

# INTERNAL BULLETIN 3

National Committee Minutes 17-18 October 1981

National Committee Minutes 19-20 December 1981

Material for the next IB to Kinnell at the centre, please, by March 1, preferably typed A4 on Roneo stencils. Please write with some care for security.

10p

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION

500 FIFTH AVENUE NEW YORK 10017

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY  
ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION  
500 FIFTH AVENUE NEW YORK 10017

---

## NATIONAL COMMITTEE. OCTOBER 17-18.

---

Present: Smith, Jones, Brooks, Keith, Macaulay, Brown, Foster, O'Keefe, Noonan, Lewis, Reynolds, Pilkington, Riel, Daly, Swing, Kendall, Glover, Lamarre, Madiox, Todd, Spilling, Eliot, Booth, Grassac, Harrison, Johnson; Connolly, Morrow.  
Late: O'Toole, Appleyard, Fraser, James, Whetling, Armstrong, Oliver, Hunt, Piggot  
Apologies: Heywood, Matthews, Hotchkiss, Ramsey, Harding, Landis, Alain-Fournier, O'Malley, Gunther, McVicar, Gunther.

---

### POLITICAL REPORT

---

Report from Pilkington. Discussion followed on Polish nationalism (O'Keefe, Jones, Booth, Keith, Reynolds, Harrison) and on the crisis in the Tory party (Jones, Booth, Keith).

---

### B.L. and FOUR PER CENT LIMIT

---

Introduction from Smith, and discussion on forthcoming strike.

Agreed unanimously: motion from Pilkington, summarising discussion:

1. OC to meet regularly to direct work, coopting extra members as necessary.
2. Reallocate resources - material resources and personnel - to requirements of strike. Full timers and available cds from other areas: one cd in Oxford and B'ham to be released from other work to focus on strike.
3. LAC to issue financial appeal, take initiative for support committees (labour movement based). Local pickets of BL showrooms.
4. Into Labour Parties - resolutions demanding LP support - focus on left MPs etc - public meetings.
5. Resolutions to be raised for a TGWU and AUEW (and other unions) national strike in the event of the sackings, linked to call for a general strike.
6. Intervene in UWM conference to press for active support to the strike.
7. Women's Fightback groups to be urged in relevant areas to develop links with BL women workers and with strikers' wives. Coverage in F and the paper to stress women's involvement and support.
8. Campaign to extend strike into car industry and public sector. Work for local labour movement conferences drawing in other groups against the four per cent.

---

### LABOUR PARTY

---

O'Keefe presented a report on the situation after the Brighton conference. Discussion. Resolution passed as communicated in circulars on: - broad LL conference  
- TU democracy conference

2/

- Labour Left group
- recruitment to LP
- building broad groups
- people joining ICC and CLPD.

## FULL-TIMERS

Grassac proposed a discussion on this. Jones proposed that the EC discuss it and prepare a written report for next NC. This was agreed.

## FINANCE

Reynolds reported. Discussion. Resolution agreed unanimously:

- This NC instructs all branch leaderships to:
1. Collect outstanding broad group dues; issue new cards, and establish such groups where necessary;
  2. Draw up a list and approach appropriate members and contacts in the next 2 weeks for large donations - specifically arguing the necessity for large sums to support the BL work and new premises.
  3. All branches to discuss and report on fund-raising in the next 2 weeks.

## RALLY

Macaulay reported. We thought rally was a success, though mobilisation was uneven. Publicity was not very good; ticket was too cheap. The rally cemented the fusion and showed the potential for recruitment. However, the NC did not act sufficiently as a driving force for mobilisation.

Discussion: on the coverage in the paper and profile of WSL in rally.

## AREA REPORTS

Included particularly mobilisation for and follow-up to rally.

## MAGAZINE

O'Keefe reported.

## IRELAND

O'Keefe: Hunger strike has ended, with British govt. taking a very

vindictive attitude. The Polarisation between the communities has led to sectarian assassinations.

In the south there is a very important political debate. The Government is proposing to amend the constitution, and Fianna Fail is opposed. It's not a simple question: the amendment to renounce Dublin's claim to the 6 Cos. might mean accepting partition, but the existing constitution means a claim to the 32 Cos. on the basis of Catholicism.

The basic struggle is not only anti-imperialist. The intermeshing of Britain and Ireland predates modern imperialism. And the struggle in the '60s was precipitated by British pressure for reform. The struggle is anti-imperialist, but not only that.

Completion of the bourgeois-democratic revolution is not the issue. There are generally 2 types of colonies in history: the USA type and the Africa type - driving out the native people or imposing an exploiting minority on top of them. These 2 types were combined in Ireland - corresponding roughly, but not cleanly, to 2 areas of the island. Partition is reactionary not on general principle but because of the intermeshing of the communities; thus in fact partition was an imperialist imposition, on the basis of an alliance with the Orange forces, entrapping 35% of Catholics in the Protestant state. But the bourgeois-democratic revolution was accomplished, as much it actually went, from above in the late 19th and early 20th century. S. Ireland is not a 3rd World country but a highly developed capitalist state.

The last 10 years have seen the revolt of the Northern Catholics in isolation from the mass of the Irish people. On the basis of  $\frac{1}{2}$  million Catholics vs. one million Protestants, the struggle is unwinnable. On a Catholic-nationalist basis, it is unwinnable. Open civil war would not mean victory but almost certainly repartition and an intensification of sectarianism.

The Catholics are right to revolt, and we should support them. But the struggle in the North needs to be transformed into class struggle on an all-Ireland basis, linking up with the South.

Why hasn't that transformation happened? There is a real obstacle created by the Border. But there is also the question of leadership. The Provo leadership is not only petty bourgeois, but downright anachronistic in its politics.

Living in Britain, we must support the Catholic revolt against our own state. But we must maintain a critical awareness. The nationalists have no real answer, and we have a class answer. I think WF and I-CL were insufficiently critical of Irish nationalism.

Irish 'Trotskyists' have tailed nationalism. They calmly look towards civil war - but civil war would mean massacre and repartition. We need to put forward an independent class view. By doing that we may be able to lay a basis for a movement in Ireland.

Spilling: I'm worried by the dominant tone of the paper's coverage of Ireland. We can't just look at the relations between Protestants and Catholics, but at the real struggle with British imperialism. The article on the Chelsea bombings was unsatisfactory. I'm not saying it was motivated by cowardice in the face of imperialist propaganda, but it read that way. Would we condemn the military actions by the French Resistance?

Reynolds: The Trotskyists did condemn the individual attacks.

Spilling: It was wrong to call the Chelsea bombing an atrocity. It's not our job to judge the tactics of the PIRA - especially when bombs are going off.

If Dublin abandoned its territorial claims, that would be a setback.

Daly: It's not true that we've gone over to criticism just now when the bombs are going off. We should not lapse into a glorification of violence. From the point of view of the class struggle the Chelsea bombing was no step forward. We're not moralists - but we take our guide from the class struggle, and we don't glorify violence.

Keith: I thought the article on the bombings was OK. In no way did it reflect petty bourgeois cowardice; it took a firm stand on the basics. We took a different attitude to the Aldershot bombing in 1972, when it was a freakish accident that the bomb hit non-military targets. In this case the bombing was clearly carried out with indifference to civilians. The article was well balanced.

Matthews: The difference between the line WF took on Aldershot in 1972 and this bombing is not just a difference in circumstances but also (and correctly) a shift to a more critical attitude to Irish nationalism. We need more attention to the tasks of building a revolutionary movement in Ireland. We shouldn't be so pessimistic and distant. There is a working class base in the Republican movement that we can relate to.

Hunt: It's important to discuss the tasks in Ireland. I think the article was right. The bombing set us back enormously in building support. We need to develop an independent line.

Reynolds: There are two separate issues: the attitude to the bombings and the attitude to the Provos' politics.

On the bombings there was a common EC line. If there was a shade of difference in the discussion, it was that the comrades arguing for sharper criticism of the Provos' politics put more reservations on any condemnation of the bombing.

The IMG in the early '70s used to argue that Ireland was like Cuba, and the national struggle would grow over organically into a socialist struggle. That idea has now become the common wisdom of the Irish left and much of the British left. E.g. the IRSP, in our interview with them in the paper, says everyone in Ireland supports the hunger strikers - as if the Protestants did not exist. E.g. there are casual references on the left to 'splitting the nationalist community' as a bad thing - whereas it must be our aim to split it on a class basis.

Jones: The fundamental issue is not splitting the nationalist community but the fight against British imperialism.

The article on the bombings is from the EC. Spilling is wrong to say we can't criticise or distinguish different acts. If the Provos shoot British soldiers one day and Trotskyists the next, do we say we can't distinguish?

O'Keefe stands too close to the problem. We should see Ireland in the context of the world struggle against imperialism.

The PIRA are petty bourgeois - but not just any petty bourgeois. They are fighting imperialism. We have to take a stand against British imperialism. We should focus not on the danger of civil war but on the fight against imperialism.

5/

Johnson: O'Keefe comes very near to rejecting the progressive character of the struggle in Ireland, e.g. suggesting that Ireland is or might be imperialist. There should be a document. There is a danger of criticising the nationalism of the oppressed and thus falling into endorsing oppressor nationalism.

Macaulay: There is agreement on unconditional but critical support for the Catholic revolt. And I don't think we've ever had the criticism outweighing the support. Chelsea was an atrocity, and we should call things by their right names. No double standards are involved.

We need to take up loose thinking on Ireland - e.g. complacency towards the prospect of a civil war.

Maybe the articles in the paper have 'bent the stick' too far in the direction of distancing us from the struggle.

Connolly: the PIRA have never claimed the Birmingham bombings. I agree with Spilling that it was wrong to criticise the bombings. Unconditional but critical support is no support at all.

The criticism seems to be based on the effect on setting back the British labour movement. But that should not be the main concern. The main struggle is in Ireland.

The Provos' desperation is born out of lack of political programme, and the British labour movement's indifference to Ireland.

We should have documents.

O'Keefe is frustrated that Irish politics are not the same as British politics. But there is a real nationalist consciousness in the Irish working class.

James: We should see the forces fighting British imperialism in the same way as the liberation struggle in Africa. We support the Provos' right to lead the struggle as they wish - we can't pick or choose among their tactics. We should focus our articles on the failure of the British labour leadership to fight.

Piggot: I'm extremely confused. I can't see where we stand on Ireland. The real atrocity is O'Keefe's articles. The whole political line on Ireland seems to have been changed. I could have sold O'Keefe's latest article on an Orange march - it calls for Protestant autonomy, which means an Orange state. I disagree with the negative attitude to the hunger strike.

Kendall: We must relate to the problems of the movement in Ireland.

O'Keefe: The PIRA acknowledged that Republican free-lances were probably responsible for the Birmingham bombings.

We publish a paper to influence British workers, and we can't just say the Irish struggle is all-important. We can't ignore the 'human response' of British workers - I think the WF/I-CL was deficient on this.

Over the last 10 years, the left has capitulated to the emotional responses of Irish nationalists, and taken a sectarian attitude to the British working class.

Jones's approach of seeing the Irish struggle as just part of the overall fight against imperialism is wrong in method. We have to come to terms with the concrete details of the Irish situation.

If we say, "it's a struggle against imperialism, therefore we don't worry about civil war", we ignore the fact that a civil war will not get rid of British imperialism. We have to criticise the



Republicans' populism, lack of class perspective, etc. Trotsky said the US whites were 'hangmen' in relation to the blacks. The same is true of the N.I. Protestants in relation to the Catholics. But Trotsky did not ignore the white working class, and we should not ignore the Protestant working class. Ireland is not a 3rd World situation. The south is a normal developed bourgeois society. The present revolt is limited to the Catholics. It can only win if transformed into a struggle led by the working class. Even if it were a 3rd World situation, we would still have to criticise the populism.

'Protestant autonomy' - the Provos advocate an autonomous Ulster in a federal Ireland.

But now the Provos are slipping away from nationalism into Catholic communalism - a perspective ignoring the Protestants. We should be in solidarity with the IRA and the nationalist struggle, but that does not mean we support their judgment and their politics. We should not abandon the PIRA, but we should not tail their politics.

The bombings: the article represented the overall view of the EC. Should we not criticise? Should we not analyse? Should we not point out the facts of communal polarisation?

The article defended the right of the PIRA to strike at the British military - just as the old WF defended the right to strike at Aldershot barracks etc but condemned the Birmingham bombings.

While criticising particular actions we do not change sides. I want to talk to the vast majority of workers who are not pro-IRA, to relate honestly to the reflex reaction of our class to bombs in the streets. The wish to talk to our class is honourable; it would be dishonourable to back down on the actual political issues, but we did not do that.

Reynolds: proposed a resolution.

1. We give unconditional support to the fight of the Catholic minority in Northern Ireland against British imperialism and for a united Ireland.
2. We fight for British troops to be got out - unconditionally and immediately.
3. We support the right of the IRA to strike against British military and state targets (even if we may question the tactical wisdom), but we condemn attacks on civilians. These criteria apply to events in Britain and in Ireland equally.
4. We criticise the nationalist and militarist limitations of the IRA leadership, and counterpose a fight to link the struggle against partition with an all-Ireland class movement, under revolutionary socialist leadership.
5. Debate should continue on the immediate prospects and possibilities of the struggle in the North, etc.

Spilling: I object to taking this resolution. It should go to the Irish commission. If the NC takes this resolution, I will not attend the Irish commission.

Reynolds proposed the resolution go to the Irish commission and come back afterwards to the NC, and this was agreed.\*

-----

\* Additional note to the minutes: I proposed this because of the NC's crowded agenda. But I do not accept that the NC would in any way have been out of order to consider the resolution before the Irish commission. Reynolds.



## TILC REPORT

Pilkington reported. There will be a written report for next NC on a visit to Latin America. There is reasonable contact with TAF and GBL. The Australian group has expanded. TAF is making progress. Money is needed for the Turkish work. The TILC internal bulletin is in preparation. A document is being done on the FI(IC) theses. US: there was a fusion after the summer school, but problems have got worse. But the paper has shown great steps forward.

Discussion about Turkey, Denmark, Poland.

Booth: What's the machinery for discussing the TILC resolutions?

Smith: the WSL delegation at the TILC meetings normally votes on behalf of WSL. But these resolutions have been referred for discussion.

Pilkington: The details are in the hands of the TILC Secretariat.

Booth: I think the resolution on Zionism is inadequate.

O'Keefe: I think the resolution on France is inadequate.

St. MARY's, W9

Noonan reported.

## UNEMPLOYED CONFERENCE

Grassac: We need a full-time comrade to work on it.

Agreed: OC to meet immediately after NC to discuss allocation of a full-timer to this work; London AC to discuss London work for the conference.

## ANTI-RACIST/ANTI-FASCIST REPORT

James: reported from the commission meeting. There is no national anti-racist organisation now. It is probably impossible to resurrect the ANL nationally. We should write to Searchlight asking them to organise a conference.

Reynolds: I disagree with putting it into the hands of Searchlight, who are politically hostile. We should agree to the general idea of a conference and refer the details to the EC.

This proposal to refer to the EC was agreed by a clear majority.

## WOMEN'S F.

Todd: There are a lot of teething problems. The F. AGM was

unfortunately very small, because of the cost, although the school was very successful.

An action programme for F was put forward and adopted unanimously, but I feel frustrated because it has not been reflected in the F. paper. The F. groups are very loosely and federally organised. The area reports show that it's all very freelance and ad hoc. The link with WSL is very vague. We had a discussion with the OC which aired the problems but didn't resolve them. Some comrades argued it's a question of subjectivism but it isn't. The problem is lack of central direction and political input.

Lamarre: We agreed that work among women would be mainly through F. But in fact the WSL has continued the old problem of I-CL and F activity running in parallel. We need to rectify that and give greater direction.

The aim of the discussion with the OC was to find ways to create a harder core in F without cutting us off from non-WSL people. We proposed to get the paper more integrated with the WSL - to establish a 4-person committee, answerable to WSL, responsible for WSL input into the paper, and giving a forum for the debate within WSL. We also decided to propose carrying editorials in F.

Landis. Todd's contribution was extraordinary. I thought it was supposed to be a report from the joint women's commission/OC meeting, but instead of reporting the decisions of that meeting Todd just gave her personal criticisms of F in a negative way.

F by its nature cannot be a homogeneous movement. We can give a lead, but it is not a disciplined movement. The scandal is not that F includes loose people who sell the paper, but that whole branches of our own organisation haven't sold the paper. F is taking a lot of initiatives, but the WSL is not coming forward to take a lead.

Daly: The problems are problems of success. The work is large-scale but unfocused. The Women's Right to Work campaign should be made central.

Pilkington: F has positive possibilities, but it's what we make it. We must put in a conscious drive. At the moment F is more potential than actual. It is wrong for Landis to place the whole onus on branches - she must be responsible for giving a central drive herself.

#### =====

#### E.C. MEMBERSHIP

#### =====

Jones and O'Keefe proposed that Piggot should be added to the EC until the next NC, for the duration of the BL strike.

Heywood: It's not necessary. Why can't he just attend?

Todd: I agree with Heywood. So would the Oxford AC.

The motion from Jones and O'Keefe was carried overwhelmingly.

=====

EDDIE P.

=====

=====

MINUTES

=====

Decided to give him formal notice of a motion to expel him, on grounds of taking VR.

Referred to next NC.

## 1. ATTENDANCE

Late: Todd, Connolly, Spilling, Piggot, Maddox, Cahiffe - at Oxford bazaar on Saturday. Oliver - domestic reasons. Hunt, Morrow, Grassac, Wheeler - car breakdown. Appleyard - missed train. Brown, Foster - stewards' meeting for Polish demo. Kendall - domestic reasons. Parsons - travel problems. Lewis, Chorley. Brown, Foster, Smith, Fraser also left early on Sunday for Polish demo. Absent: Riel (expense), Harrison, O'Toole.

## 2. AGENDA

Booth: What about the discussion on full-timers?  
Agreed to consider this point on Sunday.

## 3. POLITICAL REPORT

Smith: The rise of Solidarnosc was the political revolution. The danger to Solidarnosc came through the Solidarnosc right wing's policy of marking time. The development of an independent TU in a Stalinist state was impossible: the choice for Solidarnosc was to make a revolution or to be crushed.

We saw the danger of being crushed in terms of a Russian invasion, but in fact it has been done internally. The internal cohesion of the Polish state forces is surprising.

It's not a military coup, but basically a use of the military by the top bureaucrats. Some members of the Politbureau have in fact been arrested. The hardliners are dominant.

Solidarnosc had failed to prepare for a crackdown - though with the assault on the firefighters' school it was clear it was going to come. There was a Solidarnosc leadership meeting just before the crackdown, and it dismissed the danger.

It's difficult to quantify the resistance to the crackdown, but there have been widespread strikes. It is difficult to crush such a massive movement. Further explosive resistance is likely, though the Church has intervened with calls for calm and the leadership of Solidarnosc has been inadequate.

The attitude of the western capitalist governments and banks is effective support for the crackdown. They want to get their money back, and they fear the radicalising effects of Solidarnosc.

An internal clampdown is better for the bureaucrats than a Russian invasion, because there is less broad resistance.

Britain: a broad attack on the working class. The four per cent policy has been central. The Tories have been very successful on that - they didn't expect to keep everyone at exactly four per cent. The BL strike was central - a defeat for the government on that would have been entirely different to the concessions made in negotiations with other groups. The betrayal strengthened the Tories. Now the council workers' unions are claiming 7% as a victory. And we have a hardline Budget.

BL has also strengthened the Tories all round - e.g. on anti union laws. And then the TUC reaction strengthened the Tories further. No section of the TUC is prepared to take on the Tories. The Tebbit laws are part of a serious offensive against the working class, in which legislation is not the main thing.

The shopfloor attacks in BL are pointers for other employers, e.g. Ford. And it's a very vicious situation now in BL. BL wants to cut down the number of stewards, to end all full-time trade union positions, and to tie stewards to the track. There'll be more victimisations, too, and they'll go for us.

The leadership question is very important. The latest AUEW journal has an editorial by Boyd on BL, effectively supporting victimisations. At the national conference with BL last Monday on my recognition, the management were using the same arguments as Boyd.

Also we have the attacks on youth - the cheap labour schemes.

There is a new wave of massive cuts going through the local authorities. It poses the question of leadership again. I think the Coventry strike was very important - as important for the cuts as BL for wages - and it failed to get a victory. There was a clear need for supporting action, as at St Mary's.

The Law Lords' decision against the GLC has big implications, linking into the situation in the LP, to be discussed later on this agenda.

Ramsey: The ruling class clearly thinks it has the upper hand. Little trade union campaign against Tebbit is likely.

On the cuts: Heseltine has not lost in substance on the rates issue, despite what some people say. Labour councils are likely to be decimated - but also to go on the offensive against workers. In Tower Hamlets, 80% of the population could be on state benefits. Big attacks on state benefits, and cuts in the civil service, are a likely next step by the Tories.

I think the government may block the 7% pay offer to council workers.

Glover: The NUM is central. All the factors are there for a big strike in the New Year - people see a left leadership and recent poor wage rises. What's missing, however, is the mood in the rank and file.

The situation is not like '72 or '74. There are big stocks of coal on the surface, and the NCB is already moving more. The situation in the pits varies. Some militant pits are quiet. One non-militant pit is on strike right now.

The economic slump has also sapped solidarity in the working class.

The main question is what sort of leadership will come from Scargill between now and the ballot. We need to put our weight into a campaign for strike action.

Levy: The NUM special delegate conference showed buoyancy and militancy: not a single voice to doubt a big majority for strike action. The Tories may manoeuvre, but I don't think they can stop a big vote for action. We should call a broad-group miners' meeting.

Daly: We should discuss practical solidarity with Poland.

Brooks: We should look at the effect of Poland on the CPs - cf. the different attitudes of the Italian, French, British CPs.

In the labour movement we should be putting through resolutions condemning the Israeli annexation of the Golan Heights.

Booth: Law is being increasingly used in the class struggle - and not just as an instrument of the Tories. The judges intervened heavily under the last Labour government, too.

Jones: We should discuss Poland more. Previously our assessment was that the USSR was the main danger. But now it is Pole against Pole. The political revolution is directly posed. The Church has argued for passivity, but some religious people have been arrested, too. Solidarnosc has had a big effect including in the Church. The capitalist press and bankers have implicitly supported the crackdown - 'as long as the USSR keeps out'.

In reality no compromise can be made. The bureaucrats want to put Walesa on TV to appeal for order and then shoot him, but he won't. There is a danger of a big bloodbath. We should use the fact it is Pole against Pole to bring out the question of political revolution.

Khan: There are parallels between the Polish situation and the LP witch hunt. We can make good propaganda against the witch hunt around parliamentary democracy and the action of the Law Lords.

Carolan: We are taken by surprise by the internal nature of the counter-revolution. But how internal is it? The army and police are riddled with USSR agents. And there may be Russian troops directly involved. If the USSR is really not involved, we would have to assess the bureaucracy as much more stable than our theory seems to indicate.

The course of the struggle is one of a workers' rising channelled into trade unionism under the pressure of the USSR threat. Like 1936-7 in Spain, the workers

NC/3

were potentially masters of the situation but did not take power. The economic chaos has strengthened the state. A general strike in Poland now would have to be a direct fight for power.

The events show the need for an international perspective - outside that there is no hope for Poland - and for a Trotskyist leadership.

I'm heartened that all our comrades are solid on the fight against the bureaucracy. We should be sharp on leftists who are soft. The Polish bureaucracy is doing the work of Pinochet.

Johnson: There are a lot of similarities between what the Polish regime is doing and Turkey. I don't think the Polish regime can go as far as Chile. They aren't strong enough. I don't think there will be a bloodbath unless the USSR comes in - the regime is too weak to defeat a possible mass movement.

The Polish events also show the weakness of the world Trotskyist movement - its failure to gain roots in Poland.

Kinnell: In a sense it IS a coup - the military hierarchy has definitely come centre stage, and that must be to do with the fact that it is closer to the Kremlin than other sections of the bureaucracy.

Surely the weakness and brittleness of the regime makes a bloodbath more likely.

Parsons: I think there could be big fights coming in Britain against the cuts. On the NUM: my impression is that the vote will depend on whether miners feel ready to bring the government down, and at present they don't. The vote for Scargill does not necessarily reflect a will to strike.

Smith: If there was a miners' strike, it would get tremendous support.

The Polish bureaucracy has no real political independence. Carolan is right about that. The puzzle is how they managed to keep the armed forces so solid.

On Johnson's point - I don't think the Turkish parallel helps. It's not a military takeover as such, but the dominant section of the bureaucracy taking over through the junta.

The only answer is to go for a revolutionary general strike and try to spread it internationally.

McVicar: moved a resolution on PSC (see IB 1).

Ramsey moved EC discuss how to take it.

Jones moved NC should not take it. Comrades were seizing on an opportunity to push far-reaching ideas in the guise of a practical resolution.

Agreed EC would discuss in the lunch break. EC discussed and recommended the resolution be taken - but be opposed by the EC.

McVicar: Marxism is weak in Solidarnosc. PSC does reflect the real movements in the Polish working class, even though there are right-wing elements in it. The IMG's hostility to PSC is inconsistent, since they are uncritical of Irish clerical/nationalism. PSC has the strength of taking up the break with the state-run 'unions'. It's wrong that PSC has SDPers and Liberals on its platform. But we should participate.

Jones (for EC): The PSC has been led by hardened anti-Trotskyists. We should support mass-based PSC initiatives, while arguing for labour movement contingents.

McVicar withdrew his resolution, saying it should be discussed at more length.

Jones moved from the EC:

1. To support mass initiatives of PSC
2. To work for labour movement contingents

NC/4

3. To work for a labour movement solidarity campaign
4. To study PSC in action. To push the EESC to a more activist approach.

VOTING: point 1 carried unanimously, point 2 carried unanimously, point 3 carried with 3 against (Hotchkiss, Heywood, McVicar) and 2 abst (Hunt, Eliot), point 4 carried with 4 abst.

Discussion followed on slogans.

The following were proposed and agreed unanimously:

Defend the workers of Poland

Release all political prisoners

Defend Solidarnosc

TU blacking of trade with Poland in support of the strike

Down with the Polish bureaucracy - for workers' power

Stop Russian intervention

(all proposed by Jones)

'Down with the Polish bureaucracy' was amended on Johnson's proposal to

'Down with the military government and Polish bureaucracy'.

The following were proposed and carried by a majority:

Free TUs, East and West (prop: McVicar, carried overwhelmingly)

Self-determination for Poland (prop: Carolan, carried 14-11 with 6 abst.)

Break links with state 'unions' (prop: McVicar, carried with 3 against)

---

#### FINANCE

---

Jagger reported on finance and premises.

---

#### GENERAL STRIKE

---

Kinnell introduced his document (see IB 1). A short discussion followed.

Morrow proposed we ask for written responses through the IB, with a January deadline - agreed unanimously.

Ramsey proposed we ask for responses before the next NC - agreed unan.

Heywood proposed we set a date for a national meeting on the question - proposal defeated.

---

#### ST. MARY'S

---

Noonan reported. Discussion (Lewis, Grassac, Ramsey, Chorley, Khan, Morrow).

---

#### YOUTH

---

Fraser reported on the youth conference. Discussion. A motion from the Mersey-side branch of no confidence in Fraser and Brown as youth organisers was defeated unanimously.



---

INTERNATIONAL REPORTS

---

Kinnell reported on the FI(IC) split and on discussions with the FIT. Booth and Heywood said the report on the FI(IC) was inadequate. Smith reported on the TLIC meeting and on the USA.

---

MINUTES

---

Booth moved there be at least a 1-page summary of the discussion on the political report. James raised the question of organising for a national anti-fascist conference: it was agreed that a member of the steering ctee of the AF commission should attend the OC or EC for further discussion. Maddox raised the question of the WSL conference: agreed to discuss at next NC.

O'Malley raised the question of the summer school: agreed to schedule it tentatively for July 25-31, details to go to OC.

Kinnell moved that O'Malley be added to the OE. Agreed.

Glover moved that the EC or OC should investigate the possibilities of new centre being in Birmingham or Manchester.

---

IRELAND

---

Spilling moved the motion from the Irish commission (see end of minutes) Carolan for the EC opposed the Irish commission amendments to the original EC motion.

A motion from Casey (see end of minutes) was also before the NC but found no-one to move it.

Piggot, Morrow, Johnson, spoke for Spilling position.

Foster, Smith, Keith, Daly, Kinnell, Hill, Booth, Gardiner, Heywood, Hunt spoke for the EC position.

On the vote, the Irish commission amendment to the EC resolution was lost by 10 votes to 21 with 2 abst.

The EC motion was carried with 4 against and 5 abst.

A resolution from the Irish commission urging comrades to work in LCI was passed with 1 vote against and 2 abst.

Connolly proposed a national mobilisation for the Bloody Sunday demo on Jan.31. Daly proposed the matter be referred to the OC to discuss possibilities. Connolly's proposal was carried with 4 against and 1 abst.

---

LABOUR PARTY

---

Carolan reported. O'Malley put proposals from the EC about security.



Discussion (Brooks, Hotchkiss, Hill, Ramsey, Daly, Oliver, Todd, Spilling, Hunt, Khan, Kendall, Piggot, Cunliffe, Booth, Heywood, James, Carolan).

The EC recommendation on League sponsorship was carried with 5 against, 5 abst.

Proposal to get sponsorships from TUs etc carried, 2 against

That Cunliffe should not be a spokesperson for WSL - carried, 2 against, 2 abst, 1 not voting because absent from debate.

Remaining EC recommendations - carried, 2 abst, 1 not voting because absent from debate.

Daly moved a resolution from S.W. London (see end of minutes).

It was agreed by a large majority not to take this resolution.

Campaign to defend the youth movement (prop. Hunt) - agreed unan.

Open Letter to Militant (prop. Brooks) - agreed unan.

A masthead slogan against all witch hunts - agreed unan. (prop. Cunliffe)

Discussion on broad groups referred to EC.

#### WORK AMONG WOMEN

Khan reported. Brief discussion (Grassac, Todd, Ramsey)

#### FULL- TIMERS

Booth proposed an EC discussion on F/Ters. Agreed.

#### RESOLUTION ON IRELAND

Endorsed by EC 23.11.81. Amendments added by Irish commission 28.11.81 shown in brackets.

1. We give unconditional support to the fight of the Catholic minority in Northern Ireland against British imperialism (and its Irish representatives) and for a united Ireland.

2. We fight for British troops to be got out - unconditionally and immediately.

3. We support the right of the IRA to strike against British military and state targets -- even if we may question the tactical wisdom -- but we condemn attacks on civilians - These criteria apply to Britain and Ireland equally.

(AMENDMENT: DELETE ALL AND REPLACE BY: We are opposed to guerillaism as a strategy. We are for the weapon of mass struggle and the working class.

The armed struggle of the Provisionals substitutes itself for the mass of the class and the politics of the class. But in defending the right of the

NC/7

the oppressed to struggle. We cannot therefore select parts in this struggle to 'condemn' more than the other parts, and we are careful in our criticism always to distance ourselves from bourgeois reaction. We recognise that the distinction between military and civilian targets is not a clear divide and we cannot therefore 'support' one and 'oppose' the other ).

4. We criticise the nationalist and militarist limitations of the IRA leadership, and counterpose a fight to link the struggle against partition with an all-Ireland class movement, under revolutionary socialist leadership, (coupled with a campaign of solidarity within the British labour movement. We do not use the socialist programme on nationalism to avoid taking concrete positions on struggles led by petty bourgeois nationalism.)

5. Debate should continue on the immediate prospects and possibilities of the struggle in the North etc.

#### AMENDMENTS ON IRELAND FROM CASEY

Para. 1: delete all and replace by:

1. We give unconditional support to the fight of the nationalist population in Ireland against British imperialism (and its Irish representatives).

Paragraph 2: add new sentence:

We also fight for an immediate end to all other forms of British involvement in Ireland (political, economic etc).

Par. 3: delete all and replace by:

We support the right of the IRA & INLA to fight back against British imperialism whatever we may think of the political usefulness of their strategy and tactics. Whilst recognising that their attacks on occasion lead to 'civilian' casualties (sometimes because of the way in which they are carried out; sometimes because of the failure of the 'security forces' to respond to advance warnings), we must make it clear in our propaganda that their attacks are directed at members of the 'security forces', politicians and commercial targets. We must constantly clarify the difference between the violence of the oppressed and that of the oppressor, and expose the hypocrisy of the bourgeoisie's condemnation of the use of violence by the Irish anti-imperialist forces.

para. 5: replace "...the North..." by "...Ireland..."

#### RESOLUTION FROM SW LONDON BRANCH:

We recognise the need for a calm, adequate political response to the current demands for a witchhunt of the LL.

We recognise that the building of strong broad groups is the best means of defending ourselves within the MP and this task must be taken up as a first priority for all League members.

In order to build strong broad groups it is vital to restore a living democratic life to the broad group alliance.

The paper should not presume that every supporter is a Trotskyist.

Continued membership of, and work within, the MP is a major part of the political programme of the League. Comrades who voluntarily desert from MP

