

I N T E R N A L B U L L E T I N

4 X

- Contents :
- 1 TAF (Denmark) Statement.
 - 2 Extract from TILC minutes April 11th 1982
 - 3 Statement of International Cdes at the WSL Summer School July 31st 1982.
 - 4 INTERNATIONALIST TENDENCY Resolution on TILC democratic centralism.
 - 5 Malvinas: Epitaph - Julio N Magri (P.O.) Trans. M.J. Introduction, Morrow.
 - 6 Extract from ICL NC Minutes 4.5.80.
 - 7 INTERNATIONALIST TENDENCY Resolution on Palestine.
 - 8 INTERNATIONALIST TENDENCY Resolution on Ireland.

PRODUCED BY THE WSL INTERNATIONALIST TENDENCY FEB 18th.

FOR DETAILS OF THE TENDENCY OR DATE OF NEXT MEETING
CONTACT: EVINGTON Tel 0533 . 552314

**TAF RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF:
THE INTERNATIONALIST TENDENCY IN WSL.**

In principle TAF supports the founding of the Internationalist Tendency in WSL. We recognise the founding as an important step further in the fight against the revisionist tendencies and the centrist degeneration of the majority in the WSL leadership.

We support this Tendency as internationalists in TIIC, because we see the political fight against and the victory over the revisionist tendencies as an inevitable step in the efforts to construct TIIC as a genuine International Tendency lead by democratic centralist principles.

But definitely we also support the Internationalist Tendency on its own premises, that is to say, the published Tendency platform, which in the main lines we agree with.

We want to watch the developments in WSL carefully, and obviously we expect that the minority tendency will get fair political treatment in the organisation. This includes the political right for the Internationalist Tendency in spite of the standpoint of the majority, to join the " DC Tendency " in TIIC. If not this would be the negation of genuine internationalist principles.

Carried unanimously by a National Meeting in TAF.
6 . 2 . 83.

Copy received by the Internationalist Tendency 11.2.83.

MINUTES OF THE TILC APRIL 11th 1982

BRITISH REPORT

In line with reports circulated in monthly letters. Major successes included intervention at Labour Party YS conference (100 youth supporting our tendency) 300 strong conference of women trade unionists convened by WF; and SC Conference at which platform indicated developed relationship with key militants, WSL only force on the left fighting seriously on Tebbit anti union Bill. Important work done on Poland, including intervention into Polish Solidarity Campaign.

FRANCC: I want to raise some Questions over work in the Labour Party. We have strong doubts on some of this work. we agree with critical support to Benn, but danger of adaptation. We don't support Benn for his policies but because of the new broad left current which has not yet gone beyond reformist conceptions. We must regard Benn as the enemy.

T. It would be useful if Franco's points could be written down and replied to in writing.

LELAND I share Franco's concerns. Nobody in RWL would have written a series of articles like those of John C Mahoney on Socialism and Democracy. But we recognise that he was writing to reach an audience..

S. We have to encourage reciprocal open criticism within the TILC. I urge cdes to spell out their disagreements. We have criticisms of RWL press which we wish to discuss..

* * * * *

NB As this brief extract indicates the Question of LP work was raised a long time ago. The LCR produced a detailed written statement of their views, while the RWL produced a critique of the Socialism and Democracy series. Both of these were presented to WSL at the 1982 Summer School. To date neither has been circulated inside WSL. Nor has any written reply been forthcoming on behalf of the WSL.....so much for reciprocal criticism.

**STATEMENT OF PROTEST OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS
AND INDEPENDENT INDIVIDUALS ATTENDING THE 1982 WSL
SUMMER SCHOOL**

The undersigned organisations and individuals, having met on July 31st, 1982 in the course of the Workers Socialist League Summer School, address the TILC as a whole with the following 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 the discussion: to restrict the speaking time of the international delegations and observers to five 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 this 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 fully 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 organizations committed specifically to the reconstruction of the Fourth International.

signed :

RWL/US

LCR/Italy

TAF/Denmark

French TILC member

Hackney Group

Chilean Trotskyist militants

Belgian Observer.

INTERNATIONALIST TENDENCY RESOLUTION ON TILC DEMOCRATIC CENTRALISM

This national conference of WSL endorses the political line of the document "Towards an International Tendency - Problems and Tasks" by Morrow and instructs the National Committee to take all steps necessary for the transformation of TILC into a democratic centralist International Tendency in the Autumn of 1983.

To this end the NC is instructed:

- 1 To write to all the TILC member and sympathising sections formally proposing that the April TILC Conference be regarded as an International Pre-Conference.
- 2 To press for the circulation internationally of the internal bulletins and perspectives perspectives documents of all the sections, for circulation within the sections, and to implement this in WSL.
- 3 To circulate for amendment within WSL the founding documents of TILC, "The Transitional Programme in Today's Class Struggle" and the "Nine Points - Programmatic Basis."
- 4 To organise as necessary area aggregates to discuss these and any other TILC documents submitted as the basis for the International Tendency.
- 5 To organise a National Pre-Conference in WSL for the election of our delegation, to the International Conference in the Autumn and to ratify the documents of the International Tendency. This Conference to take place in June 1983.
- 6 To establish from the next NC an administrative sub-committee of the TILC Secretariat consisting of comrades (not necessarily NC members) with language skills, a detailed knowledge of the world Trotskyist movement and a consistent commitment to international work. This sub-committee to be made responsible for the gathering and circulation of TILC internal material, maintaining regular contact with the member and sympathising sections, and for assisting Cunlike in the preparation of materials for and the organisation of the TILC Conferences. International work to be the main priority of these comrades.
- 7 To vote, at the April TILC Conference, to rescind the decision taken at the December meeting to reject the FIT proposal for a joint bulletin beginning with a discussion of the differing assessments on the Malvinas. To press that this project is now pursued as a matter of urgency.
- 8 To propose at the April TILC Conference the publication of a regular TILC bulletin as the international theoretical journal of TILC.
- 9 To propose at the April TILC meeting that the 1983 Summer School be focussed on the task of transforming TILC into a democratic centralist international tendency, and the establishment of the necessary political basis for that.
- 10 To prepare and submit to the April TILC Conference, as part of that discussion, a detailed document on entry work as the basis for the discussion proposed by the TAF comrades at the December 1982 TILC Conference.

*

*

*

*

INTRODUCTION TO JULIO MAGRI'S DOCUMENT "MALVINAS: EPITAPH"

The publication of that classic of Marxist erudition, "The Galtieri gang rides again" by a group of comrades in Scotland has provided the Tendency with a much needed opportunity to draw to the attention of members the critique of the line in SO on the war produced by the FIT. In it Julio Magri, a member of P.C. in Argentina examines the political implications of the SO position in terms of both its anti-imperialist and internationalist content. He finds it woefully lacking in both respects and relates its failure to the tendency of SO to operate within the ideological framework of left reformism.

At the time of the war - and in the Galtieri Gang document - much fuss was made of the "capitulation to Argentine nationalism and Peronism" of those of us who opposed the SO line. It is therefore quickly noting some recent developments in the situation in Argentina and the way in which the "nationalists" of P.C. have related to them.

Since the end of the war, the continuing political crisis of the Junta has created new conditions of struggle for the Argentine masses. P.C. for example now enjoys semi-legal status, as the capacity of the military to suppress the left has crumbled. The bourgeoisie has attempted to check the movement of the masses by negotiating a return to "democracy" - in reality a pseudo democracy operating within the new statutes of Parties which definitively ends the 1853 constitution of the Republic. For ~~what~~ revolutionaries this situation of crisis has posed, in particular, the breaking of the working class from Peronism which on three separate occasions has been used by the bourgeoisie to control the workers.

P.C. have related to this task by posing - against the Multipartidaria - the building of a Workers Party. As a part of the task of organising the forces for this and assembling the necessary signatures to establish a legal workers party, they have joined with other layers of militants to produce "Prensa Obrera" (Workers Press) a fortnightly paper agitating for the construction of a workers party which can represent the independent revolutionary tasks of the class.

The programme of Prensa Obrera (the Action Programme) is short but precise:

- A minimum wage for all workers linked to a sliding scale.
- 100% pay rises for all to restore wages.
- Restoration of all cuts - occupation of unused facilities.
- Workers control of production.
- Suspension of the foreign debt - a workers enquiry into its origins.
- Immediate satisfaction of the demands of the mothers and families of the Disappeared.
- Rescinding of all treaties conditioning national sovereignty on the continental shelf and mainland.
- Freedom of organisation for unions and political groups.
- Destruction of the Dictatorship, liquidation of militarism.
- For a constituent assembly.

Despite being centrally involved in this BROAD paper with its more than adequate programme of immediate class demands, P.C. have continued to produce their own regular party press which promoted the struggle for a Trotskyist Party and for the Re-construction of the Fourth International. P.C. is used within the workers party caucuses.

It is, therefore, under conditions where P.C. themselves are carrying out broad work in the class and operating within groups much broader than themselves, that we should consider their severe criticisms of the political product of our own broad work. That their criticisms of us should come at a time when they are sharply taking up the struggle to break the Argentine masses from Peronism is perhaps a lesson to those who attack the tendency to cover their own retreat.

Socialist Organiser & the Malvinas war: an Argentine evaluation.
MALVINAS: Epitaph - Julio N. Magri (Politica Obrera - Argentina).

The organisations claiming to be Trotskyist and of the 4th International in Britain had a tremendous responsibility (it isn't necessary to say it!) regarding the Malvinas war: to practise proletarian internationalism against the imperialist chauvinism of the metropolis; and this was only possible by defending unconditionally the whole Argentine cause. Lamentably, one of the organisations of which one could have hoped for more in this sense, headed the squad of those who capitulated before the nationalism of their own country. We refer to the "Socialist Organiser Alliance" grouping, which curiously, poses itself the reconstruction of the FI. This organisation had the idea, no more no less (and in fact it was all a great "inventive trick"), to proclaim, against Thatcher and Galtieri, the self-determination of the kelpers, exactly the official position of the Foreign Ministry of her very gracious majesty!!!

A principled difference.

For the "SOA" (ex-WSL) it wasn't a war of an imperialist character against Argentina. In its paper, the "Socialist Organiser", it was maintained that "Argentina is not an imperialist big power like Great Britain, but on its side too the war continues reactionary policies both nationally and internationally" (SO 86). What one can deduce from here is that, as the Galtieri regime is a "pillar of capitalist and imperialist control" in the region, the character of the war is not derived from a rigorous characterisation of the countries in dispute, oppressors and oppressed, but of the character of their regimes. We have to conclude therefore that if the British state had been in the hands of the Labourites, 'SO' would have mobilised in the streets to support the fleet? It is precisely the character of the regimes in dispute which is not relevant here, because Thatcher did not launch the war, as said, to get rid of a dictatorship, but to smash the timid independence of the country led by that dictatorship. To erase the difference between nations, and to supplant it with that of the regimes leads us to pure subjectivism, and the international relations between states is emptied of its class basis. Trotsky alerted us against this capricious characterisation, insisting on not allowing oneself to be deceived by the wrappings in analysing phenomena from the viewpoint of the international class struggle. The fundamental dividing line of modern nations and states is that some are imperialist and others their victims, in spite of whoever finds themselves in power among the latter. The incredible criterion of 'SO' would lead us very far indeed: to denying the proletarian nature of the states dominated by the bureaucracy, as this is also pro-imperialist.

It is evident that Galtieri occupied the islands with the objective of strengthening the Argentine dictatorship and bourgeoisie within the global strategy of imperialism in the region and whole continent and vis-a-vis the internal crisis. For this reason Politica Obrera did not support the occupation of the islands and denounced the proposal of negotiations with imperialism. But this objective of the military junta failed, and the occupation of the islands by Argentine troops gave way to a war against a bloc of imperialist nations.

'SO' 83 falls into the superficiality of saying that "the war is to save the face and the prestige of Thatcher" (Reply to Morenists). But what does Thatcher represent? British imperialism. Or is it now suitable for Marxists to explain wars by the size of the nose of those in government? The fact is, since 1833 British imperialism under a whole range of governments defended the colonial possession of the islands. And in this war, the Labourites not only did not oppose Thatcher in parliament, but neither did they hesitate in aligning themselves with Thatcher and the bourgeoisie against Argentina.

Naturally the position of 'SO' must have provoked deep "remorse", because in No 81 it says that "if the conflict goes so far as British military attacks on Argentina itself (ie. the mainland - JNM), we should support Argentina's legitimate right to defend itself" (Editorial, 22/4/82).

It is clear that for 'SO', the Malvinas (which together with its own imperialism 'SO' calls Falklands!) are not Argentine, in other words they are British (because the kelpers are not, nor can they be, nor do they want to be, a nation, and in their majority are employees of a colonial company). But the geographical affectations of 'SO' do not stand up: the war of the fleet was against the Argentine nation: economic and military blockade, nuclear weapons, calls to bomb the mainland. With its positions regarding the mainland, 'SO' admits its support for British recovery of the archipelago. The General Belgrano was sunk outside the exclusion zone!

But, we ask: why is it legitimate to defend Argentina from a British attack on the mainland, if the war according to 'SO', "is reactionary on both sides" ? Or is it that Galtieri would only be pro-imperialist regarding the Malvinas, but not the mainland ?

Here 'SO' had to hurry to theoretically elaborate a cunning trick: self-determination for the Falklanders. The islands would be neither British nor Argentine, but of the Falklanders, who "are the first to suffer" from this war (SO 80). The war would have been a territorial dispute to determine who would continue oppressing the islanders (Argentine imperialism), when they are "a distinct community for 150 years, displacing no-one, oppressing no other community" (SO 83). With this argumentation, 'SO' poses the withdrawal of all troops from the islands and the rights of the Falklanders to decide their own future is recognised (SO 79).

We will put aside the fact that 'SO' decided to pose the withdrawal of all troops from the islands only when they were Argentines, because before 2/4/82, it did not call for withdrawal of the British troops. What is the real meaning of the Falklanders deciding their future ? Exactly the same reason for the sending of the fleet: the British colonial restitution. This is because the only 'distinct' feature of the Falklanders is that they are a British colonial settlement; thus their self-determination is to form a part of the British Empire. We are for the self-determination of peoples as an aspect of the struggle against imperialism. But to pose the self-determination of the imperialist colons is a total absurdity.

If 'SO' had stopped to think a while, it would see that to supplant the British oppression of the kelpers, Argentina would have had to expropriate Coalite, the virtual owner of the islands. But it was always agreed between the Argentine dictatorship and imperialism, that British interests would not be touched. 'SO' talks of "self-determination", but not "independence" for the kelpers, and this is significant, as self-determination is the right to decide, and not the demand, to emancipate oneself, and the decision of the kelpers is already known - the British crown. Needless to say, if the islands really made themselves independent, they would end in Argentine hands, because they are not economically viable. Besides, it is false to say that the Falklanders are not the result of the displacement of anyone. The British seized the islands by force in 1833, and they are a component of the imperialist oppression (military pressure) of Argentina.

Socialist Organiser and Labourism.

It is common knowledge that the Labour leaders aligned themselves with their imperialism in the war, which, we insist, contradicts once more the 'SO' statement that we are faced with "a war of the Tories". The so-called Labour left, represented by Tony Benn, opposed the sending of the fleet but supported the economic sanctions against Argentina, and Resolution 502 of the UN. This expressed one of the positions of imperialism, that which sought a semi-colonial deal between the Junta and world imperialism.

In practise 'SO' was behind this Labour faction. So much that in 'SO' 83 it led to maintaining, incredibly, the following: "The demand is mounting from the Labour movement for negotiations in place of battles. Michael Foot has refused Thatcher's invitation to private talks on the war."

"Any dissociation from the Tories, and any campaign for the recall of the fleet, should be supported. And better that Thatcher and Galtieri deal with their dispute by negotiation than by war".

To support negotiations between Thatcher and Galtieri means: a) that the Argentine and British masses should line up behind their regimes; b) that via negotiations, Galtieri and Thatcher would be able to reach a just solution, ie. an anti-imperialist one; c) that imperialism can cease to be what it is, a machine of war and oppression against the colonial and semi-colonial peoples; that the imperialist bourgeoisie can be convinced that war is a bad thing and that disputes can be resolved peacefully. Lastly, 'SO' presents the Labour leaders as opposed, although timidly, to the war, when they were in fact the main factor of chauvinist propaganda among the masses.

In conclusion, 'SO' posed the 'overcoming' of the war by means of a new alliance of British imperialist capitalism with the Argentine bourgeoisie, because negotiations between Galtieri and Thatcher can mean nothing else. The verbal, super-revolutionary "Neither Thatcher nor Galtieri" was in practise "For Thatcher and for Galtieri".

From the practical point of view in Britain it was necessary to carry out mobilisations, and to seek a united front for the withdrawal of the fleet from the South Atlantic. But for this policy to be consistent and located within a revolutionary perspective, it would have had to delimit itself from the positions of the Labour left, because they were lined up behind the defence of the global interests of British imperialism.

Therefore, it is a mystery to understand why 'SO' states that it had developed a political campaign of revolutionary defeatism in Britain, as this is supposed to mean fighting for the defeat of ones bourgeoisie.

Even more. When Argentina was defeated, 'SO' posed that one had to "fight against any attempt to continue the diversion by either side" (SO 89). Sensational! As the 'diversion' could only come from the Argentine side, because the British troops had taken the islands, the position of 'SO' can only mean the unconditional signing by Argentina of the surrender (which was the position of Anglo-Yankee imperialism), thereby putting an end to the 'diversion'. This means: for the total and complete surrender! We fail to understand why 'SO' persists in calling this revolutionary defeatism. But, in addition, what happened for the demand for the withdrawal of all troops, now that only British troops remain? In every way, the position of 'SO' leads to defending the British possession of the islands. We repeat: however much 'SO' talks about them, it calls them "Falklands"!

Socialist Organisation and "national union" with Galtieri.

The 'strong' argument of 'SO' was that supporting and working for an Argentine victory meant a policy of national union with the Junta. This is the typical argument of the left in the imperialist countries: the national union in the colonies worries them so much that they advise one to unite with "democratic" imperialism.

Needless to say, the position of 'SO' is a stupidity: if to unconditionally support a national cause leads to national union, then all the democratic struggles of the proletariat reveal themselves as pro-bourgeois, that is what was always claimed by Bordigist sectarianism. The national cause can be opposed (one must oppose it) to the bourgeoisie. This is the abc of the Transitional Programme.

If the Trotskyists abstain from participating in the struggle against imperialism (and to participate means to formulate the programme and the methods so that the struggle is genuine and effective); and even more so when this struggle rises to the level of war, which involves the whole nation; if the revolutionaries do that, the bourgeoisie has free hands for manipulating the masses, presenting itself as the standard-bearer of the struggle against imperialism.

The "national union" was not to struggle for the Argentine victory, but to abstain from all independent mobilisation of the masses in the name of the national struggle; to not develop a programme (expropriation of imperialism, arming of the masses, etc.) to place the proletariat into

the political and effective leadership of the war; was to entrust to the Argentine army, with its leadership, the task of defeating the fleet.

The policy of "national union" existed and owed itself to the role of the TU bureaucracy and Stalinism, which both opposed mobilising the masses and placed themselves behind the dictatorship (support for the demonstration arranged by the dictatorship on 10th. April, refusal to arrange their own actions, etc.).

For 'SO', an Argentine victory would have strengthened the dictatorship and crowned with success its manoeuvre for national union (SO 89). It is clear that 'SO' stood with the fleet. This argument has been the hobby-horse of the "ultra-leftist" postures. But neither have they stopped to think that the British victory has strengthened the arbitration of world imperialism in the face of the dictatorship in crisis.

If 'SO' believes that an Argentine victory against imperialism would have strengthened the dictatorship, it means that it does not know what the dictatorship is from the class viewpoint: the most direct national agency of imperialism. A victory could only have been possible as a result of a rupture with imperialism, and would have led to an extreme exacerbation of the crisis with the latter. How can this fortify the dictatorship! Undoubtedly, all would depend on how the proletariat took advantage of that crisis, but anyway, it would be in a new situation, much more advantageous to it.

The conditions which are at present favouring the cause of democracy, and of the proletariat in Argentina, are not those resulting from the British victory, but of the inability of imperialism and its agents to end the crisis opened up by the Malvinas. And this inability will grow with the developing workers mobilisation.

'SO' is so bogged down in nationalism that it does not even suspect the level of its bankruptcy. Thus, it points out that the consequences of the Argentine defeat is that the military is "less capable of intervening in politics for a certain period and maybe for a long time". Odd these British Trotskyists! Their preoccupation with the weakening of the Junta is limitless, but it doesn't seem that the same occurs to them vis-a-vis the strengthening of Thatcher against the British proletariat and the Irish people, which is a result of the Argentine defeat!

We ask 'SO': have you the remotest suspicion of why the defeat weakened the Argentine dictatorship? It is clear you do not. The weakening is due to the Argentine masses accusing it of complicity with the fleet and the U.S. State Department, in the loss of sovereignty. Without the sharp anti-imperialist consciousness of our masses Galtieri would have negotiated with Thatcher (following the advice of 'SO') and would have been strengthened. If the Argentine people had identified with the programme of 'SO' (negotiations, and what's more, the programme of Haig, Perez de Cuellar, the Pope, the majority of the military High Command and the national bourgeoisie), we would be stuck with the dictatorship for quite some time yet. With its demand to smash the fleet, the Argentine people separated itself, precisely from the dictatorship, and condemned it to death....with a victory, with a defeat, or with negotiations (which is just what we foresaw 48 hours after. 2nd. April, as can be seen in PO 328, reprinted in 'Internacionalismo' No 5).

The defeat in the Malvinas was the form in which the crisis of the dictatorship took to break out, although it was bankrupt before 2nd. April, as we point out in PO 327 (2/3/82), that "the Galtieri government is finished", and that "Galtieri will end up worse than Viola". Which meant that this crisis would not be resolved via a palace-coup, but rather the fall of Galtieri (15th. June) was more the intervention of the masses. 'SO' says that owing to the Argentine defeat "there are disturbances in Buenos Aires" (it refers to the demonstration of 15th. June), but the demonstrators went onto the streets not to salute the Argentine defeat, or to thank Thatcher for "services rendered", but to condemn the dictatorship for its betrayal, deception and lies.

(from 'Internacionalismo' 5 - trans. mike j.)

MIDDLE EAST

C KEEFE (now Carolan)

Think about the concrete implications of the secular democratic state slogan for Palestine. It has no grip on reality. It is an ambivalent slogan fundamentally wrong because it proposes the forcible integration of two peoples.

The history of Zionist oppression is terrible. But the forcible integration means forcible abolition of nationality, which is hardly possible. We're for a socialist united states of the Middle East, but we also need to uphold self-determination.

We don't need to question the sincerity of the Palestinians' declaration of not being hostile to Jews as such. But what is the logic of depriving the Jews of the right to their own state? It's inconceivable it will be acceptable to the Jews. Who is going to do the forcible integration? There is no force capable of making it happen. The only even conceivable method is conquest of Israel by the Palestinians and/or Arabs. A socialist revolution is more feasible than the secular, democratic state.

The secular, democratic state is not algebraic in a real sense, just ambivalent. It actually means just Palestinian nationalism. But the national rights of the Israelis must be part of our programme. A nation has been created - by terrible means perhaps, but it exists. Our error: to identify with the oppressed (which is correct) but to go from that to identifying with their nationalist programme (which is wrong).

Our ~~only~~ real answer for the Palestinians consistent with the Israelis' rights must be some sort of partition. (Though I don't know what dividing line)

We've failed to distinguish between the historic reality of Zionism and Zionism as a political entity now. There is not just Zionism as a political ideology, but also the vicissitudes of the Jewish people.

The USFI approach, which has coloured our attitude, is woolly sentimental Third Worldism.

And what about the Jews in Israel who were born there? We can't visit the sins of their fathers on them. Parallels with South Africa, Northern Ireland etc. do not hold up. Zionism is not fundamentally about exploiting Arab labour. And, if Northern Ireland were a homogenous Protestant state, would we advocate its military conquest.

I don't propose raising self-determination for the Israeli Jews now. But it should be part of our programme. Self-determination for the Palestinian people - does that include the right to determine what happens to the Jews? It seems so, so I am against it.

Israel is a racist state? Yes it is. But aren't all states racist? What's different about Israel is the hostility to and driving out of the Arabs. But the major racist crime is now a fact of history.

Is a different Israeli state possible? Yes, it is possible: eg withdrawal to 1967 frontiers etc.

Note to SC minutes: it quotes me as saying that "evolutionism" is the root of our error. It should read "emotionalism".

CAROLAN NOW REPLACES C KEEFE AS THE COMRADES WORKING NAME

THE POLITICS REMAINS THE SAME

INTERNATIONALIST TENDENCY RESOLUTION ON PALESTINE.

This Conference of the Workers Socialist League recognises that the invasion of Lebanon by Israel was an act of genocide against the Palestinian people and an attempt to crush the Lebanese national movement. The invasion, and continuing occupation, are yet one more ugly confirmation of the racist, expansionist nature of the Zionist state in its role as gendarme of Imperialism in the Middle East.

The Israeli's successes in Lebanon were not merely a temporary reverse for the Palestinians and the anti-Imperialist forces in the region, but constitute a major strengthening of Imperialism and Arab reaction. The continuing blows of the Phalangist militias, the Israeli army and the stooge army of Haddad in the south against Palestinians, Lebanese leftists and the Dhruze are designed to stabilise Lebanon as a bastion of counter revolution against the Arab masses.

We recognise that the fight to provide revolutionary socialist leadership in Britain is directly linked to the need to support liberation struggles of the oppressed masses world wide against Imperialism. We support the right of the organisations in the P.L.O. to conduct the struggle against the Zionist Israeli state by political and military means. Our starting point is the recognition of their oppression and of their right to fight back.

We support the Palestinian people in their fight for national self-determination.

We recognise the right of the Palestinian people to determine their own methods for conducting that struggle.

We recognise the right of the Palestinian people to choose their own representatives and leadership, at present the PLO, while fighting through TILC for the construction of a Palestinian Trotskyist party.

We oppose the racist, expansionist Zionist state erected as a watchdog of Imperialism.

WE CAMPAIGN FOR:

- A secular democratic state of Palestine.
- The right of all refugees to return.
- The rights of all settlers in Palestine, including the Jewish settlers, to remain in Palestine, to retain their own language and culture, participating as equals in the politics of the area.
- the blacking by the labour movement of all military equipment and supplies to Israel.
- the breaking of all links between the trade unions and labour movement and Zionism, and in particular for the disaffiliation of Poale Zion from the L.P.

INTERNATIONALIST TENDENCY)- RESOLUTION ON IRELAND.

- 1 We give unconditional support to the fight of the Catholic Minority in North of Ireland against British Imperialism (and its Irish representatives) and for a united Ireland.
- 2 We fight for British Troops to be got out, unconditionally and immediately. We oppose their replacement by U.N. troops or any other military arm of Imperialism.
- 3 We reject the strategy of guerrillaism, but unequivocally defend the rights of those in struggle against Imperialism to determine their own methods of struggle. Our differences with the Irish Republican is over strategy, not over the targets of their military campaigns. We are for the weapon of the mass struggle of the working class. The armed struggle of the Provisionals and the INLA substitutes itself for the mass of the class and the politics of the class. But in defending the right of the Republican to choose this wrong strategy, we are defending the right of the oppressed to struggle. We cannot therefore select parts in this struggle to 'condemn' more than other parts, and in our criticism we are at all times careful to both distance ourselves from bourgeois reaction and make clear our support for the right of the Republican to carry on the struggle. We recognise that the distinction between a military and a civilian target is not a clear divide and we cannot therefore 'support' one and 'oppose' the other.
- 4 We criticise the nationalist and militarist limitations of the IRA and INLA leaderships, and counterpose a fight to link the struggle against partition with an all-Ireland class movement, under revolutionary socialist leadership, (coupled with a campaign of solidarity within the British labour movement. We do not use the socialist programme on nationalism to avoid taking concrete positions on struggles led by petty bourgeois nationalists.)

