

Resolution: Carolan

1. The paper should be so edited as to promote and defend the agreed positions of the League. It will maintain a sharp and clear line on the immediate issues of the class struggle.

2. Agreed policy covers positions adopted by conference, leading committees, etc. It does not and cannot cover shades of analysis, assessment, etc; moreover, such officially adopted positions can be solidly and scientifically grounded only to the extent that they are based on substantial work done by competent and interested comrades to develop those 'shades' as clearly as possible in line with objective reality.

Morrow: delete all of sentence after "work".  
After "substantial", insert "and detailed".

Kinnell: for "competent and interested comrades", read, "comrades who have, or develop, knowledge and experience".

Kinnell: Add - "Political discussion should be pursued in the internal bulletins and internal meetings. Certainly articles having the character of sharp internal polemic should go into the IB.

"But, given that committees can't write articles, the week-to-week work of political agitation and propaganda cannot fail to express shades of controversy - unless all articles are reduced to shallow, minimal agitation,

"The appearance of articles reflecting shades of analysis (within agreed positions) should be regulated by the class struggle around us - i.e. by the need for keeping facts in review and responding to developments".

Morrow: for "a range of", read, "the possibility of a range of".

Smith: delete whole para.

Morrow amendment: add "The EC shall as necessary direct full-timers to prepare material for internal discussion or as the basis for material to appear in the paper".

The Leninist method strives for a homogeneous understanding - but not on the basis of averaging-out. Leninism therefore demands a range of shades of analysis in the press - the alternative being to edit the press on the basis of a lowest common denominator or a consensus, i.e. to sterilise the paper and the organisation politically and intellectually.

3. Given the different cultures and traditions in the League, and given that lowest common

Smith: delete whole para.

Morrow: for "should generally", read "may, on a decision of the leading committees".

Kinnell: For "integrity", read "activity or the integrity".

Hill: add, "seeks to avoid the internal structures of the League",

Kinnell: replace this last sentence by, "The decision whether or not to open such public discussion (on all but minor matters) of course rests in each case with the leading committees"  
.....

denominator politics is alien to Trotskyism and unprincipled, we do not have any alternative in the organisation but the approach above.

4. Where there is a majority position, minority views should generally be allowed space in the press for a discussion. The exceptions should be where such public discussion

compromises the integrity of the organisation,

would bring us into discredit,

or uses the weight of bourgeois public opinion against the League, etc.

On major defined differences the right of decision would, of course, lie with the leading bodies of the League.