

---

I N T E R N A L   B U L L E T I N   N O **10**   J U L Y   1982

---

Errors of the majority on the Falklands issue....Cunliffe.

Politica Obrera statement on the Falklands.



## ERRORS OF THE NC MAJORITY ON THE FALKLANDS ISSUE

### FALKLANDS: "COMMUNITY" - OR COLONY?

Time after time from the very first EC draft resolution onwards, the comrades of the majority have begun their analysis of the Falklands events from the position and rights of the islanders. Typically the statement runs something like this:

"The war was about rival claims to the Falklands. The Falklanders are, and for 150 years have been, a distinct community, with a distinct and separate territory, displacing no-one, oppressing no other community. Neither Britain nor Argentina has any valid claim over this community. The rival governments fought for possession of the islands to boost their respective positions at home and to promote themselves as powers in the world (Britain) or in the region (Argentina)."

The sleight of hand is to talk of the islands always in terms simply of people living on them, as some kind of autonomous classless "community". But in fact the Falkland Islands are, and for 150 years have been, a British COLONY offshore from Argentina.

The colony was seized from the young Argentine nation in 1829. The Argentine garrison was evicted by British military force, leaving the islands uninhabited except for British personnel. Only since then has the "distinct community" arisen, made up of British people, who have rigorously ejected any would-be Argentine immigrants. The reason why the islanders "oppress nobody" on the islands is because of this rigorously chauvinist policy of excluding non-British people. The reason why they are "culturally distinct" is this same refusal to allow in foreigners. Their "distinct territory" is not theirs at all, but a British outpost secured - now as in 1829 - by British imperialist armed force, and utilised in two world wars as a strategic naval base dominating the Cape.

The "community" on the islands is today in reality almost exclusively a community of Caretakers for the islands' British owners - the Coalite company and a handful of British landowners. They are no more an "independent" community than the British workers on the Isle of Wight. Their very houses in the company settlements are owned by Coalite - and on retirement they are forcibly ejected from "their" community by the islands' real owners.

And the fact that 1,800 of them still live on the islands - and some, by a bureaucratic quirk in the Tories' latest racist legislation have lost their British passports - does not in the least alter the fact that economically, militarily and politically the islands remain today what they were in 1829 - a British colony seized from Argentina. And the Argentine people have time and again over the past 150 years made it absolutely plain that they regard the issue as a real and a live one, an outstanding grievance against British imperialism.

We, too, should see it that way. The elimination of the vestiges of colonial rule is part of our programme, as well as being a key component in the struggle for national independence.

Does that then oblige us to advocate at all times, under all conditions, the forcible invasion of the islands - or to support such action when taken by the Argentine junta? No, indeed, we can recognise that the issue exists without making it in any way a primary pole of our agitation: the elimination of the British imperialist relic in the Malvinas would for us be one of the later rather than one of the first actions of a revolutionary workers' government in Argentina.

In assessing the importance of the issue, we look first at numerous questions, not at all directly related to the status of the islands or its inhabitants. Does such an invasion liberate sections of oppressed Argentine workers? Does it advance the struggle against the most tangible forms of imperialist oppression and exploitation - the multinational firms and banks, or the military junta armed to the teeth by imperialism? Having retaken the islands, can they be seriously defended against an imperialist military onslaught? Or is it simply an adventure?

Among these considerations there is also the question of the islanders. Revolutionaries do not seek to become "missionaries with bayonets". The struggle against colonial rule should seek to mobilise the exploited masses within the colonies themselves - not simply wage an attack from the outside.

There are conditions, however, where a revolutionary workers' government might disregard the factor in the case of a strategic imperialist outpost like the Falklands: for instance if it became clear that the imperialists were intent upon utilising the islands as a base of operations against revolutionary struggles in Latin America.

But while they represent a moral/political problem, the existence of an expatriate colonial "community" should certainly not be seen as a principled objection to the retaking by Argentina of territory stolen by imperialist armed force.

Our objection to the Argentine invasion should not have been one of principle, but a tactical objection: that this was not the right time or method for retaking the islands; that it was a hopeless adventure and a diversion from the class struggle in Argentina designed to bolster a flagging junta; that it focussed anti-imperialist militancy on the wrong primary targets; and that in doing so it encouraged Argentine workers to ignore the workers on the Falklands themselves.

On balance therefore it was correct to oppose the invasion. But the majority, in deducing this position from the "rights" of the islanders, proceeds to turn upside down its whole analysis of the situation.

Are the islanders entitled to "self-determination"?

For Lenin, the demand of the right to national self-determination was an anti-imperialist demand. To be applicable it required first and foremost to be addressed to a genuine nation - a national minority oppressed by imperialism.

The Falklanders are not a nation - they are an expatriate company work-force sponsored by imperialism. They do not wish to sever their ties with Britain. They are - with the Gibraltarians - among the strongest advocates of British colonial rule. In this sense despite the rudeness and violence of their arrival, and the mess an extended garrison will make, the arrival of the British troops gave the islanders their "self-determination".

The rabid pro-British chauvinism of these island workers is of course dressed up by the majority as the Falklands "national culture", as something to be defended against the ravages of Argentine nationalists. Indeed while no words seem so scathing for the majority's condemnation of the entire Argentine workers' movement as "chauvinist", the Falklanders' national prejudices - a direct echo of the chauvinism of their British imperialist sponsors - are ignored. Instead we are called upon to uphold this 150-year tradition of racialism and chauvinism as the distinguishing feature of the Kelper "nation". This 'cultural' criterion has nothing to do with Leninism - if anything it is the majority who have reverted to bourgeois nationalism.

But we should also ask the majority where they stand now on the situation in the Falklands. The islanders' self-determination is now the pretext for the development of a substantial imperialist base that will represent a challenge to any developing revolutionary struggles in Latin America and will remain a direct affront to the masses of Latin America.

Should we still say that the "rights" of these British expatriates must still be seen as paramount in the situation - superseding the rights of millions of workers throughout Latin America?

The majority comrades of course opposed the sending of the fleet. But while they have argued strongly for the withdrawal of the Argentine forces from the islands and castigated the "chauvinist" Argentine workers, they have at no point called for the islanders to unite with the Argentine workers' movement in demanding the withdrawal of the British forces, or spelled out a class line for this so-called "nation". The argument about self-determination is thus a classless abstraction, using Leninist terminology to avoid a concrete analysis and tail-end the political prejudices rife in a miniscule company settlement.

Argentina- sub-imperialist or victim of imperialism?

Since the Argentine junta is, according to their view, without justification trampling upon the paramount rights of a small "nation" in the South Atlantic, the majority concludes from this that the invasion - seeking to liquidate a colony - is "mini-colonialism" - or even "sub-imperialism".

"Sub-imperialism" has been utilised as a convenient expression because it neatly evades the question of whether Argentina is in fact an imperialist country or whether in reality it remains a rather stronger and more developed nation among those under the thumb of imperialism.

The evasion is important for the comrades, because they recognise that if we are to follow Lenin's line of analysis, then no matter how reactionary the leadership of the Argentine junta, and no matter whether they indeed struck first at British imperialism and triggered the war, if Argentina is an oppressed rather than an oppressor nation then we are obliged to defend it against imperialist attack.

Lenin for instance in A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism, quotes his own pamphlet on Socialism and War:

"Socialists have regarded wars for the defence of the fatherland, or 'defensive' wars as legitimate progressive and just" only in the sense of "overthrowing alien oppression". It cites an example: Persia against Russia, "etc", and says: "These would be just and defensive wars, irrespective of who would be the first to attack; any socialist would wish the oppressed, dependent and unequal states victory over the oppressor, slave-holding and predatory 'Great' Powers." (p. 10)

Lenin's definition here is useful. Socialists, he argues, favour the victory not simply of oppressed national minorities in struggle for the right to secede from larger states and form their own state, but the defence of - politically independent - "oppressed, dependent and unequal states", when they enter a struggle with the imperialists.

Argentina plainly is not an oppressor nation (though the modern state was born from the physical liquidation of the native Indian population); it holds no other peoples in subjugation; it is plainly dependent for its development upon decisions made by the imperialist banks and multinationals; and it is self-evidently unequal to imperialist Britain on any serious comparison. As socialists we should seek the victory of Argentina over the "oppressor, slave-holding and predatory" Britain.

This reference is useful because it undermines the recurrent argument of the majority comrades that in raising the issue of Argentina's dependence upon imperialism we are overstepping the limits of Lenin's call for self-determination. Are we perhaps pursuing some accommodation to the petty bourgeois utopia of economic nationalism and autarchy? Was Lenin's view simply to abandon anti-imperialist struggle once formal political independence was achieved?

One problem in following the debate along these lines is that Lenin is not the most developed source of material on the relationship between national democratic tasks and the socialist revolution: even quite late on in the aftermath of the October Revolution there are signs that Lenin had perhaps not fully grasped the implications of the Theory of Permanent Revolution, which Trotsky himself did not rework fully until 1930.

But we can look to Lenin for a far more rounded approach than is offered to us by the majority comrades. He challenged the ultraleftist positions of Rosa Luxemburg who argued that since there could not be full equality of nations under capitalism because of imperialist economic domination over the backward countries, the demand for political national self-determination was meaningless and should be abandoned.

In answer to her, Lenin argued that self-determination was first and foremost political. He stressed that the demand for formal independence was both necessary and achievable short of the complete destruction of imperialist world domination.

But it is wrong of comrade Corlan to deduce from this that Lenin argued that only political independence is involved in the national struggle. He saw it in fact as a component of the struggle of the masses against the bedrock of imperialist control - the monopoly power of finance capital to dictate the pace of development and levels of exploitation on a world scale. Lenin points out that direct colonial rule is only one of a variety of forms through which finance capital can exercise its control and preserve its system of exploitation. For this reason formal independence, though it may be resisted by the imperialists, does not of itself break the imperialist stranglehold.

And that stranglehold is not simply on the economic windpipe of the "independent" backward countries but through its economic power, imperialism has more or less shaped the political structures and regimes.

It is precisely the tenuous social basis of the small and relatively weak native Argentine bourgeoisie - up against a mass workers movement in a relatively modern capitalist economy - which explains the curious populist politics of Peronism, and the repeated resort of the Argentine capitalists to military dictatorships when the mass movement appears out of control.

The military juntas that have come to power represent an attempt by national capitalists to preserve their own "independent" interests: but at the same time as guardians of capitalist rule and ruthless opponents of revolutionary struggle they are welcomed, sponsored and politically/militarily assisted by the imperialists, who use them as guarantors of their interest payments.

Lenin stresses that the "political superstructure" of imperialism means the change "from democracy to political reaction". Imperialism seeks to "violate democracy" in the national question too: in other words the bankers of the imperialist countries seek to assert their control over the peoples of the oppressed nations. Lenin explains how this happens:

"Is it economically possible in the era of finance capital to eliminate competition even in a foreign state? Certainly it is. It is done through a rival's financial dependence and acquisition of his sources of raw materials and eventually of all his enterprises.

"The American trusts are the supreme expression of the economics of imperialism or monopoly capitalism. They do not confine themselves to economic means of eliminating rivals, but constantly resort to political, even criminal methods. It would be the greatest mistake however to believe that the trusts cannot establish this monopoly by purely economic methods. Reality provides ample proof that this is "achievable": the trusts undermine their rivals' credit through the banks (the owners of the trusts become the owners of the banks, buying up shares); their supply of materials (the owners of the trusts become the owners of the railways, buying up shares); for a certain time the trusts sell below cost, spending millions on this in order to ruin a competitor and then buy up his enterprises, his sources of raw materials (mines, land etc)... Economic annexation is fully achievable without political annexation, and is widely practised."

Does this mean that we advocate petty bourgeois economic nationalism? No; but it means that we recognise that in the oppressed countries there is the direct exploitation of workers by Argentine capital, coupled with the additional burden of the exploitation of the Argentine economy by imperialism. It means that we do not loosely chuck around the term "sub-imperialist" to refer to a country which is the victim of imperialism, providing super-profits to the imperialist bankers, and - in this capacity - helping to finance the "normal" parliamentary forms and norms, the democratic rights shared by workers in the imperialist countries.

"There are lies, damned lies - and statistics"

What about all the statistics trotted out by the majority to show Argentina is no longer a victim of imperialist exploitation? Those figures are for the most part entirely superficial. References for instance to Argentina's alleged (but untraced) \$30 billion in assets held overseas are not only unsubstantiated but deceptive. That figure, even if genuine, would have to include sums in the accounts and offices of Argentine-based firms - whether or not these firms are actually Argentine-owned or controlled. It would include large amounts of fixed assets, and reciprocal shareholdings in multinationals which in turn milk the Argentine economy - and many other elements - most of which are largely irrelevant to an assessment of Argentina's position relative to imperialism.

We can note that there is no comparable figure offered by the majority to assess the billions invested by the imperialists in Argentina - yielding rich pickings. The majority is silent on the fact that out of Argentina's

top 120 companies, 80 are foreign-owned - 39 of them by the USA. Of the top 20, nine are giant foreign concerns. Argentina pays \$4 billion in interest payments to the imperialist banks each year.

Far from being an irrelevance or a petty bourgeois diversion, the struggle against this level of exploitation by imperialism is a key component of the mobilisation of the Argentine working class. Our programme is not national capitalism, but international socialism. But socialism in Argentina demands first and foremost mass action that will break the grip of imperialism. Far from simply echoing the chauvinism of the junta or the Peronists, the anti-imperialism of the Argentine workers is a progressive factor, expressing their class hostility to the system which exploits them. We should not be setting our faces against such a mass movement but intervening within it to draw the class line against the petty bourgeois and bourgeois nationalists.

Lenin points out that "Not infrequently, (notably in Austria and Russia) we find the bourgeoisie of the oppressed nations talking of national revolt, while in practice it enters into reactionary compacts with the bourgeoisie of the oppressor nation behind the backs of and against its own people. In such cases the criticism of revolutionary Marxists should be directed not against the national movement but against its degradation, vulgarisation and against the tendency to reduce it to a petty squabble" (ibid p.40).

Let us also point out that in condemning the minority for "economic nationalism", and rejecting any analysis of the imperialist economic oppression of Argentina, the majority comrades are not even consistent. Their own attempt to brand Argentina as "sub-imperialist" rests heavily on the fact that Argentina "exerts influence" over Uruguay and Paraguay and has extended loans to Bolivia! In addition the territorial dispute with Chile is cited as evidence of an "imperialist" foreign policy.

#### A challenge to Leninist theory

However in putting forward the concept of "sub-imperialism" in the context of Latin America, the majority are engaged in a fundamental junking of Leninist analysis. Imperialism the Highest Stage of Capitalism and subsequent writings define imperialism not primarily in terms of the colonial domination of the imperialist countries, but of the monopoly control of imperialist finance capital. This meant that through their control over the purse-strings of economic development the imperialist bankers and imperialist-owned trusts were able to dominate the under-developed economies - and even fading former colonial powers in which industrial development was less advanced (such as Portugal).

*Don't stop* Was Lenin wrong? Or has this monopoly since been broken? Has Argentina escaped the many varied mechanisms of imperialist control in order to establish itself among the controllers of imperialist finance capital, ranking now on a par with the apparently faded prestige of Britain, or with Japan, Germany and France?

The question is ridiculous because the answers are so obvious. The Argentine economy is advanced relative to other 'Third World' countries, but remains an appendage of the banks in London and New York. The monopoly has not been broken, though the relationship of forces between the imperialist powers has shifted several times since world war one, and a few capitalist regimes have found increased bargaining strength particularly since world war two. The imperialist financiers still dominate the world and reap super-profits from supposedly "independent" countries. We need not a completely new theory of imperialism and "sub-imperialism" but a more developed analysis of the relationship between national capital and imperialist finance capital in the oppressed countries.

#### Whither Permanent Revolution?

Plainly if the whole political and economic map has been redrawn since



Lenin and Trotsky, then the conclusions are wide-reaching. If for instance the struggle against imperialism ceases with the formation of independent states then there are few if any parts of the world where the Theory of Permanent Revolution has any relevance.

If the national struggle is a dead issue in all but old-fashioned colonies, we are left with the 6 counties of Ireland (where comrade Carolan assures us Permanent Revolution is not relevant), Gibraltar and Hong Kong (where presumably the majority must echo their Falklands stance and defend the (imperialist) "national culture", while there is plainly no move towards assimilation) and a handful of similar historical relics.

Even El Salvador - long formally independent - and the other Central American states would no longer qualify, since presumably the struggle should be seen as not anti-imperialist but simply one for socialist revolution. Should we denounce the FMLN guerillas as "chauvinists" for seeing their struggle as one against imperialism? The only substantial differences are that the US soldiers are visibly present in uniforms at the side of the Salvador military, while the bankers who control the soldiers work behind the scenes with the Argentine junta; and that the economic basis of the "national" bourgeoisie in Salvador is even more miniscule than that of the Argentine bourgeoisie, forcing them openly into the arms of the Pentagon for protection.

We remain convinced that the struggle against imperialism is a vital factor in the mobilisation of the working class in the oppressed nations: to dismiss this struggle as economic nationalism is both to minimise the scale of imperialist exploitation - to the comfort of the class collaborationist reformist leaderships in the imperialist countries - and to take a sectarian stance in relation to the struggles of the masses in the majority of the land mass of the "other" five continents.

But doesn't the minority position offer support to Galtieri?

We are accused of switching position on the war according to the change in conjuncture. That is true. The question is were we right to do so?

When we agreed to the position of opposing the Argentine invasion of the Malvinas we were opposing - correctly - a military adventure which was designed to divert the Argentine working class.

When we opposed the sending of the British fleet, it was from the standpoint of opposing the use of imperialist armed force against a non-imperialist country, to reassert colonial rule over the Falklands and at the same time - in comrade Kinnell's words from SO - "Discipline the Third World".

We agitated in Britain for class action against the sending of the fleet - to force its withdrawal by a weakened imperialism. But insofar as that armed fist of imperialism was employed in action against a non-imperialist country, we as socialists were obliged to take our stance, with Lenin and Trotsky, with the "oppressed, dependent and unequal". We had to be for the defeat of imperialism, by whatever combination of political and military means were possible.

In this respect we were not wrong to change our position to a call for the military defeat of British imperialism - we were too slow in recognising the implications of the sending of the fleet. The war which began as an inconsequential quarrel over a colonial relic had developed into a test of strength for imperialism - seeking to intimidate not only the Argentine working masses but also to strike a new note of fear into those in struggle against imperialist exploitation around the world.

In calling for a class mobilisation of workers to defend Argentina - and spelling out a related series of transitional and democratic demands designed to mobilise simultaneously against the junta, the bourgeoisie and the whole

officer caste - the minority position offered not support to Galtieri but a means of deepening and radicalising the struggle of the workers diverted by the Malvinas invasion.

It is of course possible to interpret Argentine defencism in a way which does lend support to the junta and defuse the class polarisation. I think the Morenists developed such a position - calling for a national bloc of all classes against the imperialists, and setting aside democratic and other demands. The American SWP, basing itself on a false and classless view of the Non-Aligned Movement, which in turn flows from the false view of the Castro leadership, also wound up willy nilly in this camp.

But these positions are completely different from the minority line. It would be just as relevant to point out that the majority line begins from many of the same formal premises as the Militant - the violated "national rights" of the islanders; the "imperialistic" nature of the Argentine junta - and could this lead the majority to Militant's cravenly pro-imperialist position (arguing a workers' government in Britain would continue the war for the "liberation" of the Islanders, and opposing agitation for a British withdrawal or defeat since this would mean British soldiers killed, etc).

The majority keep on about the need for an independent "class line". But such a line is not only incomplete in their analysis of the situation; it is, in their approach, a completely abstract, sectarian line making no point of contact with the struggles actually taking place in Argentina. Instead of seizing upon the contradictions of the anti-imperialist movement, recognising its progressive dynamic and deepening its class content, the majority position sets its face against that movement - and makes no connection that could enable it to raise the fight for class independence.

We could readily agree to stand out as isolated oddballs in the international revolutionary movement and among groups regarding themselves as Trotskyist if by doing so we were defending a correct principle and a worked-out line. But the majority line offers us only fudged and falsified theoretical concepts as a rationalisation for a discrediting and thoroughly wrongheaded line on the Falklands: for holding such views the WSL will deservedly be ridiculed both in Britain and internationally. It is particularly damaging - though perhaps inevitable - that such positions should arise among Trotskyists inside the aggressor imperialist nation. The position starts wrongly and winds up disastrous. It should be abandoned forthwith.

Cunliffe.

The following statement was made by the representative of Politica Obrera at the meeting between the TILC and the FIT in Paris on the weekend of the 3rd and 4th of July. The PO comrade had just arrived from Argentina, where of course he had been throughout the war. I took his statement down almost verbatim, although a few sentences were missed out through inadequate note-taking. The omissions however were amplification and do not affect the line of argument.

Smith.

"Before the Galtieri invasion of the Malvinas islands, the military regime was breaking up as a result of the sharp economic crisis in Argentina which had developed since 1980. This resulted in a break up of the united front of the bourgeoisie and the formation of the 'Multi Party Front', a grouping of the five most important parties (the Radicals, the Peronists, the MIT, the Christian Democrats and the Intransigent Party).

"This created a crisis in the military and resulted in the switch from Videla to Viola who came to power on the slogan of the unity of the bourgeoisie. PO saw the coming to power of Galtieri at the end of 1981 as the formation of a crisis regime. Almost as soon as it came to power, the question of when it would fall was being discussed. This was underlined by the great demonstration of March 30th. It must also be remembered that the Galtieri Junta was a very close ally of imperialism - as shown by its support for the Salvador regime etc. It was this situation which led up to the move to occupy the islands.

"It is clear that the occupation was a tactic by Galtieri to try to deal both with the problem of his international relations and with the problem of confronting the working class. It created a kind of national unity inside Argentina, and at the international level it demonstrated to the USA the possibility of an international alliance.

"We (PO) did not support either the political or the military moves for the occupation of the islands and we could not support the objectives of Galtieri. Indeed the occupation was supported by the entire Argentine bourgeoisie. But everything changed the minute the fleet was sent. From then on we were for the defeat of the fleet independently of the nature of the regime. This was the starting point for us. But at the same time we had to remember that the conduct of the war was in the hands of a class which has very strong links with imperialism. We therefore have to be very careful not to confuse the objectives of the working class with the objectives of the bourgeoisie. To avoid this we immediately advanced the following programme:

"Firstly for the degence of Argentina - which was something which the regime actually didn't want to develop. Within that framework, we developed a number of demands: 1. Seizure of imperialist property. 2. Non-payment of debts to imperialist banks. 3. Arming of the masses. We said that the struggle against Great Britain meant the struggle against the Galtieri regime as well. We saw the regime as incapable of struggling against imperialism, therefore our basic policy was how could the working class take over the war!

"We argued that a defeat for British imperialism would benefit the working class both in Argentina and elsewhere. We said this because such a victory would not be achieved without mobilising the working class which would expose the regime to them. A victory for Argentina, we argued, would not strengthen the regime but weaken it - since the regime rests on imperialism. Therefore we said the struggle against the regime was the same as the struggle to win the war. In other words the struggle against Galtieri involved the defeat of Thatcher. For this reason we saw that the struggle against the British military was also a struggle against Galtieri. We, at the same time, did not equate the two, but concentrated on the defeat of the British military. We attacked Galtieri by pointing to his links with imperialism and therefore his inability to fight the war.

"This gave us the basis for our campaign. We worked for the formation of anti-imperialist committees in the universities and in the factories based on the programme I have outlined. Also, given that the army was an army which supported imperialism but now had to wage a war against it, we could work to create divisions in the armed forces. Given that splits already existed in the army, we could work for the formation of anti-imperialist committees within which we could raise the slogan of the arming of the working class. (There was insubordination in the army on the way in which the war had been conducted). In the anti-imperialist committees, we argued for marches to the barracks to demand arms, and we argued for demonstrations against Galtieri.

"So for us the form of struggle had changed because of the war - it now passed through the struggle against British imperialism. At the same time the trade union leaders had suspended the struggle against the regime. They said it was necessary to beat Thatcher first and then the regime. We said that although the defeat of Thatcher was the principal slogan, this can only happen through the mobilisation of the masses.

"As soon as the defeat came, it was clear the regime would fall, this was not simply because of the war, its weakness was obvious before the war. We therefore characterise the present situation in the following way. Firstly, we think the regime is finished and the big problem facing the ruling class is that although the regime is finished, they fear the political vacuum which would exist without the military. They therefore ask the army to appoint a president whilst they try to resolve the matter. But this cannot continue for long. It is likely to push the regime into permanent crisis. There could even be military confrontation between different sections of the armed forces. Already the multi-part group wants to patch up the rift which has been created with imperialism."

In response to questions, the comrade said the following:

"We were able to establish a large number of anti-imperialist committees in the factories and universities and now we hope to hold a national conference of them. They were broadly based, mostly the Peronist left wing and local trade union organisations. They were specifically anti-imperialist committees rather than patriotic committees. The VW committee for example, which organised a march of 1,000 VW workers to the military barracks, demanded the following: 1) confiscation of British holdings. 2) End to suspended wage payment. 3) Victory over the British invader. Some strikes were organised which resulted in anti-government marches.