

INTERNAL BULLETIN NO. 13.

AUGUST 1982.

Contents:

REPORT ON PROCEEDINGS OF TILC, SUMMER 1982.

Political Report/Discussion	P1
Secretariat Report	P4
Discussion on Lebanon	P7
Debate on Malvinas	P8
December conference/democratic centralism (1)	P17
Section reports: Spain/Hackney	P19
USA	P20
December Conference/d-c (2)	P22
Voting (December conf; Lebanon; Malvinas;)	P25
Summer School: Statement of protest	P26
WSL reply	P27
Resolution/vote	P29
Other Business: Italy, Chile, Belgium	P29
Resolutions: *MALVINAS WAR	
*Supplementary statement on Malvinas resolution	
*LEBANON	
*TRANSFORMING THE TILC (December Conference)	
*ON EVENTS AT SUMMER SCHOOL.	

Work is urgently needed to reestablish the functioning of the international commissions. The main ones are: Hispanic (Spain/Portugal/Latin America); USA; French; Australian; Middle East; Turkey; Anti-Apartheid. This work is crucial to support our involvement in TILC and to promote awareness and analysis of international questions in the WSL. We urge comrades with any knowledge, or simply a willingness to learn and do serious work on these countries, to come forward and help develop this work. Please contact cde Cunliffe by letter c/o the Centre.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Trotskyist International Liaison Committee

(for the Reconstruction of the Fourth International)

MEETING, SUMMER 1982.

The meeting, 9 sessions in all, spanned the WSL 1982 Summer School.

Agenda: Attendance

Political Report/Discussion

Secretariat Report

Middle East - Lebanon resolution.

Malvinas/Falklands War - resolution.

December TILC conference/ democratic centralism

USFI, developments in world movement.

Section reports.

Attendance: Present: TAF (Denmark); RWL (US sympathising section);
LOR (Italy); WSL (Britain); Rigal (France);
Spanish sympathiser; Hackney group.

Unable to attend: SF (Australia) - their written report arrived by post just too late for the meeting.

Observers: Cunliffe and Traven proposed that once again an invitation be opened to the LC(Chile) and Chilean cdes ex-FIT. They had been invited, but unable to attend Easter meeting, but since involved in several discussions. Agreed. (ex-FIT cdes did attend some sessions of meeting; LC cdes did not arrive).

Political Report: Cunliffe reported.

The economic crisis of imperialism is especially acute in the leading imperialist nations. Still no recovery in US where Reaganomics failing like Thatcherism in Britain. In Britain record unemployment figures together with employers' (CBI) appeal to Tories for reflation, attacking false govt economic forecasts. In France too economic crisis has driven Mitterrand to adopt Thatcher-style policies.

This crisis has its impact on non-imperialist countries, which come under pressure to meet debt payments and interest charges while their chances of exporting on world market are restricted by slump. This sharpens need for imperialists to keep control over semi-colonial countries. Whatever our differences over Malvinas war, we are agreed it was a war for imperialist authority - to intimidate Argentina - a big debtor - and any other nations that might consider defying imperialism or defaulting. But Galtieri of course had no intention of really breaking with imperialism - debt payments continued throughout the war. Similar phony anti-imperialism can be seen in other Latin American bourgeoisies, who talked of supporting Argentina but were used as tools for US diplomatic manoeuvres. Also Costa Mendes' fraudulent anti-imperialism at the Havana non-Aligned Conference, promoted as genuine by US SWP. to maintain this pose, Galtieri forced to withdraw 1,000 Argentine troops from Honduras and El Salvador.

Aftermath of Malvinas war has seen rise in struggle in El Salvador with seemingly big guerrilla victories met by dispatch of Honduran troops to back up regime. Reports of secret talks between D'Aubuisson and FMLN involving also Cuban representatives. Meanwhile in Nicaragua troops from Honduras together with ex-National Guardsmen have crossed border in what seems a substantial move. Little sign that imperialists genuinely want a negotiated settlement.

In Middle East, Begin exploited last days of Malvinas war as an opportunity to stage his long-planned invasion of Lebanon. Despite expressed reservations of US imperialism, we must consider that the invasion was discussed beforehand with US leaders and that US imperialists are in effect co-aggressors. The EEC bourgeoisies have denounced the invasion - but continue to supply arms to the Zionists.

2)

Another factor prompting Begin must be victory of Iran against Iraq. It has substantial implications for stability of Gulf area. We have no illusions of possible progressive elements in the Iranian regime, but we should recognise that were it to defeat Iraq and threaten Kuwait it would be disruptive for imperialism. It well suits imperialists to prolong the Iran/Iraq conflict; the longer it goes on the more the forces at least nominally opposed to Zionism are weakened. If either regime were overthrown by right wing forces that too would be welcome to imperialism. TILC position of revolutionary defeatism on both sides remains correct.

Note abstentionist position of Kremlin on both Iran/Iraq and on Lebanon. Stalinists continue to back existence of Zionist state and play a counter-revolutionary role in seeking "stability" in Middle East.

But Moscow also heavily preoccupied with Poland. Not been able to stabilise internal situation. Note cancellation of Pope's visit - fear of masses on streets - and its endorsement from Glomp. Jaruzelski's "concessions" an admission of failure: still cannot release all prisoners for fear of resurgence of underground Solidarnosc. Church leaders however backing the bureaucracy, and Solidarnosc clandestine leaders also seem to be advising compromise and "moderation". This does not necessarily reflect rank and file.

In South Africa we see a renewed strike wave - carworkers, miners, metalworkers, etc, plus Rowntree. At the same time South Africa aiding reactionary guerrillas in Angola and Mozambique.

Note that US SWP has discovered a new Grenada/Nicaragua ... in Ghana!

In the imperialist countries, important conflicts over sliding scale of wages in Italy. Also major bosses' offensive in Britain - Tebbit Bill to be followed by further anti-union laws governing union rulebooks. Tory confrontation policy in public sector - rail, NHS. ASLEF historic betrayal by TUC, almost direct repeat of BL betrayal last year. This will have severe consequences and fits in to a right wing offensive in the labour movement which also includes wht witch-hunt in the Labour Party and imposition of the register. In response to this we are trying to group opposition. Outcome of this struggle not yet clear. Sections of the reformist left are looking for ways to compromise, but strong resistance in the rank and file. Mood of working class indicated by strength of ASLEF strikers and NHS dispute - with the biggest development of solidarity strike action for decades developing round the NHS. In response to this, WSL began again agitating for "prepare a General Strike".

Jette (TAF): Islamic caste in Iran expect big problems if they end the war. They have taken no steps towards land reform - they cannot do so. The poor masses from the countryside and towns have been used to form the Pasdaran - used in the war by the hundreds and thousands, while the bourgeois army has been reformed with a new caste of military leaders. It would create an unstable situation if these thousands of unemployed poured back into the cities, and a new layer of self-confident officers having won the war return to find civil society in chaos. This must be seen as one reason why the war has gone on into the invasion of Iraq.

We should question Soviet policy in Iran with the Stalinist (Tudeh) Party supporting Khomeini. Does this suggest Kremlin might want a Khomeini-like regime in Afghanistan?

Fall of Galtieri has brought layers of military leadership to see the need for some kind of formal democracy to prevent danger of mass overthrow of the regime.

Fernando (LOR): The disarray of the Argentine junta has strengthened the pro-imperialist forces within the junta.

We should be careful in dealing with Begin's invasion of Lebanon. Imperialists were forced to support Begin - but this does not mean prior agreement was given.

Khomeini's regime in Iran is not simply an expression of the national bourgeoisie. Nor was Bani-Sadr. Khomeini can be described broadly as a petty-bourgeois movement, balancing between the petty bourgeoisie, the national bourgeoisie and the power of the army - a bonapartist regime.

The Stalinist capitulation to Khomeini is part of the same phenomenon in other reactionary regimes - for instance Latin America. The Soviet bureaucracy is not particularly committed to Khomeini, but is tied to policy of class collaboration.

Ali (Hackney gp): Sharp turn in Turkish economic crisis - resignation of Turgut Ozal, the architect of the junta's Friedmanite policies. Collapse of Castelli, who in last 3 years became the biggest banker in Turkey, threatening major banks with bankruptcy. Castelli made his fortune from the monetarist strategy, attracting masses of small savings, hoping to create a pool of native finance capital. Now gone bust owing nearly \$1 billion - leaving junta to pick up the pieces, needing to find £300 m. Shareholders worst hit were mainly officer caste of army - but victims over 5 million (1 in 8 of population). But junta held responsible for economic failure, facing political repercussions.

A couple of weeks later the regime came out with draft constitution offering supposed basis for a return to "democracy". Civilian politicians may be needed to preserve military structure intact.

On Iran, there is no chance that Khomeini can establish a stable regime. He is against everyone - even development of capitalism in Iran.

Inge (TAF): I am not sure Jaruzelski is offering real concessions in Poland. He has freed some internees - as in April - but as soon as a struggle erupts he throws as many back in jail. Censorship has been decentralised. The Church offered negotiations in March - their formula is to blame both Jaruzelski and Solidarnosc for the crisis. Solidarnosc accepted this formula - effectively inviting Jaruzelski to make a move to split the militants from the more moderate forces.

In Bydgoszcz, 112 workplaces have rejected his proposals for a "union" without regional organisation, politics or opposition to PUPP. In Warsaw too workplaces have responded with a coordinated rejection. But the leadership is still offering concessions.

Organisation in Poland still seems strong. In Warsaw, 63 workplaces are organised in a coordinating committee giving out their own paper. There is also a paper produced for use among soldiers. This is a break from the old KOR position.

Franco (LOR): Schultz/Haig switch: the Reagan administration marked a strengthening in the leadership of imperialism. In general terms this met with two problems: the force of the masses, and the sharp conflicts among the imperialist leaders provoked by the economic crisis. Plus internal contradictions of Reagan admin.

I don't agree the US wants a right wing government in Lebanon. They want a bourgeois reactionary government - but not Christian fascist government.

Iran: we should remember that the clergy is a social force based upon the plebeian sub-proletariat. Bourgeoisie still not decoded which way to move. Most logical plan would be for a coup; but not possible today.

Important to grasp moves in France. Workers trying to find a way out against the government - their level of disaffection growing every day. This may not lead to an upsurge - Mitterrand may lead workers' to defeat.

Smith (WSL): Central question for imperialism in the Middle East is the Palestinians, and the radicalisation and instability they represent - as expressed by the link-up of PLO with Lebanese Left. Imperialists need to smash both PLO and Lebanese Left. No division

4)

between US and Israelis on this objective. Tactical differences of course are possible - Zionists may move faster than imperialists would want. But same objective.

Marcos(Spain): Report wrong to miss out developments in Spain - crisis of both right wing governments on the peninsula. In Spain UCD is expected to call soon for a general election: probable that this would bring the PSOE into government. The Far Right, under Fraga, is finding it difficult to unite forces of bourgeoisie. PSOE policies threaten to disarm Spanish workers, promising that reformist policies can avoid a military coup, offering to support or form a government including members of the "democratic right". The CP says that an electoral victory for the PSOE would provoke the far right - and we shouldn't aggravate the situation any more. We should look closer at developments in social democracy - not only the positions of Mitterrand in France, but the completely pro-imperialist positions taken by Foot, the PSOE, Schmidt and co. over the Malvinas war; imperialist crisis is pushing social democrats further to the right. Also we should examine the crisis of Eurocommunism in Spain and Italy, and developments of French CP, whose alliance with Moscow links with their involvement in the Mitterrand government.

SECRETARIAT REPORT

Less satisfactory progress since April meeting - a number of agreed tasks - such as TIIC IB and monthly letters - have not been carried out. Look a little more at reasons later. Work done:

Chile: Discussions have proceeded with cdes of ex-FIT and with LC. Several meetings, covering basic programmatic positions of TIIC and some other questions - British Labour Party, Polish Solidarnosc, etc. Most positive declaration had come from ex-FIT cdes (only two of them, and not bound by commitment to any other organisation). They had declared a large measure of agreement with Transitional Programme in Today's Class Struggle (TPiCS), and begun work with WSL cdes in East London. LC cdes more reticent on their relations with TIIC and WSL: appear hampered by obvious difficulty of maintaining discussions and communications with their cdes still in Chile. And some of their positions are not only slow in development (still no official LC view on Poland) but surprisingly weak (very sectarian approach to Solidarnosc, assessing it primarily from its written programme). Some differences too on questions of Stalinism - but hard to gauge significance of these, since argued only as "personal view" of cdes concerned. Both ex-FIT and LC cdes committed to preparing written critique of positions of TIIC.

RWL conference: Cunliffe had attended RWL conference as rep. of Secretariat. A conference overly concerned with organisational matters, lacking overall political report or sufficient political content. Problems of consolidating fusion intensified by re-emergence of Larry from ex-SLDC, and lack of balance in repeated interventions in conference by cdes of the minority which had done much to alienate majority cdes as well as reducing time to discuss substantial issues of disagreement. Keen interest in TIIC, and discussions had shown substantial development of promising cadre in US. Cunliffe had worked to persuade (with only partial success) the minority to adopt a more constructive attitude to the fused organisation.

Open Conference initiative: Following the decision in December to approach Moreno's LIT with proposal that they co-sponsor with us an Open Conference of Trotskyists to discuss crisis of FI, we had met a Morenist representative before Easter. He had proposed steps to develop discussion, including public debate in the pages of Morenist international journal and invitation to a

TILC representative to attend the LIT's Executive meeting in Bogota (expenses paid). These proposals had been discussed at April TILC, and Cunliffe mandated to set them out in writing to ensure that our acceptance could not be misinterpreted.

This had been done - but LIT now replied asking for TILC to declare in advance of discussion that we regard LIT as "principled Trotskyists" and their Theses on the Fourth International (which contain no section on social democracy) as a "principled Trotskyist document". Cunliffe had written back holding letter querying significance of the term "principled" in this context. TILC should consider what formulation should be used to characterise the Morenists in advance of discussions.

FIT (Fourth Internationalist Tendency). Repeated letters since the December meeting of TILC had not been answered, and proposals made at that meeting by an FIT representative to further discussions with TILC had not been confirmed by them. But in early July a member of FIT's Argentine group - Politica Obrera - had visited Paris and asked to meet cdes from TILC. Smith, Traven and Franco had gone. Discussions included presentations on the Malvinas war (for PO position see WSL IB 10), the situation in the world Trotskyist movement - in which our unresolved conflict with the FIT's sectarian characterisation of every other current on the world scene emerged once again - and the issue of relations between FIT and TILC. FIT propose to leave first exchange until after WSL debate on Malvinas reaches some form of conclusion. They then propose publication of joint discussion bulletin.

Following these discussions, cdes of the Workers League of Palestine (FIT) visited Britain and the WSL NC, discussing the latest developments in Lebanon. The WL has maintained regular contact with WSL and is openly in favour of strengthened links and eventually unity between FIT and TILC.

Belgium: Old contact of WSL in Belgium had written again, and on receipt of material agreed to come to Summer School.

Sri Lanka: After long delay, RWP Sri Lanka (Samarakoddy group) has sent us a translation of a lengthy document on the history and crisis of the FI. Disappointing document - gives no idea of their politics in Sri Lanka or what they propose to do about crisis of FI. But a great deal of work put into its production - we should reply with some care to it.

Spain: Cunliffe had written article on FI for Spanish magazine, first issue of which is now out. Big step forward for the cdes.

Failures: The failure of the Secretariat to produce either the TILC IB or the TILC semi public Bulletin must be seen as a reflection of two types of problem. On the one hand, political problems within the WSL have preoccupied a disproportionate amount of time and this had an impact on the functioning of the Secretariat's work. On the other hand major organisational problems in the WSL including a chronic financial crisis, has also stood in the way of completing many apparently elementary tasks - such as TILC IB publication of RWL document : on Special Oppression.

But these problems most acute, yet not confined to WSL. There has been a worrying lack of internal life within TILC between its meetings. Still no reports coming in for the monthly letter. Still no material submitted between meetings for the IB; still no resolutions presented in advance of meetings by other sections. This is in part a reflection of the problem of running a tendency comprising very small groups with few material or political resources to devote to international work.

WSL Executive pledged to do what it could to resolve these problems: resolution carried to establish regular TILC IB and semi-public Bulletin, to allocate resources in terms of cash and cdes to this work, and to seek to reestablish functioning of WSL international commissions - also victims of organisational crisis.

6)

Discussion on Secretariat report:

Franco: It is possible we are not talking to leaders of LC. We should write a letter to explain formally why we want to talk to them and ask for an official reply.

Sri Lanka: RWP 100 times more promising than FIT. We should be patient with them. On most questions they are closer to us than is the FIT. They have declared their general agreement with TPITCS. We must ask for documents, articles etc on Sri Lanka.

Bolivia: No reference in report to correspondence with POR de Pie. They are very important.

FIT: I am pessimistic. We always come back to the same problem. And if TILC does not change its position and WSL not change position on Malvinas then relations with FIT are finished. Their stance is increasingly sectarian. Many of their documents are dreadful.

Their organisation is a bluff. They call themselves democratic centralist, but vote by groups - 1 vote each! So PO with 300 members gets the same vote as the Venezuelan section with 15 members! We should patiently argue our position on the FI with them but at the same time set out how we view their tendency - the positions in particularly of the (Bolivian) POR Lora.

Anti-imperialist United Front: we should develop this discussion further in TILC. In my view it is a difference with the FIT. We need a position as a tendency.

Our weaknesses: TILC too has been a victim of the Falklands war. It would be dishonest not to recognise it means a political crisis for TILC, with our sections appearing in public with completely different positions - Britain versus USA, Italy, Spain, Denmark.

This is not a reason to slow down but accelerate building of TILC. We need to specify more on functioning of central work. We need a budget for the December conference and a cde whose main task should be to prepare work of Secretariat.

Smith: I disagree with Franco that RWP 100 times more promising than FIT. It is certain that FIT is a sham. Their relationship at present with POR Lora is an insuperable problem in relating to their tendency. And there are real weaknesses in their European Secretariat. But there are positive sides - PO on the one hand, WL on the other. Worth developing relations with PO, who in reality are the FIT. I am yet to be convinced how healthy are politics of RWP - though in favour of pursuing contacts. Their dual defeatist position on Malvinas appeared similar to WSL position, but arises from distinct roots in tradition of sectarianism. Makes me more pessimistic.

Fernando: We probably would not have big differences with RWP on political issues in Sri Lanka: but their weakness is their sectarian propagandist position on reconstruction of FI.

FIT: we need to find a way to drive a wedge between POR Lora and the PO. In this we have suffered a defeat as a result of WSL majority position on Malvinas which has weakened our stand with PO and allowed Lora to attack us.

Very important to contact the POR de Pie.

Smith: Difficult to separate PO and POR. But if we were to write a document along the lines of JD's December critique of the POR, PO would be in difficulty on how to reply.

Marcos: I don't agree with maintaining relations with other organisations simply by issuing discussion bulletins or analysing other groups. We should propose joint work; better to propose to FIT, Moreno a series of practical agreements on, for example, campaigns on Poland, Central America, Lebanon, women's liberation.

FIT call for change of position on Malvinas is sectarian.

RESOLUTION ON LEBANON

First draft. Cde Keith (WSL) outlined problems with initial text - outcome of WSL drafting commission, but not all sections agreed.

Resolution seeks to explain Lebanese invasion as outcome of different factors, and to explain relationship between US imperialism and Zionism, between these forces and Lebanese fascism, and between Palestinian movement in Lebanon and the Lebanese "left".

The balance is not quite right in this text.

It should distinguish between the way in which Israel acts as a tool of imperialism and that in which some reactionary Arab regimes can act as tools of imperialism. It is not simply as in Para 2 the "primary axis" of imperialist control, but qualitatively different from other alliances. The moments of conflict and disagreement between imperialists and Zionists should be seen in this light. The invasion of Lebanon is a co-aggression with imperialism, with Zionists providing front-line troops. Indeed not every state which finds itself challenged on its borders can simply invade the next door country with full diplomatic and military backing from imperialism.

Section 5: The text talks of Arab regimes as "props of imperialism". It is true that states like Syria have not thoroughly broken with imperialism. They remain capitalist states within the world capitalist order, and the trend within Syria is ever closer to a diplomatic and political accommodation to imperialism; but not a "prop".

The resolution contains no statement on links between different sections of the Lebanese bourgeoisie and the fascists - no information.

I would also like to see the resolution contain a clear formulation stating support for the right of the Palestinians to self-determination - retaking the entire territory of Palestine.

Franco: Broadly agree with Keith. But I want to reply to Smith.

No differences of strategy between Begin and imperialism; both want to destroy the PLO and its power. But they use different methods. For Begin the destruction is primarily a physical destruction: for the USA it is political. The USA does not want problems with Arab leaders. The starting point for both is the military defeat of the PLO - but that has happened.

At the end of the 1973 war the Zionist could have surrounded the Egyptian army and delivered a shattering blow. The US leaders intervened to prevent this in order to preserve a degree of credit for Sadat, to enable him to draw towards imperialism.

Now too there is a division of labour between the hit-men of imperialism and their imperialist masters.

Document is weak on the Lebanese left. I think they have shamefully betrayed the Palestinians. The main force of the Lebanese left the PSP let the Zionist troops go by. That is why they are now flirting with the "national council". It is no accident that Israeli troops give Jumblatt an escort to his talks with the right wing and the Sarkis government. We have to denounce this role in the resolution, and the role now played by the leaders of the PLO.

Significant that the USFI group in Lebanon, the GCR, denounces the leadership of the PLO. We should also express solidarity with the cdes of the GCR.

On point 7: we are for the destruction of the Zionist state not simply because we relate to the Palestinians but because we need to destroy a direct tool of imperialism which is an obstacle to revolution in the Middle East. We should point out that the PLO's programme are utopian. To be victorious the Palestinians need the programme of Permanent Revolution.

Inge: Resolution does not mention West Bank. This has been major problem for Zionists: to annex West Bank they need to destroy PLO.

Ali: Disproportionate length of section on rights of Israeli Jews. These are not in danger at present - threat is that of extinction facing Palestinians. I disagree with this formulation - we should remove it now and discuss it in more detail. We should for instance discuss whether there is a real Jewish working class other than in the arms industry.

Self-determination of Palestinians: we support their right to form a state - regardless of what kind it is. We must also propose what kind of state we favour: I suggest a call for a Soviet Socialist States of the Middle East - covering both the Kurdish and Palestinian people.

Jones: Leadership of PLO is departing from their own programme. Far from arguing for socialist Palestine, they are now seeking simply "a place to live" - leaving the Zionist state in existence.

I don't agree with adding a lot of criticism of the PLO, but we should draw out this issue. I agree with Keith on US/Zionism.

Fernando: Incorrect to use the term "racism" to describe Israeli state. I don't agree either that it is "colonial". Since the beginning Zionism has been the tool of imperialism.

Kinnell: I agree with Franco and Fernando. But mine is a minority view on WSL NC. WL of Palestine argues clearly that US imperialism was the prime mover in the war, whose main target was the Lebanese left. But Franco's position on Leb. Left in many ways extreme opposite of WL.

If Ali opposes formulations on Jewish people as a nation, then I favour further discussion.

IT WAS AGREED THAT A DRAFTING COMMISSION INCLUDING KEITH AND FRANCO SHOULD REVISE THE TEXT IN THE LIGHT OF THIS DISCUSSION: VOTING TO TAKE PLACE ON MONDAY AUG 1.

MALVINAS DEBATE

Leland: Moving RWL resolution

Of course there has been a lot of discussion. RWL believes that a change of position from that adopted at the Easter TILC conference is required. This is plainly contentious within the WSL delegation.

During the war - and most of us believe there was a war - we should have adopted a defencist position in relation to Argentina. Some cdes from the WSL would argue that would flow from the Easter TILC resolution; but the WSL majority at least has interpreted it in a different way. The RWL regarded the resolution as an honest but mistaken attempt to bridge what were in effect principled differences which were clear enough at the Easter conference.

The resolution played a clearly harmful role in the subsequent discussion in the WSL - with one side or the other making their own claims to act in the spirit of TILC.

Even though I am inclined to agree with the interpretation given by the majority of the WSL - which is why I couldn't vote for it - it was clear that half the WSL delegation which put it forward did not support the method of Kinnell and Carolan, and expected that in an all-out war, TILC would back Argentina.

For this reason it is important for TILC now to adopt a new, clear resolution. I am pleased with the way the WSL leadership has promoted discussion on these issues, and drawn out the different lines.

The position of Kinnell and Carolan shares with the Sparts a failure to distinguish between an imperialist and an oppressed country. Yet Lenin began by emphasising the relationship between the Marxist approach to viewing the imperialist system and the Marxist approach to the bourgeois notion of "equality" between individuals. Just as the bourgeoisie has an interest in promoting a purely abstract notion of equality with regard to individuals,

so they promote abstract notions of "self-determination" which do not take into account the differences between nations. Lenin linked the classless view of capitalist society with an abstract view of nations oppressed by imperialism.

The practical problem raised by the dual defeatist position was that we were cut off from any ability to link up with the anti-imperialist struggle of the Argentine masses in a way which would allow us to develop it in an anti-capitalist direction.

Kinnell and Carolan emphasise the difference between Argentina's relationship to imperialism now as against the direct political subordination of colonies to imperialism at earlier stages. We are accused of dogmatically applying formulæ relevant only to direct colonialism.

But it is Kinnell and Carolan who have dug into dogmatic positions, building Chinese walls between political and economic independence. Without for one moment believing that Argentina or any oppressed country could achieve economic independence in the world capitalist framework, we recognise that the oppressed masses of these nations tend to have very strong anti-imperialist feelings which reflect by and large the objective situation these countries find themselves in - extreme dependency on imperialist finance capital. Our task is not to lecture the masses on their nationalist excesses which may emerge from time to time in their struggles, but to utilise everything anti-imperialist in their sentiments and struggles, and attempt to divert them in a proletarian revolutionary direction - seeking also an international spread of the struggle from one country to another as part of the overall fight for the overthrow of world capitalism.

Statistics quoted by the WSL majority cdes on Argentina prove only that it is a relatively advanced oppressed country.

But the tendency towards a bourgeois democratic rather than a Marxist view seems also evident in the exaggerated importance ascribed to the rights of the Islanders by the WSL majority. As with the Sparts, this exaggeration seems also to reflect a certain tendency to view the world from the standpoint of the imperialist countries rather than that of the oppressed nations.

Kinnell: WSL minority free to speak on their views. I speak for majority view. .

Half of our position on the war is not in dispute - the need to fight for the defeat of British imperialism, and to make that the centre of our agitation in Britain, which we did. But the reactionary nature of Britain's war does not make Argentina's war progressive. We regard it as reactionary war, dragging Argentine workers into a fight for goals in which they had no interest.

Let us start from the question of imperialism. This is not just one lot of countries behaving in an oppressive way towards others. Imperialism is modern capitalism, not just a feature of it. It is the domination of monopoly and finance capital. This stage of capitalism is marked by the division of the world between the monopolies and big concentrations of finance capital, through which the world is dominated by the imperialist states.

A majority of countries in the ~~xxx~~ capitalist ~~xx~~ world are economically victims of imperialism - their capitalist development is dominated by and subordinate to finance capital.

Our answer is not to try to restore capitalism to a previous stage; or to shed its unpleasant features, but the overthrow of the system - as Lenin wrote, we must go "through the monopolies to socialism". This means the struggle of all workers and oppressed against imperialism, with their economic and democratic demands; including national liberation, must not be considered in a formal democratic way. Historically it is a process of the awakening of the majority of the world's population to active political life, the struggle for their own demands against a minority of dominant

nations. Centrism defends rights of national self-determination, protects against colonialist violence; but Bolshevism organises amongst the oppressed peoples, mobilising, leading the struggle for national liberation. In the war between China and Japan Trotsky called for support to China despite leadership of Chiang. Indeed the Trotskyists advocated the war of national liberation before Chiang declared it.

In all this there is nothing which leads us automatically to side with smaller or weaker bourgeoisies against bigger, more powerful bourgeoisies. Our task is to mobilise the masses on demands which correspond to their interests. The war against Japan was not because of the superiority of the Chinese bourgeoisie or the balance of forces between the Chinese and Japanese bourgeoisies but around the issue of national liberation.

The idea that we should automatically side with the bourgeoisies of countries oppressed by imperialism against imperialism seems inseparable from the Stalinist conception of an "anti-monopoly alliance". Within particular countries we oppose monopoly capital which destroys the lives of millions, but we don't back small capital against monopolies or advocate the break-up of monopolies. And this should apply also across state borders in the world economy. Such demands are utopian, and therefore reactionary.

Our criteria for assessing a war by a bourgeoisie of an oppressed country are not that different from elsewhere. We take into account that national liberation is vitally important: but we evaluate the struggle according to our programme, not giving any credence to the national bourgeoisie.

This war was conducted by the Argentine bourgeoisie. Lenin assessed wars by which class waged the war, over what issue, and for what objective. The attitude taken to a war by the mass of workers is of course important for our tactics, but we must start from the actual character of the war. For instance though the masses saw WW2 as "anti-fascist" that could not be our starting point.

It is wrong to gloss over the nature of the Argentine state by reference to the sentiments of the masses. War is the continuation of politics by other means. What politics were the junta pursuing in this war?

They were not in any sense the politics of national liberation. Argentina was not threatened by national oppression. After its defeat it is still not nationally oppressed. The objective for which the Argentine bourgeoisie fought was not to liberate any part of the Argentine nation, to limit imperialist exploitation or to improve the conditions to oppose imperialist exploitation. They fought to establish their rule over a distinct community, to enhance their standing internally and internationally. It is certainly true that they miscalculated. But the war was for reactionary motives, and the miscalculation does not make it progressive.

The Argentine masses faced the main enemy - their own ruling class: also the British ruling class, but they were the enemy in a more remote sense. The Argentine bourgeoisie is the force the Argentine workers have to fight in order to fight imperialism, to liberate themselves and render assistance to workers elsewhere. Economic independence would not change this.

The defeat of the Argentine bourgeoisie has weakened the apparatus of the state, which is in disorder - to what extent we cannot tell. The workers face no supplementary apparatus of repression - as would have been the case in the Chinese struggle. "The main enemy is at home" should have been the slogan in Argentina.

The opposite argument rests not so much on the validity of the Argentine claim to the Malvinas but on the fact that whatever the rights and wrongs of 1833, the seizure of the islands by a non-imperialist country is progressive compared to them being held by imperialism.

It is correct to say that the 1833 events are irrelevant. The RWL motion declares that the seizure of the islands is a "blow against imperialism" and that the people on the islands are therefore secondary. This is mistaken. It is not part of our programme. The position of the oppressed in Argentina is not improved by the presence in the Malvinas of 6 soldiers for every inhabitant. This could not be one of our demands. It would be different if the British settlement was part of a mechanism for dominating Argentina. But when Britain did dominate Argentina it did so through ownership and economic exploitation. USA today dominates Argentine economy economically, not through the Falklands.

Is there something imperialist in the mere fact of there being British settlers on the islands? Argentina is a settler state, most settlers being more recent than the British settlement of the islands. The Argentine claim to the Falklands rests on them being only 400 miles off the coast: but that part of Argentina only integrated in 1870s and 1880s by the genocide of the native population.

The whole of Latin America settled by Europeans in 19th and 20th centuries. Falklands are an anachronistic relic. Nothing to be gained in grinding down these people - to say otherwise misunderstands imperialism.

What we base our judgement on is the attitude that the Argentine workers should have towards their main enemy. As Lenin pointed out one can be an internationalist only by fighting for revolution in one's own country. Independence of the bourgeoisie is essential for the Argentine workers. We must counterpose this to any attempt to subordinate the struggle in Argentina to vague notions of a "balance of forces" or the psychological impact of defeat for Argentina.

Sectarianism? In Argentina it is necessary to say what must be said in the best way to link in with the feelings of the workers. But our basic analysis of the war must be based on what the Argentine bourgeoisie was doing. It was up to Marxists to find the best way of putting this across tactically, to relate to anti-imperialist sentiments of the masses, and put forward demands like the arming of the workers and the seizure of imperialist assets. These are not in contradiction to a defeatist position. If armed force in Argentina had been in the hands of workers' militias there is no way they would have invaded the islands. A people's militia is to defend the working class it is based upon, not a force to invade islands 1,000 miles away.

Self-determination? We don't say it should take precedence: but all considerations dictate we should hold a defeatist position. We are not counterposing self-determination to other issues. We don't see anything to drive us towards a defencist position. The war was about possession of the islands. The fact that neither power cared about the islanders makes no difference.

Either Argentina has the right to the islands, and therefore we support Argentina; or they don't. We say they don't. Self-determination for the islanders is a way of expressing that. Either the islanders have a right to decide to whom to adhere or to remain independent, or some other state has the right to subjugate them.

The RWL resolution contradicts the TILC resolution at the last meeting. If it is passed, then the previous resolution should be revoked or otherwise dealt with. The statement of the Danish comrades is in this respect a model. They have decided the previous motion was wrong and tried to explain why.

Fernando: There should be a proletarian politics not only despite the war but through the war. The question is how the conflict can be put to use.

The basic conflict is between an imperialist country and an oppressed country. We must rule out the idea of "sub-imperialism". Luxembourg denied the national struggle because it could not lead to real independence under imperialism. The theoreticians of "sub-

imperialism" do the opposite; since some measure of political independence has been obtained, they wipe out the distinction between oppressed and oppressor.

The Malvinas are a form of imperialist plunder, which is not restricted to economic and financial questions, but also political. When the Argentine masses - including Argentine workers whom the WSL majority consider to be "chauvinists", in contrast to the Falklanders, who are not considered chauvinist - go into struggle against imperialist domination they also struggle against the junta.

Martin used some quotations. One was very good - but wrongly applied. Trotsky distinguished Bolshevism from centrism in that Bolshevism organises the armed struggle against imperialism. This would be valid if used against ultraleftists who abstain from the struggle. But Trotsky also spoke many times about supporting armed struggle against imperialism even under reactionary leadership. If it is Stalinism to orientate towards the dynamic of anti-imperialist struggle, then why are we Trotskyists? Indeed in the T Programme, Trotsky stresses that we are not against all class collaboration. We are for collaboration between workers and poor peasants, and should offer an alliance with the petty bourgeoisie. While Stalinism makes a bloc with the bourgeoisie on a national and international level in order to preserve the status quo, it would be wrong to confuse Trotskyist positions with those of Stalinism.

Galtieri is not the Argentine bourgeoisie. He was a nationalist bonaparte, an agent of US, British imperialism. But at a certain point he found his national base undermined: he was caught in a wedge between the masses, the national bourgeoisie and the comprador bourgeoisie. From that impasse followed the diversion.

In quite a long speech Kinnell managed not to speak about Britain. He said Argentina was not threatened by national oppression from England. But Argentina has been dominated for over a century not only by England but by other imperialist countries.

On self-determination I could show cdes a collection of quotes from Lenin and Trotsky we made a few years ago for use against the Sparts. We all agree here on making a socialist revolution: but by what means? What forces shall we mobilise? The millions of oppressed Argentine workers, or the 1,800 British workers on the Falklands?

Jones: (WSL minority): I have never heard Kinnell present the question before and I want to point to some changes in the majority position. One dramatic change is Kinnell's talk of the need to relate to the anti-imperialist sentiments of the Argentine masses. Cde Carolan has described the sentiments of Argentine workers as exactly the same racism and chauvinism as that of the British workers: here that chauvinism produced scenes like fascist rallies. If you really equate those positions, then Kinnell's position would be like intervening when a fascist is kicking a black worker, saying that "you shouldn't do that because you're proud to be British, you should do something else because you're proud to be British".

Kinnell's method reverses that of the T Prog; he defines workers' militias as solely to defend, where as Trotsky sees them arising from defence of picket lines to emerge in lead of struggle. In anti-imperialist movements they will arise out of the anti-imperialist struggle.

Argentina is not just a 2nd or 3rd grade country; it is qualitatively different. It is not "slightly less equal", but dominated. Imperialist oppression: 75% of the world's debts are owed to 3 imperialist countries - USA, UK and Japan. But Martin tells us that imperialism "is" capitalism. Yes, but not all capitalists are imperialists. I agree we do not argue for economic independence; but we should take up the struggles of the masses in

underdeveloped countries who fight against oppression and exploitation created by unequal relationships.

Biggest debtor nation at present is Mexico - \$87 billion - debt bigger than USSR plus whole of E. Europe. Repayments would take the whole of Mexico's oil revenues (4th largest producer in the world). The imperialists have decided that Mexico has to roll over a number of these debts. This is also happening to Argentina and other countries. But to allow this rescheduling, they have put up Mexico's interest charges by another 1% - piling greater exploitation on masses of oppressed countries. Politically there are dictatorships in Latin America. In Chile this was directly decided by the USA in 1973 - and CIA also involved in Argentine coup. To tell Mexican workers that they simply have to fight the Mexican bourgeoisie and that national struggle is out of date means you cannot relate to these material conditions. Imperialism does decide what happens to the Mexican masses. Of course anti-imperialist rhetoric is used by the bourgeoisie in these countries. But why? Because they are not imperialist countries.

Marcos: It is not by accident that most people here are against the position of the WSL majority: so is every organisation claiming to be Trotskyist around the world.

It is obvious that the junta is a defender of imperialism, whose action does not defend the masses. It seeks to divert from internal problems. But that measure could only succeed if supported by the sentiment of the Argentine masses. Different sections of the Argentine junta represent different sections of the bourgeoisie; all wanted to smash the Argentine masses, but disagreed on how.

The Argentine working class obviously had to fight against the junta. The Morenist PST position was wrongly to place themselves in the military camp of the junta. But in rejecting this we should not follow the WSL majority into the camp of neutrality, putting forward a pacifist position of no use to the Argentine workers.

What right did the islanders have to be there? They were only the consequence of imperialist, colonial occupation. They are all English, and have prevented people of Latin origin settling on the islands. We can't justify their right to "self-determination" just because there are no Argentines there. That approach is from the starting point of the imperialists. The islanders have the right to link up with Argentina or remain tied to imperialism - by coming back to the imperialist countries. No independent existence is feasible. The imperialists are using the islanders to use the islands and to gain resources in the Antarctic.

RWL resolution does not define position of islanders, or look to the future. We should defend the Argentine claim on the Malvinas and demand the withdrawal of imperialist troops.

Diego(ex-FIT): TPiTCS was very clear on the principled basis on which we fight against imperialist war. We must defend backward countries against attack by imperialism. We must distinguish between backward and imperialist countries. The section on Permanent Revolution is very clear on the way we should approach developments in backward countries. But Kinnell and SO put different position from basic document of TILC. Kinnell should read it again.

Kinnell suggests that after the defeat the Argentine military apparatus is almost disbanded. But it is staging selective arrests. The armed forces will not allow the civilian bourgeois leaders to take control precisely because it was the military that was defeated. In Britain the aftermath of the war has seen a full-scale attack on the working class as Tories utilise chauvinist hysteria. Kinnell leaves this out.

We agree with method of TILC/TPiTCS. We need not just a new resolution but an agreement on how to resolve the differences. Kinnell did not explain the differences between Britain and Argen-

tina. Why are there dictatorships and coups in Argentina but not in Britain? The struggle is not simply one for democratic rights - in Chile the first demand raised in the Popular Unity period was for the expropriation of imperialist holdings. During Malvinas war the Argentine masses likewise called for expropriation of British and US holdings. WSL majority line did not relate to these movements.

We must understand why there is sometimes friction between the bourgeoisie and imperialism. Sections of the bourgeoisie itself are semi-oppressed. The timid support for Argentina from the bourgeoisies of Latin America was partly because they were afraid to break their own links with imperialism. We must link the fight for democratic rights with the fight for socialism, linking the demand for a constituent assembly to the fight for a workers' and peasants' government.

Franco: In WSL IB No 9, Carolan claims (p11) that I, although mandated by my organisation to support an Argentine defence position, myself supported essentially the position of the present WSL majority. This is quite wrong. I was in conflict with my organisation's position (which was voted down at April TILC). But I am now and was then in complete disagreement with the positions of the WSL majority.

The initial draft text sums up the thrust of the present positions of the WSL majority. Point 1 says "We uphold the right of the Falkland Islanders to decide their own future". And Point 5 declares no opposition to "negotiations". I said then that the draft was an example of democratism and semi-pacifism.

Two lines were needed. In Britain - "The enemy is at home". In Argentina - "Turn the military adventure into a real anti-imperialist war". We needed a completely clear distinction between completely reactionary British nationalism, and partly progressive Argentine nationalism. If we had had the strength it would have been correct to break up the reactionary rallies that greeted the return of the British fleet. But in Argentina we should have raised slogans of expropriation, arming the workers. On the actual slogans my view is close to that of the RWL and Politica Obrera.

The WSL majority wrongly equated the labour movements in the two countries. The gist of their view is that the central issue is the rights of the Falklanders. They thus subordinate to a democratic slogan - and a wrong one - everything that distinguishes oppressed and oppressor nations. Their position is not even consistently one of defeatism on both sides. Such a stance requires not appeals for the rights of 1,800 Falklanders, but demands for the fraternisation of the two armies. This is clear in the first draft resolution, which looks not to the defeat of both sides, but negotiations between reactionary bourgeois governments. At best this is pacifism.

It is true I played a certain role in pushing for what appeared in the resolution. But I would have written a different type of resolution. The second text avoided some wrong positions of the first draft, so I recommended that the LOR accept it with the exception of Point 5 on the rights of the Falklanders. Reality has shown that this was a mistake; the resolution is no use to anyone, and I should make a self-criticism.

Smith: Majority has argued there was no all-out war: the issue was restricted to Falklands. This geographical definition of the war opened the door to the central focus on the islanders.

The issue was also one of the balance of forces between imperialism and the oppressed masses. Majority reject this view, but we stand our ground.

Cdes of majority ignore the fact that the Falklands are a colony. We do not need to go into detail on exact ranking of Argentina. Is it an oppressed or an oppressor country? In reality all the way through the majority have conceded that it is an oppressed nation: why else the clause in the motion, and reference in Carolan's

document to instances in which we would defend Argentina?

To say that "the main enemy is at home" in Argentina is to say that the main enemy is the first enemy you meet. Like saying the main enemy in a factory is the foreman. Kinnell by obscuring distinction between Argentina ("capitalist") and Britain ("Capitalist") is effectively saying that at no time could the majority defend Argentina.

We have been called "Stalinist". But in the world Trotskyist movement there are only two currents holding a dual defeatist position. One is the ultraleft position referred to many times; the other is the state capitalist tradition. I think the majority position flows out of the state capitalist tradition. We should look further at the economic analysis of imperialism drawn up in the 1970s by such as Kidron, who also argues that the national question finishes with formal political independence. From this view it is finished everywhere except Namibia and a few other places.

We would broadly agree with the Politica Obrera position, in which defence of Argentina leads at each point to anti-imperialist and revolutionary struggle by Argentine workers.

Jette: TAF became increasingly worried by SO after Easter as well as by weakness of initial text of resolution. Statement produced by TAF national conference for TILC meeting and sections.

We think Carolan and Kinnell exploited weaknesses of Easter resolution and distorted it. SO developed weaknesses into absurdities. Argentina has been described as "sub-imperialist", masking the scientific concept of imperialism. This simply serves the "self-determination" line of the majority. This is also wrapped up in the guise of a "class struggle" line, but one which leads right away from the line of the class struggle in Argentina against imperialism and the junta.

WSL majority has a "2 phase" theory: "first" overthrow the junta, then Argentina can claim the islands. (Kinnell - "no, they have no right to the islands"). The majority position may flow from state capitalist tradition, but also seems linked to reformist milieu.

Self-determination line also harms British workers, who are told each day that "they" regained "their" islands. Revolutionary task is to tell workers these are not theirs or property of British ruling class, but the fruits of imperialist plunder.

Ali: WSL majority start with dual defeatist position appropriate to a war between imperialist powers or between 2 non-imperialist powers, and then work backwards to justify it. Hence arguments like "sub-imperialism" and decline of British imperialism. Majority cedes more worried about the "chauvinism" of Argentine workers than that of British workers. More concerned with rights of 1,800 islanders than Argentine working class.

In all the oppressed countries capitalism has developed not through its own organic process but through the intervention of foreign capital. As such, the state power in these countries is of a special kind. Native bourgeoisie very weak; decisive influence is that of imperialism. State power must either become the agent of imperialism or, in order to resist imperialism, must offer some form of concessions in order to lean to a degree on the movement of the masses.

Trotsky argues that democracy in the oppressed countries is a progressive demand, while in the imperialist countries democratic demands lack a revolutionary dynamic. The question in Argentina is not simply Permanent Revolution; the bourgeoisie is unable to implement a democratic programme. To win democracy the bourgeoisie must be overthrown. The struggles run together and overlap.

If British workers lost out of the war, how did this help the struggle in Argentina? Majority position was in essence abstention.

Carolan: Ali is wrong to say we were worried more about chauvinism in Argentina than in Britain. SO carried consistent opposition to British chauvinism. A paper which carries Liebknecht's slogan "The enemy is at home" on its masthead is not chauvinist.

Cdes ignore the nature of the Argentine workers' movement. From a Marxist point of view we fight for an independent assessments of every situation. Political independence is our watchword, not that our enemy's enemy is our friend. This is the issue that divides us.

Do we look to various formations in the Third World to achieve what we cannot achieve? This is Pabloism. Pabloism was a degeneration in the Trotskyist movement 30 years ago with the belief begun by Pablo, Mandel that WW3 was inevitable - believing this would lead into international class war, with the USSR on one side, with its allies, and the imperialist on the other. From there they moved on to abandon the attitude of Trotskyism to all other political forces.

Their starting point was that in WW3 the USSR would be forced to fight and mobilise the CPs of the West. This was the first step towards abandoning independent class viewpoint. Followed up by tailing other forces who might perhaps lead a revolution.

Central to the view of the WSL minority is a world divided into sharp camps, like Pablo saw 30 years ago. The document of the WSL minority even talks of the Argentine junta being in "our class camp". This is the same logic as Pablo. Where Stalinists ruled there were differences between these and capitalist countries. But there is no such distinction between capitalist countries, even if we accept that Argentina is an exceptionally oppressed country.

Cdes make comments about Permanent Revolution. I don't think it has much to do with Argentina. It is a strange view of Perm. Rev. that offers the Argentine bourgeoisie any prospect of doing something progressive. In a country like Argentina it is quite inconceivable that anything like a revolutionary war could be waged against imperialism. If we had been in Argentina we would have said that the Malvinas war is a diversion: if the bourgeoisie wants to fight imperialism, let them nationalise imperialist holdings. The only revolutionary war would be mobilisation in Argentina to stop an imperialist invasion to retake such holdings.

Suppose the Malvinas contained an oppressed Argentine population. Even then it would be a trivial question which would not merit revolutionary action. In Argentina where there is no imperialist occupation, no pre-capitalist strata left, the only anti-imperialist action is working class action. To call this sectarian is to miss the point.

On China we have no difference with the Trotskyist tactics of alliances - even with Chiang. But what divides us on Argentina is that we do not see any real national struggle, and the minority offer us a picture of the world which we consider to be fantasy.

No doubt the masses who shout about imperialism are motivated by the oppression which they feel they suffer. Trotsky in the TP underlines that the patriotism of the oppressed even in the imperialist countries is not without progressive elements. Our task is to separate out what is progressive from what is reactionary.

In all the Latin American countries there is mass anti-imperialist sentiment - so much that even right wing politicians have to bend to it in their speeches. The problem is that it has no obvious goal.

The central fact about Argentina is that this sentiment is harnessed by Peronism - a bourgeois movement. Galtieri set out to deflect a class movement by appealing to this anti-imperialism. The central task is to refine out from that populist anti-imperialism a clear class programme of action for the proletarian revolution. That means to confront the bourgeois demagogues and denounce Galtieri's diversion and Argentine chauvinism.

If we are isolated, that has no bearing on the issue. We are sometimes going to be isolated - like WW1 and WW2. Our call in Argentina would have combined defeatism with arming of workers.

We could say to Argentine workers: "we disagree with you; as democrats we believe that the islanders have rights", and raise all our demands for transforming the war. If cdes say demands for arming the workers and election of officers flow only from a defencist position, they should remember where this model comes from - Trotsky's attempt to allow Trotskyists in imperialist countries to argue against imperialist war which masses supported. Trotskyists were not defencists in Britain or USA in WW2.

The central issue is one of class independence. The cdes who defended Argentina are forced to rely on arguments on the world balance of forces which are far from Trotsky or Trotskyism. They arrive at a class division which is quite ridiculous and puts Argentina into our class camp.

AGREED TO TAKE VOTING ON RWL MOTION IN MODAY SESSION FOLLOWING SCHOOL.

WEDNESDAY JULY 28: afternoon session.

Women's Oppression: Cde Dawn (RWL) moved RWL resolution for full discussion in all TILC sections between now and December conference, so that delegations can attend ready to declare their position on it. Resolution offers guidelines, but not in any way detailed or specific programme for national sections. A position on Women's Oppression a vital part of establishing TILC as a democratic centralist tendency.

Malvinas (cont'd) : Cde Marcos, to leave before voting, declared his consultaive vote as a sympathising section would go in favour of the RWL resolution.

USFI/WORLD MOVEMENT:

Cunliffe suggested that there were two possibilities for producing polemical texts on latest sitaution in USFI/world Trotskyist movement. We could pursue the debate which had begun in the school on whether or not the latest SWP positions represent a qualitatively new break from Trotskyism; or we could (preferably) agree to publish Cunliffes' introduction on the FI together with Kinnell's analysis of the SWP revisionist abandonment of the theory of Permanent Revolution in a TILC pamphlet, carrying a disclaimer similar to that on the introduction to the Spart Truth Kit (ie not all points of detail necessarily those of TILC as a whole). On this basis the question of "qualitative" degeneration could be pursued in written discussion in TILC IB.

Jette: TILC must intervene in SWP crisis in USA, not just leave RWL to take a stand on our behalf.

AGREED TO PRODUCE TEXTS - WITH ADDED DOCUMENTATION - WITH DEADLINE OF APPROX 2 months FOR COMPLETION.

December Conference/ Democratic Centralism

Cunliffe: There are real problems in carrying out our agreed timetable for the stablishment of TILC as a democratic centralist tendency. There is obviously the political problem that has arisen in the shape of the Malvinas conflict: first and biggest open political disagreement in TILC since its foundation - runs counter to history of remarkable level of agreement.

But there is also substantial organisational problem to be honestly confronted. Secretariat report pointed out lack of internal life in TILC: this is through failings both of the Secretariat and of the sections. For example, despite opening discussion last December, and again in April, still no amendments or comments

tabled to programmatic documents by any TILC section - leaving whole process of discussion (including necessary translations, etc) to very late stage.

If democratic centralism is to be more than a fiction or simply a change of name for what we basically operate now, it needs to rest upon a qualitative development in the way sections relate to each other and to secretariat. But we are a tendency composed only of small groups, with minimal resources to spare. Is it feasible that the substantial additional time and effort needed can be produced between now and December? We need to face this problem squarely, not console ourselves with phrases.

WSL pressing this discussion, but has not yet taken a position on whether or not democratic centralism in December is feasible. But we are committed to proceeding in line with political agenda and timetable already mapped out as basis for d/c decision: preparation of documents, etc. We have reported our decision to increase resources allocated to international work. But we must discuss realistically.

Leland: RWL should be able to step up commitment to international work. Favour maximum effort to complete process by December.

Franco: I think we can maintain the December deadline. In LOR we managed to keep up international discussion even after our fusion. After establishing d/c structure we will still need process of homogenisation and political construction. The moment has come. Cdes here know each other politically; to delay now would weaken us. We must look not only internally but at position in class struggle.

Marcos: We should not underestimate problems in WSL. Necessary to put forward a series of tasks. (1) International campaigns - Lebanon, Central America, and I suggest an international conference of Trotskyist women. (2) New documents needed on Popular Front and on Anti-Imperialist United Front. (3) We need an Open Letter saying why a d/c tendency necessary, and repeating call for an Open Conference on crisis in FI. (4) reinforce TILC secretariat.

Kinnell: In WSL discussion I was one of the more pessimistic. The December conference could in my view do little but change the label on what we have already. We need to establish an internal life in TILC. Also a question of political agreement. Superficially it would seem that we have less now than in December, but this does not mean so much a loss of previous levels of agreement as the fact that previously unclarified questions have been drawn out into debate. This could later offer a more solid basis for agreement.

We must not hold back on what we can do to create conditions for a d/c which is not just a change of label. In that spirit WSL has agreed to devote more resources.

Ali: What do we understand by d/c? We are obviously not going to recreate the Comintern of the 1930s. But this doesn't mean we can't have an international discipline. We have to decide sooner or later. Discipline would not resolve everything - such as resources for Secretariat. But it is easier to face up to these problems in a disciplined framework.

Franco: I agree with Ali, d/c is not a fixed thing. We are neither the reconstructed FI nor even the nucleus around which it will grow. But with d/c we will be something more than we were when we formed TILC 2½ years ago. We held back on d/c not because we were small, but to test out our level of agreement. Have we succeeded or failed? D/c will enable discussion to proceed more easily since documents can be tabled by individuals as well as by whole sections. Marcos' proposal amounts to an Encyclopaedia Britannica of class struggle, we should stick to documents agreed.

Jette: I am not keen on "stages theories", but we might use the December conference to go through the documents, and then 3-4 months later take the decision on d/c.

Leland: If December arrives and we have not completed necessary work, we must obviously postpone the final stage.

Cunliffe: In any event we must press ahead now with the work, mapping out a timetable for amendments, motions, documents, to be voted upon in Monday session.

Marcos: What about campaigns?

Mary Anne (RWL): It will take us until December to get a proper political agreement. When we have that, then we can start looking at question of holding open conferences etc.

Fernando: Dangerous to spin out the process of establishing d/c.

AGREED: MOTION TO BE BROUGHT TO MONDAY MEETING FOR VOTING.

SECTION WORK (selected reports only)

Spain: Marcos: Initially our group came from faction in the Varga group in 1979. We were about 40, produced a magazine, and began internal debate which produced a series of divisions. Some joined (ex-USFI) Liga Comunista. When the Parity Committee was formed it seemed to offer us a chance to intervene. Then we had only 10 members. In Barcelona we joined the LC as it was fusing with Lambertist section. Other cdes joined Morenist PST, some worked with USFI LCR. We left the groups when Moreno and Lambert drew up their unprincipled basis to fuse the Spanish groups. We were not in favour of forming a group, rather a current of opinion around a magazine. So we now have number 1 of the magazine; about 8 cdes have participated, in 4 towns. There are others around us, including members of LCR, Lambertists, Morenists. We've invited the Spanish FIT group to come in on the magazine but they have said no. Our position on TILC is one of general agreement - but that crisis of FI also affects TILC - eg Malvinas. We want to remain sympathisers of TILC.

We intervene in class struggles at our places of work or study. We seek agreements with other Trotskyist groups. The student cdes in Zaragossa have common work with Morenists. In Majorca our cde is a leading force in the shipyards, with a discussion group around him.

Hackney Group: Ali: At last TILC meeting we recognised the crisis in the group. Since the further discussions involving Cunliffe, Carolan and Levy, but to no effect - the group does not function. We have done some work round TSC, and prepared contributions for this Summer School.

Jette: Someone from WSL/TILC needs to be assigned to work consistently with the group.

Franco: I agree. Group should be pressed to produce a magazine, which should be run in normal democratic way. Failing this I can only suggest the group should be dissolved, with the cdes becoming individual members of the WSL - otherwise they will destroy each other.

IT WAS AGREED that the meeting express confidence in the Hackney group to function as a group and to call on them to do so. A WSL cde with sympathetic understanding of the social circumstances of the cdes should be assigned to work with them, and TILC Secretariat maintain the closest possible relations. Cdes asked to produce an article in Turkish - 1 side A4 - dealing with Stalinism and Kurdistan within one month.

USA - RWL: Leland: Contributions at School gave picture of practical work. Report will focus on organisational problems of group.

Organisational Resolution to RWL conference adopted; despite its late completion (proof of the crisis) we are proud of this document. Deals with crisis of growth. Impact of objective situation on our members - activist membership hard hit by decline in class struggle. RWL over-extended, for the first time forced to act as a national organisation; new areas of work among specially-oppressed on top of previous trade union work.

Failures of national leadership - leaving leaders of new local structure too much on their own.

Crisis 1: Larry's resignation last August, led to polarised situation in Bay Area - the hub of the fusion with SLDC. Some easing of tensions with resolutions passed last December but crisis reemerged in run-up to conference.

Crisis 2: Ann Arbor, problem began with tangle of personal relationships. Led to 6 agonising weeks of tension, 1 resignation, 1 PC member on prolonged leave of absence.

Crisis 3: Tending other problems we had neglected Detroit. Result was a faction fight at our conference over allocation of more resources to Detroit.

Organisational resolution seeks to respond to these crises with a balance between democracy and centralism - but without authoritarian leadership. Response of members has been strong.

Conference decisions have taken longer than expected to implement.

Marianne: Commitment to a monthly paper tied down Peter S. in work on the paper, at the expense of his organisational responsibilities as National Secretary. We don't have the cadre or the technical equipment to reach monthly schedule: we must cut back.

Smith: I am uneasy at the amount of systematic internal discussion in RWL. Never come across this before. If we did as much, it would tie up all our full-time staff and we would get nothing done.

Steve Z (RWL minority): We were persuaded into the fusion by TILC. We saw a chance of bringing together the strengths of the old organisations. But we straight away ran into conflict with the organisational rigidity of the majority, and problems of method. TILC wrote last autumn urging a less rigid approach to the problem of Larry. But they went on - both against Larry and against me. On trade union caucuses, RWL proposes basically that they should all have a full programme of transitional demands. This results in a maximalist approach - eg intervention into Teamsters.

We have a real difference over the importance of a regular paper. For the majority it is the lowest organisational priority. If the cdes really wanted to produce a paper they could: even a duplicated 2-sides bulletin could be produced to carry RWL policies.

When we raised these and other points within the RWL we were treated as political deviants and factionalists. We proposed a discussion bulletin to take up issues of trade union work not discussed at the conference: 2-3 weeks later instead of a discussion we were faced with a vote out on the 2 discussion documents in the Bay Area branch! They were not intended for voting.

A resolution has now been put in BA Local demanding Local 2 (Hotel workers) caucus operate on a full programme of transitional demands. This is a hardening of position - which could mean we are about to be subject to organisational action. We want a TILC inquiry into these issues.

Burt: Leland never mentioned financial crisis. But the office is not functioning - even cheques not being cashed. Most of the questions raised here are topics on which TILC could not intervene: it could advise but not instruct. But could urge RWL leadership to convene full meeting of Central Committee, with full financial statement and proposals to resolve cash crisis.

Karen: (RWL minority): The question is how the majority leadership approaches our problems. Main crisis I face is sectarian method which is disrupting work in unions. But method of leadership in pressing for its sectarian policies. Instead of taking time to discuss and agree the best way forward, a resolution was pushed through by the majority demanding a full programme of transitional demands and putting detailed consideration of the Local 2 work in the hands of the B A executive.

Smith: We should discuss another hour in Monday session. Jim has expressed to me his agreement with the minority on the trade union question.

Leland: These are very ordinary organisational problems. We cannot have TILC inquiries into every such question. TILC must express confidence in the RWL leadership to solve this and other problems, and to call on cdes S&K to raise their points through the RWL.

MONDAY AUG 2: Session began 45 minutes late. Agreed all future meetings will begin at appointed time, no matter who is absent.

RWL (cont'D)

Kinnell: TILC is concerned because issues relate to a fusion promoted by TILC.

Cunliffe: Just received new issue of Australian paper. These comrades - 6 strong - manage to produce a regular press despite technical problems, because they regard it as important. The US cdes are out of step with the rest of TILC on the question of a regular paper. It is vital to build a genuinely nation-wide organisation.

Problem of rigidity from majority cdes: I would echo message given by Leland to closing session of summer school "Listen to your minority comrades". Tone of Peter H's reply to Jim on trade union work is not conducive to objective discussion. And unless absolutely necessary we should avoid resorting to organisational methods such as those in the Bay Area to control trade union work - though of course party bodies have the right to control.

Need to understand that minority feels cornered. Shanta explained in special oppression workshop the way minorities can be driven to lash out and adopt wrong positions under pressure when they feel ignored or put down.

Certainly the case that minority cdes' role at conference was very negative, and detrimental to their own case. Need for minority to take clearly constructive stance on building organisation. S&K should reconsider moving to Detroit - to get the paper out and complete the fusion. Need Central Committee to meet, to broaden base of leadership, IB to be produced (not simply documents for voting!).

Carolyn: It is a mystery how a group the size of the RWL cannot produce a paper. Possibly this is because of extreme centralisation, with leadership assuming only a few cdes can do this work.

I don't understand attitude of RWL cdes to British trade union work. It doesn't seem to me that our attitude is the same as that of the RWL even in Cowley. In any clash the minority must share responsibility. But the overall responsibility is in the hands of what is a massive, impregnable majority.

Marianne: Newspaper has averaged 17-18 contributors - not over-centralised. Problem is technical production, tying up Peter S.

Shanta: No denying there are problems on both sides of the fusion. On majority side particularly a lack of sensitivity to cde Karen.

Experienced cdes in our org. have the right to suggest, lead and direct work in the unions - whether or not they work on the job concerned. Jim's position leans towards syndicalism.

Steve: We did not want conference to be a factional line-up. But the majority chose to begin with expelling Larry. We did not agree with Larry, but responded to moves against him.

There is a great opportunity to expand the TILC sympathising section in the US. 200-300 ex-SWPers are looking for political answers. RWL could approach them if we had a monthly press. Need that to be taken seriously. That way we could present ourselves to them even if they were thousands of miles away. We can't do it just by individual discussions and contact work. Key link in this work is Hal. But Hal has been alienated by majority cdes; he feels as if he has been treated with contempt.

Leland: Everyone is aware the problem is difficult: attempting to evaluate the internal life of an organisation a long way away.

Unless someone's rights have been violated or there is political disorientation, any intervention by TILC will be ill-considered and counter-productive. RWL is growing faster than any other TILC section. We have described our work. Evaluate us in terms of our record.

One problem is that quite separate issues are being thrown together. Hal's problems are real. He is our only member in New York. and on political issues he is often a minority of one.

In St Louis, on the other hand we have a young, talented organiser giving leadership. He has ultra-left tendencies, and has written a polemical document with undeniably excessive characterisations of cde Jim. The PC had no idea what Peter H. was writing. We didn't control it. If I had been in a position to intervene I would have urged him to write a different type of document.

We would welcome any more cdes from this room to take up our open invitation, come to the USA and place the RWL under the closest scrutiny. That goes for Kinnell, Carolan or any other TILC section leader.

AGREED: FURTHER DISCUSSION WOULD TAKE PLACE ON TUESDAY EVENING INVOLVING MINORITY CDES, RWL MAJORITY, AND TAF AND WSL CDES, OXFORD 6pm.

Monday Afternoon

DECEMBER CONFERENCE/ DEMOCRATIC CENTRALISM.

LOR (Franco) moved resolution. (attached)

Leland : We support this. It is carefully drawn up.

Cunliffe: WSL National Committee proposes a consultative vote. Having discussed the matter following the Wednesday afternoon session, our NC has mandated us to take no decision that would commit us in advance to adopting a democratic centralist structure for TILC in December or at any other fixed date. We feel that a number of practical and political developments must take place to make such a change a qualitative step forward. We have not finally decided that such developments are not possible: but neither can we be certain that they will. We propose to proceed as planned with the discussion of programmatic documents, and to focus a large part of the agenda on the question of democratic centralism.

Franco: I oppose a consultative vote. WSL at first put off decision last December: now they are doing so again. This needs a political explanation.

Cunliffe: The political problem before us is making a real and qualitative step forward in the inner life and political level of agreement within TILC. Otherwise d/c is just a change of label.

Jette: We support the spirit of LOR resolution - but propose 2 meetings, one in December, one in Spring 1983. It is regrettable

that the WSL can't take a position. But it is not too bad. They are still working towards this development, sticking to the decisions on documents, etc.

Fernando: Why did not WSL object before? It is a lack of seriousness. WSL must play a critical role in TILC and in a future d/c tendency.

Leland: Agree with LOR. To combine technical and political arguments is wrong. RWL is prepared to make achievement of d/c TILC this December a top priority. This should also be true in Britain.

Carolán: Not clear we have enough agreement for a d/c structure. We do not want to foreclose on anything, or preempt discussion inside WSL, but there are serious disagreements. I am not convinced amendments to TPiTCS would resolve them. For instance differences between LOR/RWL and WSL over Labour Party question - such things can make or break an international grouping. Can we resolve this in 5 months?

The technical problems are real. We would need an apparatus to run an international group. Is it the case that in 5 months we could set up such an apparatus, necessarily involving a large part of the time of the leadership of the sections? This seems neither politically nor technically possible.

It is no secret that there are different attitudes to this issue within the WSL. A hasty approach - a decision of the sections to proceed definitely with d/c, then the December conference would do two things: firstly exacerbate divisions and tensions within the WSL, and secondly it would set other sections moving at a pace and direction with which the WSL could not keep pace. Cdes are right to feel urgency; but this could lead tragically to a scattering of the forces we now have.

Ricardo(ex-FIT,Chile): According to Carolán the political differences are quite basic. Cunliffe's arguments are different. We as a Chilean group see discussion on TPiTCS as the way to draw out discussion of most basic programmatic questions.

We support Franco's proposal.

Levy (WSL): WSL is committed to the fight for a d/c tendency. But remember that the last year has brought fusions in 3 TILC sections. As yet the issues relating to TILC have still not been finally resolved in British fusion.

When we discuss democratic centralism, we should also consider the kind of relations between the sections which adopt the structure in relation to decisions of the tendency on the line of national groups. What for instance if a majority adopted a position contrary to the existing work of an individual section - like for instance the WSL attitude to the LP? Would there be a possibility of imposing a line on a section against its wishes? We should draw out more discussion of what d/c means,

Ali: Suggest December conference deal with political differences and delete date from LOR resolution. December to be a pre-conference on d/c.

Franco: I don't accept Ali's amendment.

Inge: I see this session as pressurising the WSL to change its position. I suggest a change in LOR resolution. First stage of conference in December, second stage in Spring 1983. Looking back on US fusion, I now think we were too hasty.

Franco: Propose change on wording: rather than say "conference will transform the TILC", substitute "the agenda will focus on transformation of TILC into a d/c tendency."

Jette: I propose an amendment to specify that voting in December should be in line with d/c decisions of sections.

Cunliffe - for WSL delegation: WSL must insist upon a consultative vote on this resolution. We are convinced that the details of the motion itself have not been fully discussed by the cdes of the sections: they commit TILC to a rigorous schedule of work. It is hard to see for instance how the cash-crisis-ridden RWL will manage both to hold a special national conference after November 20, and then within one month send a delegation of cdes to Britain to participate in the December conference. The deadlines for producing documents and amendments are also very tight. For our part it would seem to be physically impossible for the WSL to comply with the letter of this motion, since it would oblige us to hold no less than three conferences in three months - Malvinas conf, annual conf, and another after November 20.

On top of this, the structure of TILC as it is was defined on a delegation basis. It is our understanding that it should be changed on the same basis. Indeed what is put forward here is apparently the adoption of the formal structure of democratic centralism before the December conference, as a basis for making up the delegations.

We obviously cannot judge the issue for the other delegations present; but we not only have no mandate to enter into a binding commitment to such changes, we have been expressly told by our NC to make no such commitment.

In addition we should say that it has become clear during this discussion that cdes of the RWL and LOR in particular are attempting to force the pace of political discussion within the WSL by applying this kind of pressure: we are united as a WSL leadership in rejecting this pressure which we consider could have extremely detrimental effects upon our fight to consolidate a complex and occasionally tense fusion. We will not be bulldozed into a process which could split our organisation.

Finally we should again remind comrades that the decision to enter into an international democratic centralist structure is a decision by each of the groups concerned to effectively drop their own national integrity, drop some of the "protective barriers" which maintain internal discipline. We feel that such a decision has to be taken very seriously, has to be the outcome of genuine conviction that there is a real political basis for such a change, and must be taken as a decision by each group itself. There is no way such a change can be simply imposed on any of the TILC sections by a majority vote of the others. Without a mutual consent, the structure is meaningless.

Our position is therefore to urge again that the vote be a consultative vote: if this is the case, the WSL, though critical of the detailed proposals of the resolution, will abstain. If however there is an attempt to make this a binding vote which will tie the hands of all those participating, then we will have no choice but to vote against.

I repeat that we take this stand in conjunction with devoting increased resources as an organisation to implementing the decisions relating to the political and organisational preparations for the conference in December.

Franco: I think political clarity comes before all other considerations. We do not intend to exacerbate differences in the WSL. But we have participated in TILC since its formation with a perspective which we now think should be implemented. Regretting the WSL has not grasped the central question for us, we move our motion as it is.

Jette: To have things clear: Cunliffe was saying that the former practices of the TILC would not be maintained if this resolution is adopted. If my amendment got a majority, changing the point on the voting of delegations, I don't see any major change in our way of operating.

I do want to criticise the position of the LOR and RWL. They are not supporting my amendment. But we must understand what Cunliffe was saying; we cannot force the pace inside the WSL. A wrong method is being used by the LOR and RWL - the same method as we use against the bureaucracy in the unions. They have mounted constant and growing pressure. We do it in the unions to throw out the old leaders and bring in new ones. But I think what we are dealing with here is an entirely different matter. OK we too have been pressurising to make our points clear to the cdes of the WSL. But we are not fighting for a new leadership in the WSL, we are fighting for a political development in a Trotskyist organisation. I would ask the LOR and RWL to accept my amendment, not trying to jump ahead, forcing and pressurising the WSL leadership into having to reject this resolution. We should change the paragraph on voting in December.

That change, together with the change Franco has already made, should make it possible for the WSL to vote in favour.

Vote 1: Consultative or routine vote on motion:

Consultative: 7 - WSL, TAF

Routine: 6 - RWL, LOR, Rigal

Abst: 1 - Hackney.

Vote 2: "That voting in December takes place according to d/c discipline and majority decisions of each section"

For: 7 - WSL, TAF.

Against: 6 - LOR, RWL, Rigal

Abst: 1 - Hackney

Vote 3: Amended resolution on December Conference:

For: 4 - RWL, TAF

Against: 0

Abst: 9 - WSL, LOR, Hackney, Rigal

CARRIED - REFERRED BACK TO MEMBER SECTIONS.

Franco: LOR abstained not because vote was consultative, but because we think that with the Danish amendment we will be holding a conference which will discuss d/c not under the best conditions, but with each section voting as a block. Where now does Secretariat stand?

Cunliffe: As we have said, implement preparations to discuss agreed agenda; suggest sticking to LOR proposed deadlines for amendments, etc for conference.

Franco: That is good.

Amended resolutions on Lebanon, Malvinas.

Carolan: Propose since we have discussed already, we simply vote on these texts. - AGREED.

Keith(WSL):Introducing Lebanon amendments:

WSL proposes take vote on Point 5 separately, or consultative vote, since it raises important questions which may not have been discussed in sections. In WSL for instance, only discussed this on our EC. RWL appear to have no position.

Additional amendment needed on W Bank/Gaza and question of the "mini-state".

Leland: RWL will in any case abstain - discussion just begun in USA.

Voting: (1) Section 5 to be consultative - For: 6 - WSL

Against: 4 - TAF, LOR, Rigal

Abst : 4 - RWL, Hackney

(2) Amendments to section 5 : For - 10 - WSL, LOR, Hackney, Rigal.

Against: 1 - TAF

Abstent: 3 - RWL

26)

(3) Other amendments: For: 10 - WSL, LOR, Hackney, Rigal

Against: 0

Abst: 4 - RWL, TAF.

(4) Amended resolution: For; 9 - WSL, LOR, Rigal

Against: 1 - TAF

Abst: 4 - RWL, Hackney.

Additional amendment on West Bank/mini-state then read out (no written text available)

Kinnell: Suggest we vote on general line, Secretariat to check detailed wording.

(5) General line to be voted on - 6 - WSL

Wording as read out - 3 - LOR, Rigal

Abst: - 5 - RWL, Hackney, TAF

(6) For or against the general line of amendment: For: 9 - WSL, LOR, Rigal

Against: 1 - TAF

Abst: 4 - RWL, Hack.

AMENDED RESOLUTION THEREFORE CARRIED.

Jette: The main problem is the call for the replacement of the Zionist state with "a democratic state". I agree that we should connect with the consciousness of Palestinian militants; but we should say that this is not possible. I think this reflects the political weakness of the FIT cdes in Palestine. I want to see more whether this means the WL has not broken from Lambertism on Middle East policy.

MALVINAS: a mended section 4 read out by Leland, "uncontroversial"

Vote on amended resolution: For; 8 - RWL, LOR, TAF, Rigal, Hackney.
Against: 6 - WSL.

MOTION CARRIED.

Cunliffe: In view of the fact that this resolution is very different from the Easter motion, the WSL NC proposes that TILC vote upon an explanation of what was wrong with previous text. We suggest this be extracted from the Danish statement. (3 paras)

Jette: That's OK; bu delete references to SO.

Text agreed.

Voting on supplementary text on Malvinas; For - 7 - LOR, RWL, Rigal, TAF.

Against: 6 - WSL

Abst ; 1 - Hackney.

Events at WSL Summer School: Statement and resolution.

Statement of protest (not for voting)

The undersigned organisations and individuals, having met on July 31, 1982, in the course of the WSL Summer School, address the TILC as a whole with the folowing protest:

1) During the crucial stage of the Summer School political debate, namely the discussion of the Malvinas War, the WSL Executive Committee decided to impose a number of artificial limitations on the international comrades participating in discussion; to restrict the speaking time of international delegations and observers to 5 minutes for any delegation or observer; to segregate the international contributions from the regular discussion; and, in effect, to limit the statements by international comrades to positive statements of their own positions.

2) Having been free to participate with full rights in all the other plenary sessions and workshops which have taken place at this Summer School, as at the previous ones, we regard the

procedure adopted in this particular instance as being in stark contrast to the procedures which have been traditional at previous TILC/WSL Summer Schools.

3) We insist that procedures and practices which are thoroughly internationalist and promote full international discussion are essential to the development of a democratic-centralist tendency, as well as a consistent effort towards establishing democratic-centralist methods nationally and internationally. This should be all the more true for organisations committed specifically to the reconstruction of the Fourth International.

(Signed) RWL; LOR; TAF; French TILC member
Hackney Group; Chilean Trotskyist
militants; Belgian observer.

Cunliffe - for WSL EC: Our Executive offers its sincere apologies for our failure to give adequate prior notice and to have discussion offering explanation to the TILC and international comrades over our decision on the conduct of the debate on the Falklands/Malvinas issue.

In particular we plainly failed to draw sufficiently to comrades' attention the fact that the school was run throughout not - as in the last 2 years - as a TILC school, but as a WSL school. For our part we thought we had made that clear as long ago as December, when the dates were fixed. Plainly we were wrong on this. The change this year is related to the judgement of the WSL leadership that attention had to be given at the summer school to cementing the fusion of our organisation. The agenda was drawn up with this in view.

In view of the fact that this change had not been understood, we can perfectly understand the anger of international comrades at discovering that the format of the debate had been decided unilaterally by the WSL leadership. We can understand why they should see this as an example of a single section attempting to impose its decisions on others. And this was worsened by the very bad way in which we announced our decision to limit the involvement of TILC sections in the debate to a single 5-minute contribution (plus translation), and to debar non-TILC observers and non-WSL members from participation. We therefore accept full responsibility for provoking what was an understandable anger, and apologise for this method of operation.

We feel that if we had been able properly to explain the issue to comrades, we might have avoided the confrontation which took place. But we insist that as the leadership of the WSL, responsible not only for the school but for the development of our own organisation, we had the right to take such a decision.

As leaders of the WSL we were obliged to look at the position of our own comrades. Our organisation, as you know, is in the midst of a tendency debate in which tensions have grown. A date has been fixed for a special conference on the issue. It is not the same therefore as any of the other topics on the week's agenda. Originally the debate was scheduled out of the main run of the school - for the Friday evening. The reason was to contain it as an issue and prevent its dominating the whole school. And it was set out as a debate - unlike any other topic - a debate in which two rival sides would be presented from the platform, publicly airing divisions inside our organisation. After some consideration of the amount of time available, we decided that it was insufficient on Friday evening to allow a full participation of our own comrades, many of whom had not discussed the matter at all outside their own areas. And it was from this wish to maximise the involvement of our members that we decided we had no choice but to limit the involvement of non-members of the WSL. We would in my view have been within our rights to have held a closed session of WSL only. But we wanted TILC views expressed: and we arranged therefore that the views of each section would be expressed in the

debate. TILC in any case has extensively debated the question, and statements on the war by each of the sections will be circulated in our IB.

We consider therefore that we had a right to take such a decision. And we further think that the leaderships of other organisations have to respect the authority of the WSL leadership to take decisions relating to our own internal problems and debates, while of course reserving the right to raise disagreements in the meetings of TILC.

It is from this standpoint that we regard as completely unacceptable the conduct carried out by the RWL cdes in particular, with the support of other international cdes, seeking in the tense conditions at the start of that debate to appeal over the heads of the elected leadership of the WSL for a vote of the WSL members and non members present which would have overturned a decision taken by our Executive. It is no part of our understanding of democratic centralism that even were TILC already d/c it would be proper for the leadership of one section to seek in a semi-public meeting run by another section, to intervene and attempt to rally rank and file members and non-members to overturn decisions properly taken. We would not consider acting in such a way in any other TILC section; were we to do so we are sure we would be condemned for it - and correctly so.

We can only develop our tendency if we develop also a level of trust and respect for the authority of national leaderships to lead. We cannot operate in the way that the cdes did at the start of this debate. So while we again apologise for our obvious failings in this matter, we hope we have explained why we cannot accept the actions carried out by the cdes on Saturday.

Steve Z: As a minority within the RWL, we were opposed to the restriction on international contributions. But we recognised that the WSL has problems. We felt that the best way to handle a complaint was for TILC sections to make their protest before speaking. We apologise to the WSL for participating in what we regard as a provocation in walking out of the session, which we did under discipline of the RWL.

Franco: Our intention was not to appeal over the heads of the WSL but to demand that the platform put the issue to the vote. The trouble began because the attitude of the platform aggravated the tension. Comrades who were not in the chair shouted - and forced errors on our part. Our intention was to demand chair put it to a vote - and if this was refused, walk out.

Kinnell: The fact is that the chair refused a vote - and the chair was shouted down.

Jette: The main problem was the attitude of the WSL leadership in imposing the time limits. It looked to me as if this was not a decision of the whole leadership. It was necessary clearly to state our attitude, not to factionalise. We were part of the decision to appeal to those in the hall. But then it became clear that this was the wrong position - as I said at the time.

TAF was not for walking out at any time. As we said earlier you cannot just pressurise the WSL. You have to make your positions clear, but it is a sectarian method to walk out.

We support the general resolution, but I don't see the use of a TILC resolution: it is only for one purpose - to have a vote on the matter at TILC

Ricardo: Debates in the school had not brought out real differences. Malvinas issue links in with other questions - like Ireland and also Permanent Revolution. The imposition of a time limit was another problem. As observers at the School and here we recommend support to the resolution.

Ali: Hackney cdes support both statement and resolution. We would also have joined the walk-out except that some of us are members of WSL. I think it was a legitimate protest on a question over which cdes felt strongly.

Karen: Everyone agrees WSL made a mistake. But once they had done so, the reaction is another question. We should have acted in such a way as to unite TILC.

Vote on resolution: FOR - 7 - RWL, LOR, Rigal, Hackney
AGAINST: 6 - WSL
ABST - 1 - TAF

Other Business:

Motion CARRIED

BELGIUM: Cunliffe suggested TILC make formal approach to Belgian cde with request for discussions with his group of co-thinkers in Belgium on basic politics of TILC. - AGREED

ITALY: Franco: Cdes may remember our report at Easter of talks with Italian Morenists and with Mandelites. The discussions with the Morenists began first with their proposal for a fusion. The discussions with the Mandelites began at our initiative, and have just started.

With the Morenists we see no prospect of fusion, and discussions have confirmed this view. We exchanged reciprocal representatives on each other's Central Committee. From this it appears that they are a petty bourgeois, anti-worker sect led by an adventurist demagogue who has gone to far as to elaborate the theory that the industrial proletariat is no longer the vanguard of the revolution, but now the sub-proletariat. As a result they do very little work in the working class, and what they do do is very opportunist.

We accepted a proposal to attend their Congress - during the same week of this school. We sent a delegation there with a 30-page list of differences, with the aim of provoking a break at their Congress - making our position as clear as possible. Having ditched this unity business we can get on with our work.

Mandelites: in recent months we have had some clashes with them, but sometimes united front work with them in the class struggle. Serious differences are already clear. But the group represents something significant in the class struggle in Italy. And for working class militants the differences between us and the Mandelites is quite incomprehensible.

My position is to look for a basis for unification of forces with them. Against my expectation, this view was unanimously agreed by our CC. We have decided to seek official meeting with LCR leadership with a proposal for fusion talks. One unshakeable condition is that we have the right to enter as a faction which is the Italian section of TILC. On this basis quite possible the Mandelites will reject the proposal. TILC should know about these moves.

CHILE: Diego: We would like to clarify our relations with TILC, and take another step forward. We are preparing a document with our full critique of TPITCS, and a contribution on Latin America. It will be completed next month. On the basis of discussion on this document we as Chilean Trotskyist militants intend at the next meeting to apply for full membership of TILC. (APPLAUSE!)

LABOUR PARTY: Franco: we would like LOR text circulated in WSL IB, discussed by all sections and replied to by WSL.

Inge: Differences in TILC are a healthy sign of life. We must try to exchange written documents before meetings. This is vital for cdes with language problems.

Ali: I have enjoyed all 11 days we have spent together. I'm sure you enjoyed it as much as I did. We go forward strengthened by this year's Summer School. I close this summer meeting of TILC.

TROTSKYIST INTERNATIONAL LIAISON COMMITTEE

RESOLUTION ON TRANSFORMING TILC INTO A DEMOCRATIC-CENTRALIST TENDENCY.

(Adopted by consultative vote at meeting August 2 1982)

- A) The Second TILC conference will take place in Britain on December 24-31 1982.
- B) Such a conference, acting under provisions established at the founding of TILC, will be focussed on the transformation of TILC itself into an organisation based on democratic centralist rules.
- C) The agenda of such a conference will include the following items:
- 1) Discussion and updating of the Document "The Transitional Programme in today's Class Struggle";
 - 2) Discussion and updating of the 9-point document "Programmatic Basis"
 - 3) The world political situation;
 - 4) The crisis of the world Trotskyist movement and our tasks;
 - 5) Work among women by consistent Trotskyists;
 - 6) Rules
 - 7) Financial questions;
 - 8) Miscellaneous matters.
- D) At this conference each TILC section will have one vote for every 10 members. If needed the number of delegates for a single section may be less than the number of votes**. In any event each section will have at least one vote.
- Delegates will be elected by national pre-conferences.*** Voting will be according to the majority decisions and democratic centralist discipline of each of the sections. The number of delegates will be determined on the basis of the number of members of each section as of November 20. No pre-conference should be held before that date.
- E) The TILC Secretariat is entrusted with the practical preparation of the conference. All documents, motions and amendments for debate in preparation for the conference should be made available to the Secretariat by October 30. Written contributions of any kind may be submitted for discussion and voting even after that deadline or in the course of the conference itself, however no guarantee can be given of international circulation of such material.
- F) Organising costs of the Conference will be assumed by the British section, while expenses for travel and accomodation of delegates or invited cdes from other countries will generally be assumed by the respective sections. However, international financial support may be provided in special instances. For this purpose, and in order to provide the organisation with an initial fund, a fund-raising campaign should be launched as soon as possible in all TILC sections.

* Original wording: "will transform TILC itself into an organisation based on democratic centralist rules"

** Original wording: "the number of votes, with due respect for minority rights"

***Original wording: "by national pre-conferences, in proportion to the various political positions emerging at these pre-conferences, as indicated by counterposed votes and/or resolutions. Each delegate will not be bound by the discipline of her/his own national organisation, and will have the right to freely put forward her/his own positions both in discussions and in voting."

TROTSKYIST INTERNATIONAL LIAISON COMMITTEE

RESOLUTION ON EVENTS AT WSL SUMMER SCHOOL, JULY 31, 1982.
(not for publication)

- 1) The TILC, meeting on August 2, 1982, deplores the attitude which the leadership of the British section took regarding the July 31 debate on the Anglo-Argentine war over the Malvinas Islands, a debate held around the end of an eight-day Workers Socialist League Summer School, throughout which no limitations of any kind had been imposed on the participation of international comrades.
- 2) Actually, the WSL leadership, by limiting on their own initiative the speaking times of the other TILC sections and international observers to only five minutes each, and limiting the ability of international comrades to participate freely in the discussion in other ways, violated the traditional TILC methods of free, genuinely internationalist discussion.
- 3) Confusion on the nature of the Summer School (whether it was actually a TILC or a WSL school) was primarily due to the incorrect decision the leading WSL bodies took to cancel, on their own initiative and without even explaining the decision to other sections, the previous decisions of the December 1981 and April 1982 TILC meetings to hold in 1982, as in two previous years, a TILC Summer School -- that is, a School whose course had to be governed by the TILC itself.
- 4) Such an attitude on the part of the WSL indicates a dangerous trend towards misunderstanding the relationships which are necessary between an international organisation and its national sections (especially the most important ones). This attitude sharply contrasts with the whole past history, political and practical, of the WSL as well as with the founding principles of TILC.
- 5) The TILC resolves that such situations should never again occur, and that in the ongoing process of transformation into a democratic-centralist tendency, the widest and most open political discussion must take place both between and within the different sections, with reciprocal interventions and exchange of criticism especially on such intrinsically important and serious topics as the Malvinas War.
- 6) This resolution is not intended for publication outside the TILC sections.

(Adopted August 2, 1982)

