliciously charge our women comrades with being members of a "male-dominated" movement that manipulates such movements as women's liberation.

An even more recent example of the ultraleftist trend of the IMG is the handling by the *Red Mole* of the Clydeside shipyard struggle. As you know from reading the latest issue of *Labor Challenge*, the workers have occupied the yards. Instead of developing a program that would widen support for this struggle and lead it forward towards nationalization without compensation and with workers' control, instead of developing transitional demands that link this action with the whole process of radicalization in Britain, the *Mole* counterposes as the central slogan, a Scottish Workers' Republic.

A notable aspect of the IMG congress was a reversal of the democratic norms that had heretofore been practiced with regard to the rights of the tendency which made modest gains over the past year. They were of such a character which, along with the factional hostility generated by the leadership, could only be understood as being designed to drive the tendency out or lay all the grounds for organizational actions to be taken against them.

Thus the developments in the British section affirm (1) the dangers implicit in the strategy adopted at the last world congress for Latin America – that it tends to overleap in its application from Latin America, in the hands of our British comrades to Canada, for instance, and (2) also affirm that the adoption of this strategy reflected an adaptation to ultraleftist pressures on and within our movement. It would also appear not an accident that the first signs of the employment of organizational means to "solve" a political problem, the problem of the tendency, which is by no means a British problem, are revealed in the IMG.

In this respect I would like to refer to two other recent developments which the comrades will become familiar with in the next few weeks when the bulk order of the English language 'International Information Bulletin' arrives.

One is the chance finding of a letter circulating in revolutionary circles in Latin America under the name of a Uruguayan Committee of the FI, and signed by one ‘‘Domingo.’’

Domingo, it turns out, is Comrade Maitan, who heads the Latin American bureau of the Fourth International. The United Secretariat agreed to publish this letter which, when you are able to examine it, you will find to be not at all a personal letter, as the majority of the United Secretariat claims, but a highly factional document designed to secretly line up comrades.

Aside from its factional attack on Comrade Moreno and the Argentinian *Verdad* group, which is a sympathizing section of the Fourth International there are two aspects of this letter and Comrade Maitan's reply to the SWP Political Committee's communication to the United Secretariat concerning the Domingo letter, that I should bring to your attention.

Comrade Maitan uses the term "entry of the Argentinian organization into the International" and states "we relied on a process of progressive assimilation" in the "Domingo" letter – and later in his reply "we maintained in principle even Healy and Lambert could enter the International" – and again "we were...for the entry of the Argentine organization."

This is how Comrade Maitan describes the reunification of the major forces of the FI in which we played a major role back in 1963 – that reunification consisted of entry of the International Committee into the Fourth International, to be subjected to a "progressive assimilation" thereafter.

This of course was not at all the concept of the majority of the International Committee – we were overcoming a split with a principled unification that could lead to a liquidation of the former lines of difference and result in a complete fusion with a genuinely collective leadership. The other aspect of the letter and Comrade Maitan's reply I would draw attention to, is the latter's use of the term majority and minority in such a way as to clearly show that he is not referring to the last world congress vote on Latin America, China, and the youth radicalization – but to crystallized international factional formations.

That again hasn't been our attitude to the dispute in the world movement. We have viewed the differences as being vastly out-weighted by the areas of common agreement and have sought their resolution in a free exchange of views and experiences.

The majority of the United Secretariat has not disassociated itself from the Domingo letter and by its statement that it sees such letters as normal, personal, and private, leads one to conclude that it considers that it would be normal for other members of the United Secretariat to operate this way.

In the light of this experience, the SWP has suggested that the leaderships of sections and sympathizing organizations concerned by such developments would do well to begin consulting directly with one another – particularly in considering what relationship these developments may have to the political differences that have arisen and what is the wisest course to pursue.

The Political Committee of the Canadian movement should consider this as soon as the members of the Central Committee obtain copies of these documents, and take appropriate action.

The other development which the comrades will become familiar with in the next few weeks when the *International Information Bulletin* bundle orders arrive is a contribution to the discussion over the names of comrades Krivine and Frank entitled "Again and always, the question of the International," and dated June 10, 1971.

I draw only two aspects of this document to your attention: (1) the implication that the SWP holds a federalist concept and not a genuine Trotskyist concept of internationalism and (2) an attack on the SWP for encouraging those who share its view to pay no attention to (the) vote of the world congress; supporting through its press and the interventions of its leadership, groups and comrades who openly fought the orientation decided on at the World Congress; and intervening against the Argentine section.

The implication that the SWP has a federalist concept is not sustained in any way, either in words or in deeds, throughout our 44 years of continuous and intimate collaboration with the American Trotskyist cadre. All our experience is just the opposite.

Nor is there any truth in the attack, completely unsustainable by any facts, that the SWP has played or is playing a divisive role in the Argentine situation not to speak of the world movement.

Such statements are ill-advised and are not conducive to solving the political differences that exist in the world movement within the overall framework of our basic agreements, to providing a proper atmosphere – the necessary atmosphere to solve them.

The comrades in the Montreal LSO tendency have for some time attempted to present themselves as wearing the garment and speaking with the voice of our French comrades in the Ligue Communiste.

We have never accepted this claim which often takes on the garish form of clamping the French experience on the Canadian reality in the most absurdly mechanical way, as we witnessed at the last convention in their rejection of our NDP orientation.

Perhaps they think they are brokers for the Ligue Communiste in their recent actions boycotting *Libération*. We deny this. And in their extravagant charges attempting to justify this action. We deny this also.

When the tendency decided to boycott our press, to break off all participation in *Libération*, including its circulation – the key work of our movement as a propaganda group – they charged us with "public betrayal of the line of the world congress, and even more seriously of the Argentine section".

What is their evidence of this infamous charge? The publication of two articles. One, an adaptation of a document of the Groupe Punto de Partido of Brazil which our Québécois

comrades published without comment as a document generally Marxist and of interest to our movement; and the second, a straight factual account of the ERP kidnap action.

What does the tendency expect our Québécois comrades to do? To applaud the actions of the ERP as an example to emulate – as the IMG leadership factionally tried – through the framing of a congress resolution hailing the action – to force the British tendency to do? The British tendency in our opinion quite correctly protested such gimmicks used to overwhelm discussion. Is that their evidence of betrayal of the World Congress line and of the Argentine section by the Canadian section?

And of course in their typical negative, irresponsible and divisive way, they completely outstrip anything that our French comrades have even suggested by adding the charge – the incredible accusation that we "are taking the first step outside of the world party of the socialist revolution" and that "we are moving in the direction of a split".

There is no truth whatsoever in either charge. We are firmly entrenched in the 4th International. It is our International which we commenced to build, armed with Trotsky's ideas in collaboration with James P. Cannon, back in 1926, and with Trotsky himself, in 1931.

It's our International and we intend to do all that is possible with all our European comrades, and in particular with our comrades of the Ligue Communiste to forge it into a decisive tool of the world revolution.

At this stage in its development it is necessary to create and sustain an atmosphere for collaboration and for resolution in free debate of the differences in our ranks.

Only in this way will we build the Fourth International into a world party of socialist revolution.