

**International  
Socialists**

**Bulletin**

**#4  
5/82**

## In This Issue

In This Issue of the Bulletin you will find a draft of a Third Camp Manifesto that will be discussed at the Convention. The Manifesto, as was explained in the Convention Resolution on this subject in the April Bulletin, is intended as an initiative towards individuals and organizations who consider themselves Third Campers. The idea is to seek signers to this Manifesto, and to publish a final version as a pamphlet. It is an ideological intervention, rather than an organizational one.

Also in this issue is a discussion article by Mike P. on regroupment, and a resolution which will be submitted to the Convention. Kim's resolution on regroupment is also included in this Bulletin. Mark has announced his intention to also submit a resolution on regroupment to the Convention, and that will be sent out next week.

Proposed rules for the Convention have been adopted by the PC, and will be presented to the Convention. They are included.

The following is an overview of discussion articles and resolutions you have received, or can expect to receive before the Convention. We encourage anyone with other amendments or resolutions to send them to the National Office in time for distribution before the Convention.

### Session 1: Overview of the Labor Movement

The Trade Union Left and Perspectives for the Labor Paper

#### Discussion articles:

Towards a Perspective for the 1980s by Kim

Labor Paper and IS Perspectives by Carole K. (4/82 Bulletin)

#### Resolutions

A resolution will be forthcoming from the Trade Union Commission

### Session 2: Proposal to Explore Entering DSA

#### Discussion articles:

A New Perspective for the 1980s by Mark L. and Mike U. (2/82 Bulletin)

#### Resolutions:

A resolution will be forthcoming from Mark and Mike

### Session 3: Regroupment Perspectives for the '80s

#### Discussion articles:

Regroupment: A Revolutionary Socialist Perspective by Kim

For Broad Third Camp Regroupment by Mike P. (this Bulletin)

#### Resolutions:

Regroupment: A Revolutionary Socialist Perspective by Kim (this Bulletin)

For Broad Third Camp Regroupment by Mike P. (this Bulletin)

A resolution will be forthcoming from Mark L.

Changes and the Regroupment Process by Mel B. and Mike P.

### Session 4: Third Camp Manifesto

#### Discussion articles:

Draft Third Camp Manifesto by IS Political Cttee (this Bulletin)

#### Resolutions:

Third Camp Manifesto by Kim (4/82 Bulletin)

### Session 5: I.S. Perspectives in the New Movements

#### Resolutions:

Resolution on CISPES by Foss T. and Dave F.

Resolution on Central America and the Anti-War Movement by Dave F.

A resolution on the disarmament movement will be forthcoming from Kim.

A resolution on the student movement will be forthcoming from Peter.

### Session 6: Meeting for Members

In This Issue--2

Resolutions:

Draft Constitution by I.S. Political Committee

A resolution on a new Political Committee slate will be forthcoming

A resolution on dues will be forthcoming.

Obviously, I have not listed every response to the discussion articles. Please note in the Convention rules that amendments over one paragraph or 50 words have to be duplicated. It will be a lot easier if we have these in advance.

Also, copies of all resolutions will be included in your convention packet, but discussion articles will only be available for non-members. If you want to have them at the Convention, bring them with you.

Many of these resolutions and discussion articles went out in mailings without waiting for a full edition of the Bulletin. If there is no reference date beside an article, that is the way it went out. If you are missing something that you want to see, request a copy.

Invitations to the Convention

We have begun to get registrations in from both members and friends. We again urge you to invite friends to the Convention. We expect it to be an event of high political level with serious but comradely debate. Contacts should be encouraged to attend. In addition to the organizations we invited previously (RWH, Workers Power, Solidarity, Christians for Socialism), we are also inviting Theoretical Journal and the ISO. We expect the Convention to be small, but we expect it to be a positive start in rebuilding the I.S. The beginnings of new social movements, and the recent successes in our labor work, provide an optimistic backdrop to the discussions of perspectives for the I.S.

*Elissa*

The world is being carried to the brink of war -- small ones first, greater ones in their wake -- by the clash of two declining systems of class rule. To a greater extent than at any time in the last thirty years, the crisis of capitalism and Stalinism leads them to attempt to solve their internal contradictions through international adventure. Both systems face economic crisis, both feel the pinch of declining empire. They are responding with military build-up, intervention and repression. Though military alliances shift or decay, it is the exploitative class nature of these two social camps that spells disaster for humanity.

As the threat becomes clearer to millions, an anti-war movement of global proportions has unfolded. Almost three or four years ago, it can now bring hundreds of thousands into the streets in European capitals against the siting of US nuclear weapons in Europe. The movement has now spread to the United States, where both nuclear disarmament and opposition to US involvement in civil wars in Central America have become mass issues.

The anti-war movement is already discussing critical issues of strategy and program. Is a "nuclear freeze" enough? Should the movement demand unilateral disarmament of its own government? What should its attitude be towards the armaments of the "other side," the Soviet Union and the Eastern bloc? Should the movement against nuclear weapons be separated off from the anti-intervention campaigns, or is there a need for a more wide-ranging peace movement that embraces both?

Any attempt to answer these strategic questions raises more far-reaching ones. What is the anti-war movement's ultimate goal? To whom, in the United States and internationally, should it look for allies? These questions demand an analysis of the roots of the danger of war, which are to be found in the internal crises of the systems that today rule the world.

\* \* \* \* \*

America today is a society suffering from deepening economic crisis, social crisis, permanent inflation and growing structural unemployment. Its government is apparently committed to a permanent state of war with the Third World, to getting government off the backs of the rich, and to making racism once again legitimate.

The supporters of this manifesto believe there is a positive alternative to a decaying capitalism. Unlike many on the left, however, we do not look to those who rule within this system to solve the crisis, nor do we believe that change can come through permeating the institutions and political parties they control.

Nor do the supporters of this manifesto look for answers to the bureaucratic system prevailing in the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and China. It is an equally crisis-ridden system, and by no means more subject to popular or democratic control than the one we live under. Indeed, the military crackdown in Poland is only the most recent and spectacular demonstration of its bankruptcy.

But the events of 1980-81 in Poland also demonstrated that there exists an alternative to bureaucratic rule in Eastern Europe. Posing that alternative to bureaucratic rule in living, concrete form is the greatest significance of the Solidarnosc movement. We believe it is, in essentials, the same alternative that exists to the crisis of our own capitalist society. It is the organized power of working people, built on the foundation of democratic control at the workplace and reaching out to transform society from below, spearheading a mass struggle for democracy and socialism.

This, in a nutshell, is the core idea of Third Camp socialism.

This manifesto is an attempt to spell out the meaning of Third Camp socialism in more depth, and to explain why we consider it critical to the future of a viable left.

#### I. What Is The Third Camp?

First and foremost, the Third Camp is a force in the world, not simply an idea. As the positive alternative to the capitalist and Stalinist systems of exploitation and oppression -- the power of the workers and oppressed peoples of the world -- its potential is embodied in every struggle for freedom, large and small.

Solidarnosc in Poland, the magnificent Black trade union movement growing up in South Africa; the popular and revolutionary movements in Central America; struggles for national independence, whether in Poland, Namibia or Eritrea; the massive movement for nuclear disarmament in Europe; and every struggle to defend trade unions from persecution in Turkey, Argentina, and the United States; the fight for rank and file control of the unions -- all these struggles represent the hope of our time. They are the only alternative to the ultimate destruction of the world by the rival ruling classes who dominate it. They have the ability to inspire each other, even spontaneously. The example of the Polish workers inspired American air traffic controllers in the fight against the destruction of their union. The mass anti-war movement growing up in America is motivated -- not exclusively, but in part -- by the desire to defend the right of the peoples of Nicaragua, El Salvador and Guatemala to determine the future of their own societies.

And the very existence of these movements throws into sharp relief the hypocrisy of the ruling classes -- and often poses ideological acid tests for the tendencies of the left. Ronald Reagan lit a candle for the workers of Poland (after the Polish bureaucracy had temporarily defeated them, not before), while stepping up aid to a Salvadoran junta under which trade unionists are murdered by the hundreds and firing the entire membership of PATCO.

For the left, the issues raised by the independent trade union movement in Poland were equally clear. If trade union rights are a legitimate aspiration in repressive capitalist states, why not in the "socialist" world? And if Solidarnosc was a good idea in Poland, why wouldn't it be a good idea in China? Why not in Cuba? The conception of the Third Camp socialists is nothing more or less than the simple idea that all these diverse struggles have a common historic direction and goal; and that the consistent struggle for democracy

and the basic human rights which both capitalist and Stalinist regimes guarantee on paper leads to the overthrow of both systems.

But this result is neither automatic nor inevitable; nor, tragically, is it consciously sought by the majority of people engaged in the struggles in the world today. For both material and ideological reasons, the Third Camp is largely unconscious of its potential. Third Camp socialists seek to be its conscious expression, to build both the individual struggles and their mutual solidarity and identification with each other, which all too often does not exist.

For example, the workers' movements of Poland and South Africa -- the most powerful trade union movements to arise in recent years -- do not, on the whole (undoubtedly there are some crucial exceptions) look to each other for sustenance and reinforcement. On the contrary, workers in Poland have carried on their struggle with one hand tied behind their back, due to the belief of masses of Polish workers and many of their leaders that the "natural allies" of their free trade union struggle are western capitalist governments. Thus, even while Solidarnosc appealed to workers in other Eastern European states to take up that struggle in their own countries, it made no appeal for similar action by labor movements in the West.

It goes without saying that the extent to which pro-West illusions exist among the masses of Solidarnosc is uneven. Those views cannot be ascribed homogeneously to the entire movement; and even those Solidarnosc leaders who do regard the West as the camp of "democracy" often do so far more critically than many of the West's own ideologues who cheer on the Polish working class out of Cold War motivations. What is more, the backwardness of sections of the Western left who withhold support from Solidarnosc or hesitate in supporting it, on the grounds of pro-Western illusions that exist inside Solidarity, is more than shameful. Leftists of that stripe are more backward than the workers, not only of Poland but of any other country.

Nonetheless, it would be naive to imagine that illusions in the "democratic" West, the viability of capitalism, and the "progressive" character of the free market do not exist in Solidarity. Indeed, such illusions are natural and inevitable for two reasons: the bankruptcy of "planned economy" as Poles have experienced it, and the absence of a militant movement of workers in the West, fighting against capitalism and for goals which Solidarity could recognize as parallel to its own.

The picture is no less contradictory if we examine the Black trade union movement in South Africa, or other examples of liberation movements such as the Palestinian struggle, the revolutionary movements in Central America, etc. Many of the political forces most actively involved in the organization and leadership of Black unions in South Africa, to a greater or lesser extent, are committed to a world view that sees the Eastern bloc as the key strategic ally of their struggle for liberation. Some uphold this view out of conviction that the Soviet Union is a genuine socialist society and a firm friend of Third World liberation; others are far more critical, but for ideological or pragmatic reasons perceive an alliance with the Soviet bloc as a strategic necessity. Again, it must be noted that we are making a broad generalization which does not uniformly apply to all these movements.

Manifesto--4

The pro-Sovietism of liberation movements and trade union struggles in the West is no more reason to withhold support from genuine struggles against oppression, than are the pro-Western illusions held by sections of the workers' movement in Poland. Nonetheless, however understandable, it is equally mistaken. No one can deny the legitimate right of any liberation movement to accept material aid from the Eastern bloc, just as no one can deny that, if the Polish workers took power, they would be entitled to accept (indeed, to demand) financial assistance from the West. But to mistake such aid, in either case, for genuine "proletarian internationalism" (of, "support for democracy") is a profound error.

If the Polish workers become dependent on western government backing, if the liberation movements of Nicaragua and El Salvador were ever to become dependent on the backing of the Soviet Union and its allies, a series of highly negative, if not disastrous results would follow. The western powers, given a choice, would not prefer a Poland ruled from below by the mass democratic institutions of the workers' movement, but a restructured economy in which market mechanisms were used to impose the "rationality" of unemployment and speedup on the Polish workers, to enable them better to repay Poland's outstanding loans. On the other side, the price paid by liberation movements for a political alignment with the Soviet Union is heavy: the importation of the Soviet economic model with its gross bureaucratism, subservience to Soviet views on foreign policy (seen most recently in the Nicaraguan government's sympathy with martial law in Poland) and in certain instances (Cuba) the use of one's own armed forces to carry out Soviet policy needs even where this may be against one's own political better judgement and practical interests (the use of Cuban forces in attempting to suppress the Eritrean liberation movement.)

The domination of world politics by the leading military nations of the two declining social systems, US and Soviet Union, enforced by the nuclear balance of terror as well as conventional military means, has tended to push dissident or revolutionary movements in each camp into the arms of the other. In Europe, the nuclear disarmament movement has begun the effort to overcome this, not only in terms of building greater European unity against nuclear arms on all sides, but in terms of ending the oppression of the Third World peoples as well. In fact, regardless of its ideology, every movement of rebellion is a potential threat to the "rock and hard place" political choices imposed by the major capitalist and Stalinist powers. Fulfilling that potential, however, requires a conscious understanding of one's potential and of one's potential allies.

To a considerable extent, the future of the disarmament movement in Western Europe and the survival of the Polish Solidarity movement are objectively intertwined. The effective suppression of Solidarity would strengthen the right-wing arguments that the only result of the disarmament movement would be the disarming of the West. Solidarity's survival is the best practical refutation of this reactionary view; it is living proof that even under difficult conditions, opposition movements in the bureaucratic states are not only a possibility, but a reality.

While we cannot propose that every anti-war march in the United States attach the issue of Poland to its slogans, we do seek to win over the mass base of the movement in the West to the understanding of the importance of

defending Solidarity, as much for the future of the movement in this country as for the hope of the democratic movement in Poland.

The same approach, more generally, applies to the inter-relationship of all struggles against exploitation and oppression. Third Camp socialism argues that, to the maximum extent possible, movements for freedom within both repressive social systems in the world today should look to each other as allies. Of course, we are not idealists. We know perfectly well that the Polish workers, even were they so inclined, cannot supply guns to the popular forces in El Salvador. And we know that Nicaragua cannot give the Polish workers concrete assistance in the resistance to martial law. However, we can argue that as a minimum, such movements should reject all attempts to use them as pawns in the ideological war of the world's ruling classes.

The obstacles to creating at least this minimum level of solidarity are not, decisively, practical and material ones. The major obstacles are the lack of the necessary consciousness. We seek in our own work as movement activists, in our literature and our practical activity, to build that consciousness, beginning, of course, with the workers of our own country. We seek, in short, to help make the camp of the workers and the oppressed conscious of itself.

## II. The Nature of the Crisis

### A. The Crisis of Capitalism

"A prosperous empire may possibly be able to 'afford,' in its metropolis, a little more space for liberty and dissent among its citizens. I do not discount the significance of these internal freedoms, or dismiss them as 'phony;' they were ardently fought for, stubbornly maintained and remain exemplary today. It was even possible for British citizens to mount protests against their own nation's endless little imperial wars; and while those protests were with little effect, they did something (as in India) to inhibit repression and exploitation, and to regularize a rule of imperial law.

"My point is only that imperialism, or militarism, can perfectly well cohabit with democracy: indeed very happily...But this tells us nothing whatsoever about military, or even imperial, dispositions. The question of warlike or peaceful propensities is another question altogether, requiring attention to different evidence and different mode of analysis."

--E.P. Thompson

The empire is no longer "prosperous." Its warlike propensities are less and less masked by the ability to offer a decent life and democratic freedom at home.

Unemployment in Western Europe and North America this year will reach 26 million. Once recession-proof West Germany has been drawn into the stagflation slump. The International Economic Survey published by the New York Times begins: "In 1982 the world economy, which has been growing increasingly interdependent for decades, is being subjected to the most powerful disintegrative pressures, both economic and political, of the postwar period."



Besides massive unemployment throughout the industrialized countries, other symptoms of the crisis include the groundswell of protectionism, the breakdown of the United States' ability to coordinate and dictate the policies of all the capitalist powers, the incapacity of government policies whether reflationary or monetarist to generate new productive investment.

The return of full-blown crisis to the capitalist world has accelerated the deterioration of the monolithic Western and Eastern blocs. This has, on the one hand, helped to open up potential new political options; on the other, it has also created a more volatile and complex set of interlocking crises. Policy differences among the major capitalist powers range from the split between US and West European banking capital over whether to extend further loans to the bureaucratic states of Eastern Europe, to the European's fears that high US interest rates and budget deficits will wreck their own economic recoveries, to the fractures that are threatening to wreck the European Economic Community.

The capitalist ruling classes are also badly divided over the attitude to take toward the frightening escalation of United States intervention in the Third World. A decade ago, despite the Vietnam war, it could be taken for granted that American power guaranteed stability -- cheap and plentiful oil, the "security" of Western Europe's energy and raw materials, even the relative stability of the remaining outposts of European colonial rule (e.g. the Portuguese in southern Africa), the illusory strength of such regional policemen as the Shah of Iran.

Today, America as a force for stability cannot be taken for granted. The defeat in Vietnam, the overthrow of the Shah, and of Somoza, the tide of national liberation in southern Africa and the re-birth of potentially revolutionary Black struggle inside South Africa, the far more intractable crisis over Palestine and the Middle East, have called the effectiveness of American imperialist strategy into question. It is not simply that it has suffered strategic defeats; but worse, the very structures it has created to police the regions of the world are becoming factors leading toward instability, war and revolution.

The interlocking crises of imperialist policy are today coming to a head over two issues, which, in tandem, have called into being enormous anti-war movements in Europe and now the US as well. One is the stationing of medium-range US nuclear weapons in Western Europe. Far from assuring peace through "overcoming Soviet strategic superiority," European activists realize this assures that Europe will be the central battleground for a threatened atomic holocaust. The marches of hundreds of thousands of Europeans against stationing weapons has now been followed by a campaign in the U.S. for a "nuclear freeze" -- and within that campaign, the emergence of voices pressing far more sweeping and radical demands for disarmament.

The second galvanizing issue is the Reagan Administration's moves toward regional war against popular movements in Central America and the Caribbean. In a series of apparently conscious and deliberate acts, the Reagan-Haig administration is cutting off the option of negotiations with the Salvadoran opposition and opting for an open-ended military commitment to an "elected" regime of "pathological killers" and fascists. Hundreds of thousands of Americans have already marched against US intervention in El Salvador, an intervention that inevitably carries with it the same commitment to the military rightists in Guatemala, the destabilization of Nicaragua, and other actions leading toward all-out regional conflagration.

Manifesto--7

There cannot be any shadow of doubt that socialists stand in active solidarity with the popular and revolutionary forces in Central America. Whatever their political strategic weaknesses, whatever their ideological shortcomings and whatever illusions they may harbor in the friendship either of bourgeois liberal governments or the Stalinist world, they are the force in the region standing against the "restabilization" of the US empire and another generation of misery. Our minimal responsibility is to build a solidarity movement in the US which is up to the level demanded by the escalating US war drive against them.

But it is also the responsibility of socialists within the solidarity movement to make clear that the US war in Central America is not simply the product of the viciousness of Reagan and Haig. It is only the latest manifestation of the crumbling of American capitalism's empire. The anti-war movement's ability to rally masses of Americans, especially within the labor movement, against intervention in Central America and nuclear weapon escalation is conditioned by the effects of the economic crisis upon them at home. There can be no more "guns and butter" wars. The financing of adventure abroad now comes directly and visibly out of the dwindling social funds for services, education, and public employment. Armed with this understanding, the American left can begin to rebuild itself out of the wave of anti-war (both anti-intervention and pro-disarmament) protest.

While capitalist governments may differ in their attitude toward the specific policies of the US both in Europe and the Third World, they are at one in the imposition of austerity on their own working classes. Thatcherism in Britain, the brutal measures taken against trade unions in Brazil, Turkey and the Philippines -- they differ in intensity and in the specifics, but all are aimed at destroying effective working class resistance to austerity.

Such measures are no longer simply something that happens "over there" in so-called "backward" countries. PATCO was the government's first attempt at destroying an entire union. The shocking passivity of the official labor movement in the face of the firing of the air traffic controllers guarantees that it will not be the last such attempt.

In major industries, the existence of trade unions as such is not yet challenged, but the framework of post-war labor relations is. Pattern bargaining is being dismantled in a gigantic wave of concessions, wage cuts, and working conditions giveaways. Not only union locals but whole cities are held up to corporate blackmail. The trend must be resisted and stopped now; or, after another decade of crisis, American trade unionism will be effectively back where it was at the end of the 1920s.

The crisis of capitalist imperialism is, at root, the same as the crisis at home. It is a crisis of declining profitability which requires, for short-term "solutions," the intransigent defense of each and every piece of the empire and a continual assault on labor and the rights of the oppressed at home; and in the long-run, will only end with the massive destruction of capital in war or the political and social victory of the working class and the fundamental transformation of the entire system.

## B. The Crisis of the Bureaucratic System

The evident crisis of capitalism and the declining ability of American imperialism to police the world has produced, within certain sections of the left, the perception that the US is the "declining" superpower and the Soviet Union is the "rising" one.

This is a fundamental illusion. The crisis of the Soviet Union and the Stalinist system in general is, in some respects, even more acute than that of the capitalist west -- and furthermore, this was apparent even before the Polish events of 1980-81.

The Third Camp socialist viewpoint is historically associated with an analysis of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe which concludes, on the basis of Marxist theory, that these societies have nothing in common with socialism or a progressive "transition" toward it, but that they are class societies in which a ruling class organizes production and expropriates the surplus product created by labor.

Most of us who support this document hold the view that the bureaucratic system represents a break from capitalism, not toward socialism (the rule of the working class) but to a new social system, bureaucratic collectivism, dominated by a new kind of ruling class based not on private ownership of the means of production, but rather on control of the means of production through control over the state. (Ed Note--Formulations will have to be adapted and qualifiers introduced for supporters of state-capitalist theories.)

This new bureaucratic ruling class arose out of a process of counter-revolution inside the first workers' state, Russia, during the mid-1920s through the 1930s. The culmination of this process destroyed all forms of direct and indirect working class political and economic power, destroyed the revolutionary Bolshevik Party and replaced it with a new "party" the upper echelons of which organize the industrial, state and military wings of the bureaucracy.

The expansion of this system to Eastern Europe following World War II, and later to Cuba, was a result of the failure of the working class movement to establish its own rule in circumstances where decaying capitalism itself collapsed under economic and social crisis. The existence of the bureaucratic system is in no way historically inevitable, but represents the penalty the working class movement pays for the failure of the socialist revolution.

In decisive respects, the economic workings and contradictions of the bureaucratic system are distinct from those resulting from production for profit through a capitalist market. Nonetheless, because the bureaucratic system is not socialist, because its attempts at planning are neither controlled from below nor based on the needs and desires of the masses, because it has its own class goals in consumption, the expanded privileges of the bureaucracy and a bias toward the most rapid possible expansion of heavy industry, and -- last but not least -- because it exists in a state of military and political competition with the capitalist system and its imperialism, the bureaucratic system is crisis-ridden and filled with intractable contradictions. Furthermore, because unlike capitalism this system comes into being at a time when a relatively well-developed working class already exists, it has taken only a very brief period of history for these contradictions to take the form of full-scale

revolutionary crisis.

Bureaucratic production has proven to be incredibly inefficient, exploitative, wasteful and short-sighted. Agricultural failures have made the Soviet Union permanently dependent on western grain imports. Except in certain military areas, its technology remains (technological) generations behind that of the West. Attempts at economic rationalization, initiated by the top bureaucracy are chronically blocked at the level of the middle bureaucracy whose entrenched interests would be threatened by reform.

Appearances to the contrary, the Soviet Union is at a profound economic disadvantage in competition for the allegiance of the Third World. With few if any exceptions, developing nations turn for aid to the Soviet bloc only when for political reasons aid from the West is blocked. No country would rationally opt for Soviet technology if aid from others were available. Indeed, both the Eastern bloc and the Soviet Union itself (although less so) have since the mid 1970s piled up such an enormous debt (over \$80 billion, \$27 billion for Poland alone) to Western banks that the crises of the bureaucratic system and world capitalism have become interlocked.

In its competition with the United States, the imperialism of the Soviet Union has suffered more setbacks than advances in the last decade. The Sino-Soviet split and the Chinese decision to adopt a collective security pact with western imperialism, all by itself, is enough to compensate an "geopolitical" gains the Soviet Union has made. In addition, however, while the Soviet Union has expanded its influence in such countries as Ethiopia, Iran (tenuously), Afghanistan, Southern Yemen, Central America (potentially), Angola and Mozambique, it has dramatically lost influence in Egypt, been frozen out of Zimbabwe, lost enormous Third World prestige over Afghanistan, suffered a serious split with Iraq, and faces enormous costs in subsidizing Cuba. European Communist Parties are either in crisis (France), completing a break with the Soviet Union (Italy, Spain), or both.

Then, just as the United States was facing the revolution in its Central American backyard, came the rise of Solidarnosc in Poland. The bankruptcy of a system that can maintain its rule over the workers only by brute force is evident to all but committed Soviet ideologues. The temporary maintenance of Soviet domination and Communist Party rule in Poland has come at the expense of a permanent political discrediting of the Soviet Union and the entire system.

The independent trade union movement in Poland certainly had its share of historically unique features. In principle, however, it is not different from the kind of movement other Eastern European workers and ultimately Soviet workers themselves will build to meet their need for representative institutions. The dynamic inherent in Solidarnosc, to move from the most elementary demand for trade union rights to a revolutionary challenge to the entire structure of power, in only about one year's time, illustrates the brittleness of the bureaucratic system beneath its totalitarian form of rule, and the revolutionary challenge presented to it by any form of working class activity.

In short, it is a fundamental mistake to regard either imperialist system as "rising" or "more aggressive" in regard to the other. Both systems are declining rather than rising. Both are wracked by internal economic difficulties,

both face the spectre of national liberation movements around the edges and deepening social dissatisfaction at the heart of their empires.

But the decline of the capitalist and bureaucratic systems has not made them less dangerous, but more so. They are impelled into an increasingly frightening and unimaginably costly arms race with each other, a race which often seems to take on a logic of its own not susceptible to any human intervention (though this, too, is an illusion). Even more, they are increasingly vicious toward their internal opposition and liberation movements.

At the heart of our perspective is that these systems can be stopped from destroying the world only through struggle from within, by overthrowing them. The workers and peasants of El Salvador and Poland share a common fate -- and along with them, the working people of the United States and the Soviet Union -- even if presently they don't share this view.

### III. The Independence of the Working Class

There is a common denominator of the theoretical and practical work of Third Camp socialists, a guiding principle that we seek to advance through any political position or organizing strategy we adopt toward a specific struggle.

That principle, which is synonymous with the vision of "socialism from below," can be described as the independence of the working class. If this seems to be a simplistic slogan or truism, analysis shows that it is at the heart of practically every major ideological struggle and division in the history of the international socialist movement.

We use the term "Third Camp" to describe the working class and the oppressed peoples of the world, to denote our conception that today there are three basic class forces capable of occupying the position of ruling class in the world. These are the capitalist class, the new bureaucratic ruling class briefly described in the preceding section, and the working class. The alternative to the continued division of the world between rival imperialist blocs, with the ever-present threat of World War between them, is the victory of the working class in alliance with the movements of all the oppressed.

Socialism is the society that the working class will begin to create when it takes power. All theories on the nature of planning, of nationalization, of centralization and decentralization of power, and of the "transition to a socialist economy" must flow from that premise or they are meaningless. There are not shortcuts to, or substitutes for, the rule of the working class through its mass institutions.

The struggle for socialism, therefore, is first and foremost --without in any way discounting the importance of all democratic struggles, of all struggles of the oppressed -- the struggle of the working class, "not only in order to change extant conditions, but also in order to change yourselves and to render yourselves fit for political dominion". (Marx's address to the Communist League, 1850) As Hal Draper puts it in Two Souls of Socialism: "In order to change yourselves and render yourselves fit for political dominion': this is Marx's program for the working class movement, as against both those who say the workers can take power any Sunday, and those who say never."

This class conception of the struggle for socialism is both revolutionary and anti-elitist. It is the core of our answer not only to theoreticians of "peasant socialism" (i.e., the rule of a bureaucratic or capitalist ruling class riding a peasant struggle to power) or to variations of the theory of "planning equals socialism." It is, equally if not more important, our answer to the theory prevalent among socialist and radical intellectuals in our own society, of socialism arising through labor permeation of the Democratic Party, of labor participation in "control of corporate investment," or similar schemes for the restructuring of capitalism through planning or liberal reform.

We participate in and build the struggles of working people from the vantage point of seeking to strengthen their independent institutions and their consciousness. We seek to make the working class movement not the tail for so-called "progressive sections" of other classes, but rather the vanguard in the struggle for democracy as well as socialism. This principle provides us with the essential bridge between practical activity in the struggles of the present and the socialist goal. To further that principle, we seek to build support for independent political action by labor in America, the only economically advanced capitalist country where the labor movement remains strictly a political appendage of the ruling class.

The principle of working class independence does not unlock all the secrets of successful trade union tactics. It does provide some important strategic insights, however. We combine unconditional support for defense of trade unionism against employer attack, with a struggle to revitalize the unions from within through rank and file democracy and the revival of militant traditions of struggle. In every significant American industrial union, this requires organizing at the rank and file level against the deeply entrenched bureaucratic conservatism and privilege of the existing leaderships, as well as their political flunkey-ism toward the Democratic and Republican parties. We view the wide measure of cynicism and apathy at the base of the unions (although to be sure, this is often deliberately overestimated by the bureaucrats), and the bureaucratic structure and policies of the officialdom, to be mutually reinforcing phenomena. There is no short cut around the enormous task of revitalizing the unions at the grass roots both in struggle with the employers and in the struggle for a new union leadership based in and responsible to the ranks. Not only the future of socialism, but to a great extent the very survival of unionism in the crisis of the 1980s, depends on carrying out that revitalization. It is a process in which socialists must be active participants, organizers and leaders, not simply commentators.

We do not see unions as vehicles for purely economic struggle while political issues are fought out somewhere else. Indeed, the very idea of a labor party is intended to make the working class a participant in politics as an independent force. Far less ambitious than this, however, we also see the unions as crucial areas for the raising of anti-war issues, for the defense of the Black community against racism, for the struggles of the women's movement. We do not advocate that movements of the oppressed hold back in their struggles to accommodate a conservative and inactive labor movement, but we do urge them to regard the unions at every level (not only the top) as crucial targets to win over and forge alliances with.

The idea of the independence of the working class implies that socialism

ultimately grows out of the struggles of workers, at the workplace and for a better life. It does not mean that this happens as an automatic process. It means exactly the opposite. Socialism becomes a possibility when those struggles become conscious, when they become aware of all their interconnections with each other, when they are linked together both through large and powerful socialist organization and through mass institutions of struggle such as workers' councils. Working class independence must be organized and fought for. That is the only reason why socialists and socialist organization are necessary in the first place.

#### IV. Today's Movements

The methods of building independent struggle from below that we see as the heart of working class socialist revolution also apply to the mass movements of today. For the mass anti-war movements, for example, to affect US policy they must maintain their political independence on the one hand, and sink their roots deep into America, into the working class, on the other. The notion that mass movements must not embarrass politicians or public figures who are said to be sympathetic has always served to derail movements for change. In the '60s both the Civil Rights and the anti-Vietnam war movements heard this plea again and again. Their mass character and progress was maintained precisely in so far as they rejected those pleas, in favor of mass action and political independence.

This disappearance of the anti-Vietnam war movement in the early '70s dates from the absorption of that movement into the tepid reform efforts of George McGovern in the Democratic Party. After that, the anti-war movement ceased to be an independent factor in American politics.

The lesson of the last great mass movements in the U.S. and of the European disarmament movement today is not that movements should shun politics or the electoral process. Far from it. It is rather that they must develop their own political expressions, independent political action, whether direct or electoral, that allow these movements to fight for their demands without their dilution at the hands of election day "friends" in the Democratic or Republican parties. Thus, whatever their weaknesses, we welcome developments such as the Citizens Party in 1980 and the National Black Independent Political Party. Such development can play a role in advancing those movements and in a larger working class-based break with the twin political parties of American capitalism.

#### V. Some Conclusions.

The left in America must be rebuilt after a decade that began with high hopes and ended in disillusionment, the organized left has rarely presented such a dismal picture of failed perspectives, of sectarian obscurantism on the one hand or cynical adaptation to liberalism on the other. By no means do we, the supporters of this document, exempt ourselves from this assessment. Indeed, precisely because our ultimate goals are so high, and precisely because we consider that events of the 1970s have confirmed our fundamental world view while shattering others, we cannot lightly dismiss the fact that we have failed along with the rest of the left to build a strong socialist presence and organization in the working class.

For most of the 1970s the revolutionary left in America was dominated by

various trends of Maoism. But in the last few years that ideological current has shattered. Partly this can be accounted for by the general failures of the revolutionary left, but part of it stemmed from the demise of China as an attractive pole -- a seemingly revolutionary, even for some a semi-libertarian alternative to the classical Stalinism of the Soviet Union. Both events within China and China's reactionary foreign policy ended that illusion for most, and precipitated a political crisis within American Maoism. This crisis has produced a variety of political directions. Maoism has become a political milieu in flux, producing at its extremes ultra-Stalinism, on the one hand, and pro-west apologias, on the other.

But many of those who supported the Maoist variant of "Marxism-Leninism" have not adopted either of these reactionary positions. A considerable number of them are activists, in trade union, community or white-collar struggles, in the anti-intervention and disarmament movements, etc. Their experiences need not be lost to a generation of new activists now becoming radicalized around these issues. We believe that the world view and key political ideas of Third Camp socialism can win over many of these activists, that this view is both consistent with their ongoing work and provides a framework for a revolutionary socialist theory and practice without the grotesque deformities of competing variants of Stalinism.

We do not regard our Third Camp world view as a finished party program or strategic and tactical recipe book. It is, we believe, the beginning of the way out of an ideological impasse, a way to get out of the straitjacket of debates over "existing socialist states" or "rising" and "declining" superpowers, a way to link the every day struggles of the workers around us to a broader struggle for freedom around the world: in short, a modest but important contribution to the enormous tasks confronting us.

Today, new mass movements are arising in opposition to Reaganism, to the economic and social crisis, to the evident drift toward war -- smaller wars at first and greater ones to follow. Workers, both as individual activists and through the unions, are taking an increasingly active interest in many of these issues. The Black community is increasingly feeling that not only its historic gains, but its physical survival is at stake. The women's movement finds itself the first target of a New Right which sees the defeat of feminism as the first step in the moral re-armament of America. Activity on campuses for disarmament and against intervention in Central America is growing rapidly. We also find a continuing, though less readily mobilized, audience and sympathy for solidarity with the workers of Poland.

Socialists, tragically, cannot approach the new mass movements with unified and effective socialist organization. We can, however, bring to the movement both our experience as activists and, most critically, our political ideas. These ideas can link together one movement's struggles with others, offer a principled, and independent political framework, and in turn lay the basis for building socialist organization with the best of the movement activists.

We regard the conception of Third Camp socialism as a powerful potential ideological weapon. It is a conception which world events are vindicating as the crisis of the capitalist and bureaucratic systems accelerate. It is not some esoteric theoretical abstraction without application to the movements we work in.



Manifesto--14

On the contrary, it is the only theory that makes sense, that explains that you should support the workers of Poland and the people of El Salvador for exactly the same reasons.

The argument that capitalism is irrational, decaying, increasingly militarist and dragging humanity towards barbarism has never been more compelling. Against that reality, the capitalists and their ideologues can only point to the bureaucratic failures of Eastern Europe, to the massive indebtedness of the bureaucratic economies to the West, to the incompatibility of those regimes with any form of democracy or working class rights. To defend the system in one's own country is to accept the barbarism of one's own rulers. To defend the other system as the "alternative" is simply to reinforce the cynicism of the masses one is trying to organize.

The need to organize a Third Camp socialist pole of attraction within the mass movements, and among the cadres of socialists who remain active from the 1970s, is urgent.

(Specific proposals will follow, to be based on conclusions adopted in regroupment discussion. Would be premature to write them now.)

## Convention Resolution

Regroupment: A Revolutionary Socialist Perspective

Kim M., Detroit

A new mood is arising in America and in its wake new movements against war austerity. These new developments are creating a new political climate -- one far more hospitable to the left than that which has prevailed for the past several years. The movements against intervention in Central America and for nuclear disarmament are introducing political ideas, often revolutionary and socialist in content, from Europe and Central America. This changing political context is affecting the revolutionary left, including the trade union left, producing a new mood of cooperation, non-sectarian functioning, and hope. In addition, a new generation of political activists is in the making. A new political context is emerging with the following basic characteristics:

- \* The fragmentation of the left has reversed and the desire for unity has increased and produced a few small initiatives.
- \* The behavior of leftists is becoming less sectarian and more cooperative.
- \* These changes are produced by the political changes wrought by Reaganism.
- \* The rise of the anti-war movements in the US has created a focus for left actions within the mass movements.
- \* These movements, like any other, are developing left, right, and center wings on questions of importance to revolutionary socialists.
- \* The European and Central American movements are providing some of the revolutionary ideas for new political activists.

The emerging movements are politically diverse and there exists no central, hegemonic political tendency -- right, center, or left. While the DSA represents one of the largest groups, its position on the right of most issues in the emerging movements precludes a hegemonic position on the left. As in the unions, where the crisis finds most social democrats on the wrong side of most issues, so in the anti-war movements the attachment of DSA, as an organization, to the liberal wing of the Democratic Party inevitably limits its ability to play a left-wing role. On the revolutionary left, there is no single group capable of playing the sort of role that the SWP played in the anti-Vietnam war movement, or that SDS played in the mid-1960s.

This situation creates both an opening and a need for a new political pole on the revolutionary left. No existing organization is capable of playing that role, or of growing rapidly enough by itself to fill the need. The opportunity and the need has brought forth a new popularity for the idea of regroupment. Indeed, in its own way the merger of NAM and DSOC that produced the DSA has challenged the revolutionary left to prove its ability to achieve a credible level of unity. Small attempts are under way by sections of the revolutionary left to achieve unity, but so far these are limited to "like-minded" groups pursuing the traditional negotiated merger approach to regroupment. But we also believe a broader process is needed.

The IS poses to other revolutionary organizations, individuals, and movement activists that an open process of political discussion aimed at a broad revolutionary socialist regroupment be initiated in the coming months. This process would not require prior political agreement, either on regroupment, or on other issues. The process should begin with open forums, articles and statements on questions of importance today -- particularly those of relevance to activists in the unions, anti-war movements, women's organizations, and Black and Latin communities. The process should be initiated by a broad list of sponsors, spanning the revolutionary left, as well as the various areas of activity. While the IS will play a responsible role in the process, we do not believe that we can or should do it by ourselves. This process must involve the initiative of a broad range of socialists. Organizational affiliations are not,

## Regroupment Resolution--2

in themselves, a barrier to inclusion in this process. Agreement on the goals of the process is not assumed.

We are not naive enough to believe that the revolutionary left, with its various -- often conflicting -- traditions and politics can simply be brought together. We do not expect that everyone who joins in the process will necessarily end up in the same organization. We do, however, believe that a revolutionary organization far broader than any that currently exists is possible, and, if there is to be a viable revolutionary pole in the '80s, is necessary.

In our view it is crucial that any organization that comes out of a regroupment process be capable of functioning in American politics, in the anti-war and social movements, and in the unions. We are not interested in an organization that has no program and no perspective. At the same time, we do not see an ideologically homogeneous organization -- if there has ever really been such a thing -- as a necessity for the next stage of socialist organization. We recognize that any broad organization of revolutionaries will probably have to be multi-tendency. This, in itself, is not a barrier to a common program of action, to the existence of majorities and minorities on a number of programmatic questions, or to the ability to function democratically.

To implement this perspective, the IS Political Committee will establish a national regroupment committee of the IS, with a steering Committee in Detroit. In addition, the pages of Changes will feature open debates and discussions, with articles by people from a variety of tendencies, along the lines of the motion passed by the PC in April, 1982.

For Broad Third Camp Regroupment

-- Mike P.  
5/4/82

Kim's regroupment document is a valuable contribution to the discussion. I particularly want to support 3 major points in his analysis. But these 3 points also lead to conclusions different from Kim's.

#### 1) THE ANTI-WAR MOVEMENTS

While we were talking ourselves into a corner around DSOC, we were missing the new consciousness and movements which are changing the whole political context within which we function.

What is just beginning to get off the ground in Detroit and the Midwest is much more developed on both coasts. That the movement is really only starting but that there are expectations for 1/2 million people in NY in June should be something of an indication. Even more exciting is the developing level of the political debate. A good part of this movement were educated through the Vietnam struggle and with the impact of Poland, El Salvador, the crisis in the labor movement and in the cities, the Reagan attacks on minorities and women, a major wing of this movement starts out making political connections at a high level. At the recent NY Protest and Survive Conference virtually every speaker spoke from an explicit socialist point of view. And the audience which included nonsocialists as well felt completely comfortable with this.

This movement is also serving to politicize or repoliticize sections of the trade union left which had limited itself to narrow trade union work as the left disintegrated around it.

#### 2. AGGRESSIVE REGROUPMENT

Kim's document rightly points out that previous regroupment strategies focused on group to group leadership negotiations and hence allowed little room for the membership of groups or unaffiliated individuals to be active in the process. Any real CAMPAIGN has to be something that every member can be involved in and can utilize the input and energy of every nonmember revolutionary who would like to create a group they can comfortably call home.

#### 3) THE PROCESS

Finally, Kim is absolutely correct in talking about Regroupment as a process. We can have certain expectations about that process but it will be a process. We can not expect regroupment to work if we suck out of our thumbs the basic forms and content of a regrouped organization and wait for everybody else to sign on. What's needed are concrete steps to get the processes going. Kim has suggest some good starting steps. Elsewhere, Mel B and I have suggested some others. We need more.

#### WHAT WE PROJECT

Having said all this about the focus on process we still have to project

something to give an idea of what WE are working for. We are open to change and indeed if we have learned anything about organization in the last 15 years it is that organizational politics and structures must have a relationship to what is going on around. But given what we know now we have to project some sense as to where we are going. Kim does do this. But I don't believe that these projections flow from his analysis.

Kim projects a regroupment with the following outlines:

- A) The members are self-described revolutionaries.
- B) The group would have an "operational set of politics, a basic program, for intervention into American political life...agreement on a near term strategy for socialists in the U.S."
- C) A "multi-tendency" organization consisting of organized tendencies
- d) Much broader than a Third Camp organization. This is obviously implied when Kim talks about the Third Camp politics as one of the organized tendencies within this regrouped organization.

Whatever value this approach might have had a year ago, it misses what is happening now. Now is exactly the time that Third Camp ideas are becoming operational in American politics. That is the significance of the politicized disarmament movement. Kim recognizes that the question of unilateralism is already a cutting edge question. But any discussion beyond the first sentence that supports "unilateralism" immediately gets into Third Camp Politics. Are you for Unilateralism in the East as well? If you are for Unilateralism in the US does that mean you think that Russian bombs (policy) pose no threat? Or do you see that a political struggle in the West for unilateral disarmament undercuts the Russian ruling class ability to sell its war policy and is therefore a powerful encouragement to a disarmament movement in the East? Just making the connections between Poland, El Salvador, the Mideast and disarmament automatically raises the Third Camp AS OPERATIONAL IDEAS.

A group which does not have rough general agreement on a broad third camp politics will not be able to intervene in the very movements or on the very issues which are actually moving people toward thinking about regroupment.

We should be projecting a broad Third Camp regroupment. This does not mean simply reuniting the "geological layers" of the IS. We have to define Third Camp in terms of today's questions rather than in terms of Trotskyist history. In the broad sense, Third Camp means support for workers struggle and National liberation and opposition to imperialist domination everywhere. We may even have to give up the term "Third Camp" because of its historical connections.

But, the disintegration of Maoism, the effects of Poland etc have politically moved a large section of the left into Third Camp politics broadly defined. Fifteen years ago Paul Sweezy was counted as one of the leading theoreticians of Socialism-from-above. Now the thousands who have been forced by events to make similar political migrations to third camp politics in the broad sense should be in the same organization intervening in the world.

This brings me to my other objection to what Kim projects. As Kim rightly states we do not simply want an organizational merger of currently organized tendencies. I do not believe unaffiliated individuals will find attractive the idea of an umbrella organization structured around groups which have their own program of action using the umbrella for a battle ground. I certainly don't. Who is going to take responsibility for the umbrella group as a whole? The very

attraction of a regroupment now is because there is a real political struggle out there that revolutionaries can intervene in. A large regrouped revolutionary left can gain a broad audience for its ideas beyond the narrow circles in which we have been debating each other.

Kim's "either-or" -- either you project a multi-tendency organization or a Democratic Centralist one -- is wrong. This dichotomy is true only if we are talking about an organization consisting of little more than competing organized tendencies. But if our aim is to bring in large numbers of unaffiliated individuals then here is another alternative. We should be projecting an organization united around a clear operational program and encourage the idea that every difference does not need an organized faction or tendency. A sign of the growing maturity of the left is a recognition that different political questions within the organization will cut across all kinds of different lines.

We want to project an organization that unaffiliated individuals can think of as THEIR organization which increases THEIR effectiveness in the world without also having to form their own sub-organization. If they wanted to create their own small tendency organization they probably would have done so already. And they don't need to form a new organization to watch the battle of the sects.

\*\*\*\*\*

We will not be voting at the Convention on Kim's document but on a two page resolution which Kim has not yet finished. Depending on the exact formulations in his resolution I will offer some amendments along the lines described above.

For a Broad Third Camp Regroupment

ammendment to Regroupment Resolution

Mike P.  
5/18/82

(Replace 2nd last paragraph of resolution with the following)

In our view it is crucial that any organization that comes out of the regroupment process be capable of functioning in American politics, in the anti-war and social movements and in the labor unions. This requires a common approach within the organization toward the cutting-edge questions facing these struggles. These questions change with time. For the next period common agreement appears necessary on:

\*\*\* Rebuilding the trade unions as militant democratic organizations of workers struggle; for a labor offensive in politics and building toward a labor party; against strategies of class collaboration.

\*\*\* Opposing the growing drive toward war and all imperialist domination; for unilateral nuclear disarmament in the U.S. and every other country; support for worker and national liberation struggles everywhere.

\*\*\* Fighting all forms of oppression (racial, sexual, national) of sections of the working class; support to independent organizations of the oppressed.

This program covers a broad range of the the revolutionary left, organizations and individuals. At the same time it provides for a common approach for what seem now to be the key questions of the 80's. This common agreement plus the developing maturity of the left makes it possible to create an activist organization that both members of present groups and current independents can feel is their organization. It will be possible to break from conceptions that every question requires a line and disciplined action or that every difference requires an organized tendency, or that differences always cut across the same lines. The sharpening crisis, involvement in common struggles, and the experience of the past 20 years should help keep these organizational problems in perspective.

I. Convention Steering Committee

The Steering Committee shall be established at the beginning of the Convention. Its main purpose is to maximize the amount of time available for substantive discussion by reducing the amount of time the whole convention spends trying to determine procedure. Any problems or proposed changes in convention procedure or agenda should be brought first to the Convention Steering Committee. The Steering Committee shall recommend to the convention chairpeople for the sessions, agenda changes and procedures for dealing with the points on the agenda. Its recommendations shall be voted on with no discussion unless there is a minority report from the committee or an alternative from the floor.

II. Chairpeople

The chairperson plays a crucial role in guiding the convention through procedural hassles. The chair should have considerable discretionary power in making rulings on procedural questions. The check on this power is Motion to Overrule the Chair. Motion to Overrule the Chair requires seconding by an estimated 10% of the body. The maker of the motion speaks for 1 minute for the motion; chair for 1 minute against the motion. Immediate vote.

III. Voting

Voting may be conducted in the following ways:

1. Voice Vote
  2. Hand Showing (on demand of any member)
  3. Hand Count (on demand of 10% as estimated by Chair)
- Unless otherwise specified, all motions require a simple majority (50% + 1) of those voting yes or no.

IV. Substantive Motions

1. No substantive motion or amendment may be entertained unless it has FIRST been submitted to the Convention Secretary in writing.
2. All motions or amendments ruled "stylistic" by the chair shall be submitted to a styles committee established by whatever continuing body is established by the convention.
3. No substantive motion or amendment of more than one paragraph or 50 words in length shall be entertained which has not been duplicated and distributed, unless seconded by one-third of the members.
4. All substantive motions or amendments must have an estimated 10% of the body as seconds to be considered, unless placed on the agenda as part of the Steering Committee's approved report.

V. Discussion

- A. The Steering Committee shall make recommendations on the time of presentations, floor discussions, and summaries.
- B. Unless otherwise provided for there shall be a limit of 3 minutes per speaker and no speaker shall speak twice in the same round of floor discussion. Observers who notify the chair may be given speaking rights at the end of each session, time permitting.
- C. Where no time limit has been proposed by the Steering Committee the chair must propose one.



Convention Rules--2

VI. Miscellaneous Motions

- A. To table: requires simple majority, not debatable.
- B. To commit (i.e., to a committee) or postpone (to a specific time) requires simple majority, limited debate at discretion of chair (e.g. 2 speakers for, 2 against). This procedure may be suspended in a proposal by the Steering Ctee.
- C. To reconsider: must be made by someone who voted on the prevailing side and seconded by an estimated 10%. Limited debate (2 for; 2 against). This procedure may be suspended in a proposal by the Steering Committee.
- D. Procedural (for suggesting a procedure to handle a given point): non-debatable, except at the discretion of the chair. Requires simple majority.
- E. To recess: non-debatable except at the discretion of the chair. May be ruled out of order by the chair if previously made during the last hour. Requires simple majority.
- F. To end debate and come to vote (call or move the question): non-debatable. Chair must ask for a voice vote showing first those who do not wish to end debate, and then take a normal vote. Requires simple majority.
- G. To adjourn: same procedure as to recess. The meeting is not adjourned until the chair declares it adjourned. The chair at his/her discretion may announce or inquire about the remainder of business for the body.

VII. Miscellaneous Points

- A. Point of personal privilege: To be used only when there is an impairment to participation in the meeting such as a draft, high noise level, etc. It may NOT be used as a way of getting the floor if verbally attacked or even slandered by another delegate.
- B. Point of procedure: Motion to alter or add to the procedure of the body.
- C. Point of order: to be used when it is felt that the body or chair has deviated from its previously established rules or procedures. May not be used to challenge the relevance of a speaker's remarks. May challenge the ruling of the chair.
- D. Point of information: To ASK a question of the chair. May not be used to give information or interrogate another delegate.
- E. Point of clarification: there is NO SUCH THING.

All these points may be made by shouting out. Except for personal privilege, they may not interrupt someone while he or she is speaking. The chair is not required to recognize all persons who rise to various points if s/he feels that the meeting is degenerating or seriously impaired.