

EC 23/12/81

Present: all bar Noonan, Morrow, Lardis, Lanarte  
plus Johnson

## 1) ASSESSMENT OF FUSION

Smith: Dissatisfied about orientation of paper and of movement, too much towards LP rather than w/class. Major crisis in Oxford area. Whole AC now bitterly hostile. Also linked into development of political line of movement - eg vote on self-determination for Poland, forced through despite protests.

Corolan: What exactly is problem? In Oxford, I'm not surprised there are problems. But we should beware of spurious political rationales. Can't see point on self-determination for Poland pushed through - if so, it should have been moved if be delayed.

Link between LP and TU work alleged is not plausible.

Central problem is that many cds have not reconciled themselves to so work.

Jones: Unifying factor is that we have taken steps forward, but fight in movement for political positions by Corolan while other cds not pushing theirs. A lot of inflexibility. Eg NC discussion on Poland - Corolan pushing national self-determination demand, needlessly. Also 'break with police state +Us' was abstract. When we discussed so platform before fusion, there was not the same inflexible approach. Self-determination slogan would pre-empt debate on Afghanistan.

Same response on Ireland discussion.

I'll be writing an internal polemic on Brown's article on Poland. Deficient on programme.

There should be a fight for political positions.

Oxford area: relates in a complex way. But cds feeling that the movement is drifting one way.

HU: What Jones' point on Ireland debate?

Jones: Inflexibility. other points brought in that need not be brought in.

Ramsey: Idea of movement drifting... I.e. papers' coverage? campaigns? what?

Smith: It's the lot. There is no pressure from leadership to interventionist position in working class. Goes through to disagreement on party. People don't feel the same pressure any more.

A Th point <sup>is</sup> linked - but not in the way he says. EC separate.

ex ICE hi-fucking. EC not functioning well - cannot create pressure. All work suffering, as well as TU.

Understand + reasonable, but view is wrong.

Jordan. It's easy to weave things together falsely. We need to discuss problems concretely - eg on TU work.

Jones: my attitude has hardened on Ireland. I found the leading ones reflecting incoherent feelings. Matters have not been brought in artificially - eg federation is a real issue in analysing current situation. Old WPL's politics were underdeveloped. Differences are inevitable. It would be wrong politically if leading ones took positions on the basis of pressure exerted from membership.

Oxford AC's veto power - eg on Piggot and EC - is unhealthy. Must be combatted - avoid tangling in all big questions with disgruntlement.

Poland - no conspiracy. Best handled by Jones writing for the paper. Don't generalise.....

Self-det. for Poland does not pre-empt Afghanistan.

Police-state TUs - I'm not very flexible. Polish development exposes 'Pabloite' mysticism about state TUs.

Jones We should have a clearer line in next issue. But disputed issues should be fought out internally.

Cordan Nothing wrong with discussing self-determination (eg) openly in the paper. Ireland issue could have been dealt with in the paper - rather than having a model of functioning we can't live up to.

I'm in favour of conciliating Oxford cds - but not to the point of giving them a veto. On some issues we can't make concessions - eg where it would wreck the LP work.

Jones Noone would argue that.

Cordan Cds' view coloured by pressure from Oxford.

Kinnell Need for tolerance + getting ctees functioning.

Ramsey Lack of response on EEC at NC. And GS - nobody really wanted to discuss.

Debate on Ireland - cds should have put their views down in writing. We can't always work to written theses, but sometimes we find a consensus too quickly without clarification.

At fusion sports said ICL had swallowed WFL, and Cordan was 'stickiest manoeuvrer on left'. Do Oxford cds feel that?

Smith yes.

Ramsey Real test of TH work would have been BZ strike. St Mary's has been mythologised.

Hill: St Mary's was an important test. London area did not respond well. But it's not unique to St Mary's - true also on LLB and Bernandsey.

Debate - better if it's written - but need not be in the paper.

Need a regular functioning IB.

We do need a tolerant and liberal regime - a ctee can't write the articles in the paper - but that can't be done at the expense of building ctees and having internal debate. Also we can be so open new with the fusion and the problems.

Cunliffe: The fusion offered the prospect of bringing together strengths and creating more rounded work. Much of response of Oxford cds is that they feel disappointed — no fight to take old WTL strengths into fused organisation. No clear perspectives. Whole of leadership bears responsibility, esp. ex-WTL cds. None of this insoluble. Must devote more energy into TU work. Doesn't mean <sup>less</sup> work in LP. Means more stress on work like St Mary's. EC has to function more as an executive. And EB is decisive, for paper. Not enough drive towards areas and branches. Need more drive not just to ~~assuage~~ assuage Oxford cds but to give all cds a direction. EC must give more time to party-building tasks.

Lery: Morrow's resolution sparked this off. Discussion around resolution was illuminating. Showed problems of knitting together EC.

Cordan's intransigent defence of letter has to be set against struggle to develop a collective leadership. Openly and defiantly breaching terms of previous EC resolution.

Dev't of LP and TU work? We haven't sufficiently defined our relative priorities. Direct struggle has not received sufficient attention — eg LSE, indictment of EC.

No shared definition of TU work. Channelling of work through SO groups is one side of that.

Relates esp. to Laidis and St Mary's.

Need a fight on OC and EC for turn towards direct action struggles.

TU democracy conference — renovate Re LM, not a legitimate slogan. Should have been taken to EC.

Cunliffe's resolution on work among ♀ should be discussed. Cds are trying to put it off indefinitely.

~~██████~~ Ramsey: Attitude to DA struggles is not an ex-WTL/ex-ICL issue — eg in London. Old I-CL SC spent less time on TU struggles. Nothing to do with SO organisation.

Certain euphoria and complacency from fusion - level of discipline has dropped, partly because of fusion 'diplomacy'.

Did expect ex-WHL strengths to be imported <sup>into</sup> the EC.

At Mary's - the fact is AC did not feel strong enough to push it to the point of expulsions.

Oxford pressures don't occur elsewhere. I think the big thing is the physical moving of the centre.

Perhaps we need smaller, more effective ctees.

Hill: There is a search for paraceas. A lot of things from Len NC weren't done adequately. Just not true that they were things pushed by ex-WHL blocked by ex-ICL.

Industrial work: problem is not ex-WHL vs ex-ICL, eg around St. Mary's.

Ctees must be organised better. From that point of view, Corolan's letter wrong.

Jones: It's a drift. Eg on Coventry strike. Such strikes are basic. We're drifting away from industrial struggles and into political positions. Disagree with Corolan when he says leading ctees should not take positions on basis of pressure - that shows inflexibility. Why do we need to force issues through?

Poland? Jones should write in paper? Paper should have a clear line. Contentious questions should be internal debates.

Corolan's letter anti-DC, anti-development of fusion

Corolan: I feel as if I'm being criticised as leadership from people who aren't in it... Levy is on all the ctees.

Seeking after explanations is alarming, sometimes bizarre... including ridiculous and venomous suspicions. Ditto on political differences, eg Ireland.

Atmosphere of intolerance - eg Ireland, on Landis, ... We need a more liberal and tolerant atmosphere, including in the paper. It's unworkable that even articles have a clear precise line

Lery. Oxford area: I was hostile to way Oxford ~~the~~ NC cds conducted themselves in NC. Took it up with them after — discussed with Maddox. There are real problems. We must help develop cds. Kinnell takes a patronising line.

EEC: I agree largely with Corolan's article.

Motives: Corolan looking at Lery and Smith as people stirring ~~the~~ things up. But we must look at reasons for things happening — there must be a reason.

Corolan: You can have suspicions but should test them before coming out with them.

Macaulay misses point on liberal regime. But we need to produce a paper where people use their intelligence — and some mechanism for reflecting all nuances. Otherwise we must sterilise people or give people privileges.

All problems — we should discuss concrete proposals.

Oxford — should discuss concretely. More contact with ex-ICE  
Leading ctcs — should function properly, esp. OC. If any  
ctc has to fade, it should be EC.

Paper — deficiencies? No problem. But some cds wd not  
satisfied with anything less than full formal trappings and wrecking  
LP work.

Smith: Cds who are for ~~the~~ formal label are for it because of what it  
think it symbolises.

All work: our present orientation doesn't work.

Jones: On Morrow's resolution: We should just decide that  
contentious items shd come first EC and OC.

Corolan: That wd give a privileged position.

Ramsey: All motion says is that issues should come first to ctcs.  
Does not contradict what Corolan says.

Curliffe: O'Keefe's not right that there are no rules. Members of ctee should relate first to the ctee that they are members on. Nothing you can do about technical privilege

Macanlay: Better functioning EB would help. But we can call emergency meetings too. If that doesn't work, we need a day-to-day EB.

Smith: Corolan's view depends on a subjective decision. It's wrong for an individual to take such things.

Corolan: Relating first to ctee does not imply abandoning rights of personal initiative. In this case I'm sure I got it right. If nothing can be done outside of ctee - original piece was not put a ctee. Either it's a privilege situation or an unwritten mechanism.

Ramsey: Maybe Corolan should argue that if OC is wrong he should have right of personal initiative.

Corolan: I was not prepared to subordinate my right to undo the damage to the decision of the ctee.

Jones: The further we get, the worse we get. I disagree with C. 'individual right of every member'. Political responsibility of leas cds is to ctees. Editors have technical advantage but they can be chucked out. Eg at a public meeting where a cd. makes a bc speech we do not denounce them in public.

Curliffe: As an editor of paper I'm under the discipline of the ctee but not of individuals. Not the prerogative of the individual to put things in the paper.

Corolan: Logic of what Curliffe says is that incident raises his ft of paper. I wd. argue for tolerance etc. on paper.

Situation is one of a witch hunt - piece was damaging. Best thing was to undo the damage.

Jones: resolution

Jones's resolution - for all but  
opst: Corolan  
abst: Kinnell

Corolan: explained vote against. Don't disagree in general but  
inapplicable in particular.  
Reserved right to take it to NC.

Kinnell: explained

Previous decision reaffirmed unanimously.

---

### TILC CONFERENCE

Attendance: EC

Corolan: Lardis gave apologies.

Agreed Curlyffe to chase up.

Mr Hill: will miss some.

### Political line:

Central America: Curlyffe to try to redraft. EC meets 11 AM. ~~if~~

Poland: Jones can put minority position if he wishes.

Middle East: Keith to do draft

France: Kinnell to do a draft.

Agenda: Curlyffe to draft.