

Nedy

60¢

SPARTACIST LEAGUE

INTERNAL INFORMATION BULLETIN

Additional Documentary Material on Moore/Stuart and Treiger, Cunningham

"I have dirty hands, comrades."

-Nick Benjamin

(Minutes, Expanded
PB #50 -- Second
Session, 24 June
1972, page 23)

SPARTACIST
Box 1377, G.P.O.
New York, N.Y. 10001

November 1972
whole no. 18
Two Dollars

Table of ContentsPage

I. <u>Note on the Departed Cliquists</u> by the N.O., 13 Nov. 1972	4
II. <u>Early Material on Moore/Stuart Cliquism:</u>	
-Letter to Moore/Stuart by Helen C., 17 May 1971	6
-Letter to Helen C. by Moore, 19 May 1971	9
-Letter to Helen C. by Moore, 10 September 1971	12
-Letter to Helen C. by Moore, 22 September 1971	14
-Letter to Larry L. by Moore, 6 December 1971	19
-Special PB International Group Meeting, 19 December 1971 (Notes by PB Secretary)	21
-Letter to Steve G. by Moore, 14 January 1972	29
III. <u>Material on Cunningham, Benjamin and Rogers:</u>	
-Note to Cunningham by Benjamin; and Reply by Cunningham, 24 February 1972	31
-Letter to Janet R. by Moore, 28 April 1972	32
-Letter to Cunningham (Unsent) by Benjamin, 12 June 1972 (?)	33
-Letter to Cunningham (Unsent) by Benjamin, before 24 June 1972	34
-Draft Resignation by Janet R., 25 June 1972	37
-Note to Janet R. by Benjamin, 25 June 1972	37
-Note to Robertson by Janet R.; and Reply by Robertson, 25 June 1972	37
-Note on a Conversation with Cunningham by Jeff B. (Bay Area), 30 June 1972	38
IV. <u>Confrontations in SL Locals:</u>	
-Carter/Nelson-Cunningham Debate--Minutes of Joint California Meeting, 1-2 July 1972:	
First Session, 1 July 1972	39
Second Session, 2 July 1972	50

Table of Contents--continuedPage

-Factional Statement (to Joint California Meeting) by Cunningham, Rep, Janet R. and Mirra M., 1 July 1972	59
-Robertson-Stuart Debate--Minutes of Boston Local Committee, 2 July 1972	60
-Summary of Evidence on Moore Clique by George A., 4 July 1972	87
-Motions and Voting Record--Excerpt from Minutes of NYC Local Committee, 4 July 1972	89
 V. <u>Rogers Case:</u>	
-PB Motion Suspending Janet Rogers, 9 July 1972	91
-Request for Transfer to Bay Area by Janet R., 8 July 1972	91
-PB Motion on Rogers' Transfer Request, 13 July 1972	92
 VI. <u>Cunningham Resignation from PB:</u>	
-Statement of Resignation from PB by Cunningham, 13 July 1972	93
-Action of CC on Cunningham Resignation, 15 July 1972	93
 VII. <u>Denise C. Case:</u>	
-Expulsion of Denise C. from RCY--Extract of Minutes of NB #21, 14 Sept. 1972; and Four Appendices:	94
1) Extract of NYC SL Local Minutes, 4 July 1972	95
2) LA RCY Local Minutes, 5 August 1972	96
3) Statement by Duffy M. (LA), 7 August 1972	100
4) Report by Todd N. (NYC), 14 September 1972	101
 VIII. <u>Chronology of Clique Defections</u>	
	102

* * *

This Bulletin is essentially a supplement to Internal Information Bulletin no. 14, June 1972. Related material also appears in Bulletin nos. 15, 16 and 17.

NOTE ON THE DEPARTED CLIQUISTS

In lieu of any full summing up of the internal situation (now external in view of the departure of the "oppositionists") it seems to be in order to make a few observations.

The selections in this bulletin from the "dirty file" are perhaps somewhat diffuse, since they consist mainly of personal correspondence. The purpose of this material is to document the pattern of operation of Cunningham and Moore. Moore's letters clearly demonstrate Moore-Stuart's attempts to use personal connections to push organizational policies, especially in the RCY; the unsent letters to Cunningham from Benjamin conclusively show that these ex-comrades, over a long period, shared the most serious organizational and political differences which they, at Cunningham's insistence, hid from the Political Bureau and the membership.

Lengthy sets of minutes from local meetings are included because of the absence of any oppositional documents, or even resignation statements, from the defectors. We would have greatly preferred being able to circulate such documents prepared by the "oppositionists" themselves since minutes are inevitably inaccurate and incomplete.

The sheer weight of cliquist material in this and previous bulletins--much of it trivial, redundant and above all wilfully and evasively unpolitical--should not obscure what is decisive. The material is political; it reflects in devastating, even lurid, fashion the inexorable motion of this rotten cliquist combination toward the fulfillment of its inherent political program.

Second-hand hearsay and circumstantial evidence (but still nothing in writing) have it that in only a matter of weeks these intransigents have come to challenge or deny: the possibility or desirability of the Fourth International, the validity of the Transitional Program, the necessity of principled struggle against the labor bureaucracy, the maintenance of Leninist democratic-centralism, and any trace of resistance to rotten blocs. These people are, in a word, already fit candidates for membership in the left-reformist IS.

The positions of these ex-Trotskyists are but the objective programmatic scaffolding to contain the petty-bourgeois snobbery, arrogance, self-pity, skepticism, personalism and above all dilettantism to which these Treigers, Moores and those "supreme Marxist moralists," the Cunninghams, capitulated. And therein lay both the source of their desperate tension with the SL and of their overwhelming repudiation by the SL membership which is committed in life as well as theory to the revolutionary struggle.

* * *

It should be noted that the PB has postponed taking any disciplinary action against Moore-Stuart, despite repeated serious violations of discipline by them, because Moore promised to write a document presenting his views. However, as of this time no document has been received. Moreover, to our knowledge there has been no communi-

cation whatsoever from Moore-Stuart to any member or body of the SL since their departure from the U.S. for personal career reasons. The anomalous situation of their membership should be cleared up at or following the National Conference.

There still remain several instances of disputed facts. The purpose of the earlier document, "Account of Recent Internal Developments," was to put in writing all the allegations as well as the evidence we had, in the hope that it could be challenged and the facts established in a Control Commission. With the departure of Cunningham and Co. this has become much more difficult. Many of the essential accusations are verified by material from the "dirty file" but some of the projections, especially of the internal dynamics and development of the cliques, can never be finally "proved," but must be judged on the basis of the information we have. We still believe it is important to hold a Control Commission to deal with some of the specific disputed facts--especially Cunningham's repeated accusations against Comrade Tweet Carter that she lied about what he had told her concerning his grievances about the SL--its regime, personnel, politics, putative CC candidates, etc.

Finally, it should be noted that one of the motions passed at the 1-2 July West Coast meeting was based on a misconception. It is extremely important to maintain a separation between the financing of any majority or minority faction and the national SL treasury. Any expenses of a faction must be raised by a faction fund drive. Of course, any struggle against ex-members is a struggle of the whole party against external opponents and is financed by the whole organization.

--National Office, 13 November 1972

[NYC]
17 May 1971

[Boston]

Dear Bill and Judy:

You know by now I'm fairly inarticulate in conversation, particularly when presented with disturbing information. Such as your phone call of Sunday afternoon--which bothered me a lot. The more I think about it, the more I believe that my moving to Boston will not solve the problems you raise in connection with the local. The fact that contacts are coming to you with the same criticisms of George and Chris and Judy K. and Nancy which you have seems to me very serious. It may be that they are partly reflecting your own observations and feelings, but still--where there's smoke, there's usually fire, and I think that you are obligated to discuss this all with the national leadership. I am not capable of resolving anything for you, neither does my position in the organization warrant it. You have to talk to Jim or other PB members, such as Al and Liz, when they were up there.

Look, it's just not true that if you raise any criticisms of how things are handled you are going to be 'punished'--what's worse I think, is how you are doing things now. Private conversations are a great release and help a lot, I know, but if it's really true that you think the local is going to disintegrate and fall apart, and/or George's political reputation is going to be destroyed, then you are absolutely obligated to the organization as a whole to try to do something about it--particularly for the sake of the other comrades involved, who may be unconscious of the depth of your fears, or unaware of what's happening to them. I know I myself am often unaware of how I'm fucking up something and I really appreciate being told how to do it right. The S.L. is supposed to be a collective of some kind, isn't it?--that means to me that members are obligated to criticize other members, further, to try and reach some solution of the problem through the organizational structure we have established (which, I admit, is not all that sensitive, immediately responsive, etc.)

You say you've been threatened if you stir up any trouble. Well, the trouble's obviously there anyhow, in the first place. Second, the only way it's going to get resolved is, I'm afraid, through discussion with the national leadership, because as long as the Spartacist League does exist, those are the people ultimately responsible and able to resolve it. I can't do anything for you! And it really bothers me...maybe the S.L. is not a very good org. but it's all we've got and we have to use it the way it's supposed to be used. You really have to try. I do sympathize with your fears, though--I remember during the faction fight, when I first joined, everybody was very tense and nervous, and I got one of the biggest shocks of my life when I was accused of a lot of shit, first behind my back (Dave talking to Nick) and then when I insisted on talking to him personally, to my face...just general suspicion, etc. But if that kind of distrust exists, the only way to clear it up is by facing it and bringing it out in the open. I am not that suspicious of the leadership--I think if you're right, you shouldn't have anything to be afraid of. The only thing is, it takes a long time of screaming and kicking to

make people respond. And if it's done privately only, that makes the distrust worse, because it will make the leadership believe you don't trust it to be fair. So you go sneaking around complaining to everybody and not raising your criticisms to the people who are ultimately responsible for what's going on, and who can resolve it. That's what really bothers me, I guess.

I know you don't want to talk to Jim. It's probably not going to be very pleasant--but it's a hell of a lot better than your present feelings of isolation, bitterness and rapidly developing cynicism. Judy saying "I just can't stand it much longer," etc. You shouldn't have to feel isolated--at this point if I were you I wouldn't even care what happened to me, I would just come out and start screaming what I think. If you really believe that you don't have any chance whatsoever to be heard, or to be treated fairly by the national leadership, then that means there's something awfully wrong with the S.L., and I don't think there is. There are a lot of things wrong, that's true, but things really aren't that bad.

I am not trying to encourage a huge messy fight or anything... I hate them. But to see you afraid to talk to anybody responsible is really disturbing.

So I guess all I can say is, please, you have to try to get this whole thing out in the open--probably by talking privately to Jim (yes, again if it still isn't settled) first. I don't know what else to say.

Except about me going to Boston--you have to realize what I am, anyhow, my talents, capabilities, potential, etc. I certainly believe I can't handle the problems you are raising. I'm good at doing a lot of hard work of a fairly high technical level, I can be pretty stubborn and argumentative, but not necessarily that convincing due to my own lack of experience with a wide range of political types. For contacting work--I can make 3 million phone calls, set things up, etc. But I don't know very much. God damn it. I'm sorry about it, but right now I just don't. Seems to me what you want is somebody like Dave or Al, with the political experience and knowledge to convince and recruit fairly sophisticated contacts. Also, somebody to provide leadership to the local...I can't do that. It's not that I'm scared to find out how much I don't know, that I feel comfortable and safe insulated in the N.O. or anything, because I don't. I just think I'm good at what I'm doing, it's needed, and I'm trying to develop politically and think I can do that as well here as anywhere, and in some ways better maybe. Besides, I really do want a chance to try and be good at editing the RMC Newsletter--I like it (I know it was kind of accident I got stuck with it in the first place, but still...). I'm not trying to denigrate my own talents or anything, just trying to be honest. I'm not very good at a lot of things...and I want the chance to try to be good at what I'm doing right now.

I just don't think I'm the right person to go. (on the other hand, I know it's true one learns things by being forced to, but that's another question).

I can't help it. I just don't think this organization is in such bad shape it will let a local blow up, particularly our most (or almost) important one. If I'm wrong, you can tell me you told me so, but I really don't think I am. I know I've kept quiet when I shouldn't have about a lot of things that have been fucked up, but that's my fault, not the org.'s. If something's wrong, you should say so, as soon as possible. I was pissed off at Liz at the last Youth Bureau meeting we had, because she raised the complaint that she had never seen any RMC mail, felt we were keeping it to ourselves on purpose, etc...if she had said that a couple of months ago, or asked us to show her the mail, told us that as National Secretary she had to know what's going on, which she does, I know we would have made a point of making it accessible--but that particular thing wasn't mentioned to me or Mark, so we just didn't think about it and it wasn't done. And so she got upset, and I got upset, and felt bad about not doing it, but was glad that at least it got finally resolved.

Anyhow, and finally (I hope), this whole mess is not just your problem, it's an organizational problem of the Spartacist League. If Judy's going around having headaches every day about this stuff, that's irresponsible in a sense, because it impairs your functioning and in that sense hurts the whole S.L. (besides being a crummy way to have to live.)

Well, I don't think I'm telling you what you want to hear, but I can't help it, that's what I think.

Hope to see you soon.

[Helen C.]

[Boston]
May 19, 1971

[NYC]

Dear Helen:

Just a brief interim reply to your letter. Yes we do have a political duty to raise our criticisms. Nothing that is going on now hasn't been going on since George and Judy [K.] came here. We have raised our criticisms as well as suggestions for Jim or other experienced comrades to talk over George's political cum personal problems. We wrote a letter in Jan. 1970 (no response), Judy [G.] called NYC and talked to Jim for over two hours in June 1970 when George became hysterical over the phone (response: "bite a bullet"), in November, 1970 I wrote a letter to Jim which expressed my concern over George and Judy's political future after George was laid off and suggested that the national leadership make every attempt to pressure George into a trade union situation before he was laid off. (response: nice idea, but as far as I know there was no concerted pressure exerted. Today George has been unemployed since the beginning of February and is completely demoralized, as I had thought he would be.) After Chris came here he fell hook, line and sinker for Judy's (K) line that the nasty G.'s were trying to drive them out of the org and had been spreading all sorts of "lies" about them. Result is that Chris goes to NYC and says the problem is Judy G. and her "vindictiveness" or some such crap. (Jim agreed with this.) In Jan. Jim was here and we discussed the situation and told him it was by no means solved and that Chris' judgement was completely off base. Recently (see the last two Boston local minutes; you might advise other comrades to look at them), after several important political fuck-ups (some of which Jim witnessed while he was here), I introduced three motions. Two passed, the third which had the organizational teeth to implement the other two was defeated (2 for, 4 against-guess who?). These were discussions on political priorities and how to balance our work so that we could take advantage of all the good contacts we have.

To quote you: "So you go sneaking around complaining to everybody and not raising your criticisms to the people who are ultimately responsible for what's going on, and who can resolve it."

Bullshit! The only people we have ever talked to (apart from the above--what is Jim's responsibility) have been our personal friends. Your observation strikes me simply incredible coming from someone who has been told most of the above at one time or another.

Another remark of yours which has the same tone: "The fact that contacts are coming to you with the same criticisms of George and Chris and Judy K. and Nancy which you have seems to me very serious. It may be that they are partly reflecting your own observations and feelings, but..." (my underlining). This comment and the above implies an attitude that somehow we have been guilty of some infractions of democratic centralism, etc. which is complete nonsense. If we (Judy and I) are in a minority and have already raised our criticisms of the locals' organizational inefficiency at meetings, and a contact (who was at these meetings) comes to us after being raked over the coals by Chris for "PL Challenge selling mentality" when he was trying

to raise criticisms of George's handling of the Workers' Action distribution, what are we supposed to say? That the distributions are going along fine; that Chris was correct in his demagogic steamrolling of this contact--obviously not. What we have said is that the local is going through some problems because of people's personal lives--George's being unemployed and Nancy's unnamed kid, etc.

If this problem is raised, how can it be handled? Nancy needs a psychiatrist very badly; Chris is ignoring the situation completely (does no contacting or other work, going to bed at 7:30 p.m. every night). How is the PB going to handle this when they are going to leave in two months. Why have a big blow-up in Boston which will inevitably affect our close contacts (probably for the worse). We have done our political duty; we are trying to hold the local together and recruit in this situation. I really don't see any viable alternative.

After we have made all our criticisms of George etc. (see above) Jim wanted to send him to London as our international rep.! What more can one say.

If the PB after reading the latest minutes, if Liz and Al after seeing the pitiful turnout at our latest public forum, don't see that something is wrong and is not due to our bad-mouthing people (an allegation I resent), then I don't see how our raising the problem once again will help.

As far as your cri de coeur that you are not qualified etc, I could go into that at length, but I think it is a lot of nonsense. At all costs we need some outside cadre person to come in and be organizer for a while (several of the contacts once in the org are very competent and could function as organizer after several months integration). The Chris-Nancy problem is temporary for Boston, let the N.O. and the NYC handle it when they get there: it's absurd to do it now when the PB sent them here, esp., considering the fact that she refused to get the abortion (Jim's capitulation). So after August we only have the George-Judy problem which I believe can be handled in the short run by technical expedients. George's problem has been that he was expected to lead and be a great organizer. He isn't. With you as organizer and Judy G. and George on the Exec. most of Boston's organizational problems can be solved. Whether or not it is possible to solve the question of George's political authority is another question. You are the most available top cadre material (Dave and Al would be much harder to shake loose), you are energetic, competent, and have no visible signs of neurosis to affect your functioning. To attempt to beg off is a political cop-out... You can develop your political abilities, but first you have to want to do it. I realized you enjoy the RMC work and you have done an excellent job with it, but there is no reason for you to consider yourself only capable of 'functionary' type work. I think you could do a very good job holding the local together while developing the excellent contacts we have here. I really have more to say on this, but more later.

This local is held together by scotch tape and bailing wire; a

big investigation as Jim projected in January would leave lasting scars in this area. If the judgment was against us (G, J, C, N are better commies, etc) the impact on the contacts we are now in the process of recruiting would be incalculable, esp., since I wouldn't be here to counsel restraint. (Of course Judy G. would have to leave as well in this case). I'd rather have migraine headaches and a nervous stomach than see three years of political work go down the drain.

Love,
Bill

p.s. It's too bad if the PB is 'offended' if they assume we think they won't be just. The history of this affair leaves no room for optimism.

Brannenburg
September 10, 1971

[NYC]

Dear Helen:

I just received your letter of 16 August, needless to say 'your credibility'! is somewhat worse for wear. You mailed it first class which goes by the boat, only airmail is fast. In fact, it usually takes a month by boat so your letter was fast. You must have been very tired when you wrote it, I can barely read it.

When I first got here I was very depressed, lately I have been coming out of it. I am beginning to make progress in German and the social life here isn't so bad....There is a little circle of communists and fellow travelers, consisting of me, quite a few Italians, and some Rumanians. Lately, I have heard very little from the USA, except surprisingly from Larry L. I don't know what is the matter with Judy but I have written a very nasty letter, which hopefully will not be without effect. Last weekend was my birthday and I haven't even received a note or telegram. Also there are important political and personal things which she promised to do: so far either next to nothing has been done or she hasn't informed me. Also I have written about five letters to the NO, and in particular need to know something about how attitude to the latest IKD-RCL action, (I must know in order to tell RCL or IKD) so far not a word. It is not very pleasant to live in a personal and political vacuum: I guess I'm lucky to have the type of personality which can go along without reinforcement.

The fuck-up you describe over the SWP convention is a nightmare. I don't know what the SL is going to do unless Robertson wakes up and organizes a bureaucracy. The new comrades in Boston will not--like you did--jump up at the drop of a hat and run off to Ohio. They won't be brow beaten either. I would like to know why the article that I translated for the Spartacist has not appeared. I have a suspicion that after Jim and Liz discovered that it had appeared in the Fourth International that they decided to put it on the shelf. Splendid use of manpower and planning! I have heard that George in Boston is beginning to have his problems, esp., with the MS'ers. They are simple naive people and can't understand the profundity that George can fuck off, not work, be completely unorganized and yet be the wonderful leader that others make him out to be. The Boston problem until June was aggravated by New York, that is by Jim. His whole attitude is based on false premises and is absolutely wrong. If Judy lost her temper, and you say 'it's not helpful to personally alienate the national leadership,' the cause was Robertson's earlier policy. The proof is the construction of the Boston local which was built by Judy and I against George, Chris, and the NO (until June). We were right and still are. The problem is that Jim has alienated a fine cadre, Judy, and has made a bad error in judgement. It remains to be seen whether Judy has the political strength to overcome this bad treatment and develop in spite of Jim's past attitude. So Benjamin thinks Robertson is nuttier than a fruitcake? I hope he doesn't murder Chris, Nancy, and the kid. He will sure have to eat crow if Judy builds the Boston local in a way commensurate with the

opportunity. 30 people at RMC conf. from Boston alone. I am proud.

So please write and tell me about the plenum and soon, the personal messes that are inevitably going to develop. Also I would like to hear Nick's opinion on post plenum prospects. I desperately need to know what is going on if I am to effectively represent the SL here. Could you xerox the PB minutes which are not yet approved, that is the only I can think of that I can find out enough specifics.

Could you please bug Jim to write me about the latest IKD-RCL maneuver.

Love,
Bill

P.S. Inviting Chris is consistent with Jim's earlier behavior, even if he didn't do it. Until you told us what went on in the PB he said nothing menacing, and on the surface was ever so friendly. Judy was, in particular, duped, I wasn't.

Type your letters on airmail paper or the special envelop-letter form so I can read. And please air mail.

Brannenburgh

September 22, 1971

[NYC]

Dear Helen:

I received your letter of 8 September on Monday and your letter of Sept. 18 today. Also on Monday I finally received notes from the Plenum plus documents. In spite of the success of the CWC fusion the overall impression I get is not entirely positive (a sense of foreboding), perhaps because of the continually problems with Boston and the disagreements I have with your analysis which I find impressionistic. But before I get into all the mess: Congratulations on election to the PB!

I am puzzled at the character of your analysis of the mistakes of the Boston local as well as your general attitude to the problems of the SL. Now that you're on the PB you can have a direct impact on the politics and organization and I hope you will not refrain from criticism. Therefore, I am somewhat worried the tone of your remarks on the Boston RMC problem. I can only contrast the tone of your remarks on Boston with how pissed off you were over the SWP intervention: your anger at the NO fuck-ups seems to be always ephemeral, while your line on the Boston situation seems to me both askew and harsh. Both seem to be impressionistic reflecting a pervasive tendency which I have observed. When you say the fault is on both sides or call my attitude defensive I can only describe your attitude as eclectic. As far as 'defensiveness' goes, that is merely a tactical expedient, the mistakes made by the NO in Boston reflect a pervasive organizational malaise which I have no power or influence to right. Therefore, it is only possible to argue about the merits of this case which skews the argument completely. This is nothing new, Nick has repeatedly remarked on it, and on occasion you have chimed in as well.

I hate to rake over the past, but the character of your remarks makes it impossible not to go over this problem once again. Without a clear analytic perspective, cause and effect become so intimately joined that one is forced to say, the way you do, fault lies on both sides. A concession which is worthless in the context you place it. (Who ever said that hard work is a substitute for general political competence, that sounds like Liz criticizing the RMC. Without the hard work there would be no Boston local. If you can not admit that point there is no point in discussing). I have never excused the limitations of Judy, the softness of particular RMCers, or the deviousness of Phil R. Leaderships can make blunders without being bankrupt, and one can criticize these mistakes without questioning the general political thrust of the leadership. For example:

1. Before the First World War Rosa Luxemburg and Leo Jogiches were mistakenly convinced that Karl Radek had committed some gross organizational crime (like filching party funds, I can't quite remember). Therefore they drove him out of the Social Democratic Party of Poland. Radek had the inner resources (and the support of Lenin) to weather this crisis.

2. In 1921 Paul Levi suffered complete political breakdown because of the idiotic 'March Action' initiated by Radek with the connivance of Zinoviev behind the backs of Lenin and Trotsky. The course of the German party was eventually corrected, but Levi, the only German leader after the death of Luxemburg (with historical hindsight) capable of leading the party was lost for good (he committed suicide in 1928). Weak people can be destroyed by mistaken policies, and the ultimate responsibility belongs to the leadership and to no one else. (one can of course make the profound observation that people like Levi will inevitably betray the revolution). You say 'let's not get carried away.' For me it is impossible to struggle consistently as a revolutionist without a clear analytic perspective. I cannot subordinate analysis which is derived from Marxist theory and empirically verified, to the exigencies of the moment. What you seem to be saying in my opinion is "forget it." But what if Judy suffered complete collapse and the Boston local went down the drain. Would Jim, Chris, and George automatically be right? What would we have learned about the nature of Jim's leadership? These are questions you can ask yourself, for me it is clear that one cannot develop competent cadre through pressure cooker methods. Nor can one build a revolutionary party on the basis of the seniority system. My main point on the past Boston problem is simple: no one ever adduced any evidence or tried to convince me of the correctness of the line Jim took. It was merely asserted. I had experienced the contrary and cannot like a heretic 'recant' my heresy.

Your attitude to the contemporary problems with which I am not well versed strikes me a little strangely. You have forgotten a lot of facts or I thought you knew more. I will run down some salient points.

1. Judy was organizer of the local for some fifteen days before the Plenum, and presto all the responsibility for the local's mistakes falls on her shoulders! This is a bit too comical. Of course all through last year the real direction of the local against all odds was determined by Judy and I, but that is no excuse to make the empirical leap of judgement that therefore we were responsible. Why do we have organizational forms if not to assess responsibility? For this formal point of view, which is not merely formal, the capability of Chris, George and Judy K. is no less than Judy's if such a judgement is to be made. The fact is of course, since Chris, George, and Judy [K.] would do no RMC work, no contacting, it was easy to stand on the sidelines and come off lily white. The opposition of Libby H. and Steve is no surprise to me, I had repeatedly criticized Steve throughout last year and this summer also had arguments (not hostile) with Libby. Libby's methodology is still wholly liberal.

2. I believe George was in Boston before the Plenum, earlier he had the closest working relations with the MS. (During the summer months I had several contacting sessions with Jon B., but did not work directly with MS). I would like to know his attitude and politics toward the MS fusion. Did he have any or did he wait like before for a mistake to be made and then piously point it out?

3. As regards the youth-party question. We spent the whole summer on Marxist theory and the history of the social youth movement.

I know this topic came up repeatedly (for instance at Joel's talk in June). I can't believe that the attitude of Libby and Steve was based on ignorance as you seem to assume. (The whole month of August was spent on the history of social youth movement).

4. Thus I cannot take your comment that the Boston RMCers should reread MB 7 seriously. The problem is not ignorance. At the moment I can only surmise that they were using the organizational independence which is embodied in the RCY as a means of asserting their political independence and probing the seriousness of Spartacist's intention to build a truly organizationally independent group. If this latter is so, it reflects their experience with PL, that is, the real political milieu which we have penetrated in Boston. In this case I would not worry so much since the RCY is precisely the place where such softness (milieu reflected problems) can be fought out without danger to SL! After all this is the purpose of RCY, to train young revolutionaries. These people in Boston are all very bright and competent and need to be convinced through political debate. If that won't work, within certain limits mistakes are tolerable in RCY. Or perhaps I have an erroneous conception of the youth organization. Do you expect people to come into the youth as finished communists, if not, then such deviations are inevitable: the only other method of handling the problems is the PL or SWP method, running a party fraction.

5. I don't understand your comment about the distance between SL and RMC: "also reflecting the unfortunate distance that developed between RMC and SL in Boston. People were excusing the confusion by the 'isolation' of Boston RMC--that is inexcusable!!!" Then you talk about fault on both sides, which I have already rejected, and defensiveness. The distance developed because no one else would do RMC work and because Chris believed in running a party fraction in RMC. I don't know what he and George were able to accomplish in August, but the people in RMC are not dullards and can recognize when leading comrades regard them as somehow 'illegitimate' and so forth. If George is up to the same thing today you can count on trouble. People do not develop when consistently placed in ultimatic situations by people they have no respect for. Chris and George were suspicious of these people, naturally they have reciprocated. So the stage is set for a classic confrontation: orthodoxy without substance and the youth, without experience flying off the handle.

6. I don't know what policy Judy followed through all this. In the summer she had a tendency to back peddle a bit, instead of aggressively fighting for our positions. That is, instead of acting as the leader, she acted like the first among equals. The amendments of Steve and Libby (which I hope Judy fought) represent in a sense the repudiation of Judy's leadership, which is bad. I don't know if I would have had the authority to stop this, but I certainly would have aggressively fought it both in Boston and in the conference. How capable Judy is depends on the character of the struggle she waged. One does not necessarily blame a trade union comrade for the deviations of his fraction, especially when he fought these deviations.

7. About the MS comrades, you certainly took my comment on them

in relation to George out of context, "they are simple naive people"-- perhaps I had better never again write anything with tongue in cheek. They are simple and naive like the whole left milieu in Boston in that they expect work from the leadership. That is no political assesment. I wrote Larry L. on the same day (Sept. 10) before I knew anything about the plenum. 'The MS comrades are a bundle of contradictions which could develop in almost any direction and George (K.) could be the occasion but not the real cause of their deviation.' I believe that the first document of Bob L. and Jon B. was very good. Judy told me that it was after Jim had read this document, he suggested an immediate fusion perspective at the Plenum. I don't know who hastened the situation, but the desire of Phil to get into the SL was caused by the political necessity to save his own hide. His personality may be stronger than Jon or Bob's, but he was defeated politically by Jon since he never wanted anything to do with the SL! Frankly I have too few facts here to understand the dynamics of the situation. But I am sure what you had to say is far from the whole story. First, as is obvious I have never trusted Phil. (Neither does George, and where was he). He only comes to us because the majority of MS forced him left. The entry work of Jon B. was very good and disciplined. It was his patient work which opened the situation up for us. The fundamental problem was, however, that from the first we had hoped for the optimal solution, that is, all the MS'ers, and have continually advised Jon in this light.

But the situation developed so fast that Jon was unable to develop a solid faction against Phil, that is, it was totally unlike the CWC developing together toward a common goal. Phil has adopted our positions in large part only to preserve his old authority. When he decided to move left, he was able to undercut Jon and represent himself as the leader of a united MS ready for fusion with the SL (first supposition). Then in this context Jon and our comrades were overwhelmed or disoriented by Phil's opportunist maneuvering, his attempt to secure for himself a place in the sun, I imagine Phil kept on upping the ante for fusion first within MS placing Jon on the defensive, then in Boston, then in the Plenum. I'm glad he was stopped. But it was a difficult situation to handle. I can't understand why someone from NYC was not involved. Jim was in Boston in the second half of August, why didn't he check further? What was George doing? And so on, always the same questions. Never any answers.

I can summarize this long epistle briefly: your attitude I believe reflects both an inadequate grasp of the empirical situation as well as a methodological deficiency. Ever since the Boston problem began you have been trying to have it both ways: either a plague on both your houses or there is guilt on both sides. That won't wash. There is an art to developing cadre which I hope you can exercise in the Boston RCY, if the same methods that we employed earlier on Judy and I are again brought to bear there will be big trouble, and we will suffer for it. My pride in Boston does not stem from the illusion that things are 'all that great in Boston,' but from the fact that for the first time we have the opportunity to attain hegemony on the left in an area, we have made the breakthrough. I hope you (that is the NO and Boston local) can take advantage of it. For that I take no responsibility.

There is little I can do here about Boston so I guess that is why I have examined every phrase of your letter under a microscope, so I hope the analysis here will be of some use even if you don't agree.

I can't say that I am particularly troubled by Marv's attack on Mark. Perhaps it was ill advised, but the only reason I would support Mark is that there happens to be no one else with some theoretical and writing capacity around. Perhaps in the future you could take over, but it seems that you are kept so busy with organizational work that there is little time for the necessary reading and theoretical preparation. I can only say that I hope Marv will shake things up in the NO, it is about time people began refusing to accept incompetence and slackness as a way of life.

I can't understand why Mark was given the task of presenting theses on the woman question. This blunder only postpones a thorough examination of the notorious 'softness' of the woman's liberation fraction. I sense here (perhaps it is only my imagination) the clever Machiavellian hand of Jim. From reading the notes my negative impression of Helene was only reinforced. Raising her to CC status is something we'll regret. (Was anything said at the Plenum about the blunders the Bay area local made in the Spring?)

For the past two days I have been having exams, in an hour or so I have an oral exam in German. I have been doing well, at an elementary level, and am not worried.

Nothing new to report, except that I don't know where I will be, etc. Either Bonn or Munich. For the next 2 weeks I will have no address, hopefully I can get things straightened out with the people who pay the fellowship and make a quick trip to London and Paris. I think the possibilities are very good in Bonn for the recruitment of a Spartacist tendency.

So, perhaps Benjamin might be interested in this letter, I will try to write him later.

Love,
Bill

[Bonn]

Dec. 6, 1971

[Boston]

Dear Larry,

I was very happy to hear that things worked out for you, i.e., that George pulled his horns back. It seems you handled the situation very well. However, one thing worried me: you wrote at the suggestion of Joe N. and so far as I can tell never consulted Judy throughout the entire episode. Joe is close enough to the party that it is inevitable that one would talk to him about such things. But, for advice, you should go to a party member, especially, when you are deeply troubled about the leadership's mistakes. Judy is part of the local leadership, and has worked closely with me for many years. She has my full confidence. And if you have confidence in my judgment (and of course, I am flattered that at this distance you should seek my advice), you certainly should have consulted with her first and continuously. There were certain comments in Joe's letter to me (after about three months he finally replied) which lead me to believe he has little confidence in Judy. This reflects (i.e. tells) more about Joe than Judy. I would appreciate a reply to these comments.

You ask some questions which are really important: "Have you been hearing from everyone in the local regularly? Does New York keep you informed?...What are the effects of the OCI affair in Europe."

Number one: I have only heard from you and Judy in the local recently. John S. has written me one very long letter and has been doing a lot of work on the international stuff so his silence is understandable. But, as above, Joe took three months to answer, Jon B. has not yet answered my letter of Sept 1! Helen C. wrote a short reply to a four and a half single spaced political letter (i.e., critical of her) and no answer to it since Oct 1. Tweet was supposed to write but has not. Jim has not written at all. I have hardly an idea of what our position on the OCI-SLL split is, by the way what is our attitude to the POR? I really don't know. I have received only two letters from the NO, one from Liz and one from Al, but both were very general and not very useful. I have asked for a big packet of literature but have only received recent bundles of Workers Vanguard, have not received any RCY newsletters, etc. I could go on but I think that is enough to demonstrate my point. While I seem to get by, this incompetence and lackness certainly doesn't improve my political morale. The NO has repeatedly ignored my advice (as well as Tweet's earlier). In August while attending classes thirty hours a week I spent a whole weekend 'flat out' exhausting myself on the international discussion article which the PB hasn't even discussed yet! The international bulletin would tremendously facilitate our work here and its nonappearance is a tremendous blunder. Frankly I can't understand the logic of sending Marv on tour and then liquidating the almost the entire national office by sending Janet, Jim, and Liz to LA. There are three hundred Trotskyists here for the asking, how many are in LA? (not to mention our absolute duty to carry on a minimum level of activity in the international arena, we haven't done anything for a year).

My research goes well, I am beginning to get excited about the prospect of finishing a real scientific work on imperialism.

Sorry to hear about the layoff prospect but that reflects our relative newness in the trade union arena and can't be helped. (You and our TU fractions should study the early history of the depression and especially how the CP and SWP coped with this problem, e.g., how later, '34-'35 and '37-'38, they were able to get their cadres in the trade unions and take the leadership) It certainly is not merely a technical problem. (As from above you can see I am a bit pissed off, so I let off some steam.)

Comradely,
Bill

P.S. What do you think of the outline study series on working class history?

Special PB International Group Meeting, Boston.....19 December 1971
Notes by PB Secretary

Present: PB: Cantor (RCY), Gordon, Robertson
Full CC: Crawford (Boston), Foster (Boston), Long (frat.)
Other: John S., Robin (frat.), Stuart
Meeting convened 3:30 p.m.

Agenda: 1. International - German work
2. New Zealand

Presentation by Robertson: This meeting has been convened by a decision at the last PB meeting primarily in order to have the National Office take centralized control of international work, which has been previously done here on a federated basis. The persons attending do so for good reason. Long and Robin are present, as a crucial decision involving them must be made here; John S. and Stuart have been functioning essentially as Moore's secretariat; Foster is our general international representative designate; Crawford is the Boston organizer; Cantor is present because she may well be visiting Germany soon, (although this is only tentative, and was planned as a purely personal trip); Robertson and Gordon are primarily responsible for SL international work. (Libby H. was present because it's her home; various other RCY and SL comrades from the Boston local drifted in, towards the end of the meeting--an exact record of who all these comrades were and when exactly they came in is not available--sec'ty's note.)

This is a crucial time for us internationally. The split in the International Committee has had a devastating effect internationally; the claims of the IC to being an international have been shattered. This comes on the heels of the break in the United Secretariat between Mandel/European sections and the U.S. SWP; so that there is a situation of utter chaos in the world Trotskyist movement, and a corresponding leap forward in interest in the Spartacist League internationally. Given these circumstances, we have found it convenient to redefine our conception, as outlined at the Plenum, of our production of the International Discussion Bulletin. We intend to produce a perfectly straight-forward IDB, as per the initial agreement, plus bring out immediately in conjunction with it, a U.S.A. supplement, to include the documents and groups we have particular interest in. The U.S.A. supplement will include a contribution from Sammarakkody, the exchange between the IKD and the OCI over the Essen conference and our own letter to the OCI, the "Where We Stand" statement in the New Zealand Red and our response to it; the Kuroda group statement; the Workers Vanguard article on the IC split; a letter to the Ceylonese group which has recently emerged, taking up the question of Ceylon's role in relation to the Indian subcontinent, the necessity for Singhalese Trotskyists to break through to the Tamil proletariat, an analysis of the LSSP origins as a lousy fusion between radical left nationalists and trade union bureaucrats which explains the recurring splits and fusions that characterize Ceylonese left politics.

We have the possibility (assuming merely routine optimism on our part) that within the next year or so we may be able to crystallize sections of an international Spartacist tendency in three or

four countries. The particular countries where interest has been currently expressed in us present the following problems and possibilities:

New Zealand: Basically we must re-establish the Spartacist League in NZ, which is mainly a question of a lot of money and hard work--this will be taken up later in the agenda.

Ceylon: We must be rather careful here. We know Sammarakkody as a left Pabloist, but also seems to have a lot of personal integrity. The Ceylonese group led by Manickam of about 15 younger comrades seems to be all right; they have access to more or less the same political traditions we do, and they do have an awareness of the development of the Trotskyist movement since the Stalinist Third Period. They seem to be at odds with Sammarakkody, who is probably the best of a bad lot. They hate the Healyites. Their attitudes towards the Tamil workers must be tested, as well as their involvement with the Guevarist uprising in Ceylon and their attitude towards it. Probably our most immediate possibility of consolidating something will be in Ceylon.

Japan: If we had more authority both as a national section and internationally, as well as available funds for international work, we could probably develop something. We are in contact with about a half dozen groups, but because of the nationally limited origins of the Japanese Trotskyist movement, it is difficult to define these various groups in an international context. Apparently the Japanese groups take the particular post-war configuration of the Japanese bourgeoisie as a model for the entire world. The Trotskyists there all date from a series of splits to the left of the CP after the Hungarian Revolution. Note there have only been three Trotskyist sections with continuity in Trotsky's time of real importance and strength; the Chinese, French and American. The Bolivian, Vietnamese and Ceylonese essentially came later.

England: Have received report from the RCL that Healy's international authority has been considerably dented by the IC split. The RCL has lost Richardson; Knight and Veness have taken over the organization and are professionalizing it, are currently making a hard pitch towards us. Within their limitations (such as failure to raise the vanguard party demand!) their politics are good. Their line on Bolivia was good, with the characteristic weakness that their approach to it was "What should revolutionists do in this situation?", not defining this as Bolshevik-Leninists.

France: At present we can't do much but nibble from the outside at the various Trotskyist groups. We want to put our questions forcibly to the Lambertists. We would like to establish at least a thin distributive apparatus for our material there.

Germany: We don't know much about the current situation. Moore took it amiss that we characterized Rose and Tweet as better international representatives than he during the recent phone conversation with him; however, the fact remains that all we have received from him is a very few letters, with no connected paragraphs on anything; some carbon copies of letters to Boston, and an occasional

word from Boston. All the basic German documents were sent to Boston. It is impossible for us to determine anything from a summary of the Bolfra documents; they are no basis for determining anything. This whole question resolves itself into two parts:

We represent the Political Bureau, and our intention is to liquidate the separate national office Moore has managed to create for himself here in Boston. We know enough to know what material we wish translated, and we have been deprived of the opportunity to make that decision by his direct transmission of all documents to Boston. Note we didn't send him over there, he went basically for his own reasons, and we weren't even that happy to see him go, as we felt he would be needed in Boston. He will not function at all in Germany unless it is as an SL member, under SL discipline.

Secondly, there is the possibility that Moore may be into something good, and we must not let our irritation turn into something politically destructive. Our impression is that the Bolfra is qualitatively similar to the IKD, but quantitatively better than the IKD, which managed to precipitate the split out of bureaucratism. We may well crystallize something out of Bolfra, although not by doing what Moore suggested over the phone in his call of 13 Dec., which was to immediately support Bolfra all the way, with a pro-Bolfra statement, and technically and financially. It seems to us the split was the result of mishandling by the IKD of the Spartakus, in the context of a sharp turn rightward by the IKD.

As regards the International Discussion Bulletin, we told Moore over the phone that we had made a tactical decision that blacks were more important than international work, re. the Los Angeles trip and resultant absence from the national office for almost a month of three N.O. functionaries including those 2 most responsible for international work. We believe this decision to be valid. Results from the trip look promising. We have in the present period four equally vital tasks; the problem is that given our present forces, it is impossible to follow all to the extent they demand at the same time. Our vital tasks are: 1) to consolidate the production of a monthly newspaper, 2) international work--we must not allow ourselves to be nationally isolated because in the long run deformations are bound to result, and NOW we have a uniquely powerful chance to intervene in the international movement, as our line and history are very good and clean, 3) trade union implantation--as we continue to grow, mainly through our student work, it is crucially important to concentrate on building trade union fractions. We ought to have a rate of growth in trade union implantation greater than that of party growth as a whole, 4) the recruitment of black cadre, given the deeply racist character of American society. We worked desperately hard on the West Coast. Note that as soon as the tour was over, and Joe visited NYC for a brief period, the whole question was dropped and we (Robertson and Gordon, primarily) turned immediately to the other pressing tasks that hadn't been covered in the period of their absence. Over the next immediate period there are 2 considerations that will occupy my time 1) international correspondence and production of the International Discussion Bulletin, and 2) work on the financial section of party activity, mainly attempting to raise money.

So--we want all documents and material from Moore to be routed through the National Office. Had we a better, easier working relationship with him, it wouldn't matter so much--however we never got a letter like this (letter received after phone call with Moore, giving detailed description of situation, of 14 December) until after Moore got stung on the phone.

(Sec'ty's note: the following is as complete a transcript as possible given my somewhat uneven and rough notes, of the speakers who followed, and what they had to say--I have attempted to leave them in pretty much the form I took them down in, in order to avoid leaving out or distorting by rewriting, anything.)

Speakers:

Stuart: In defense of Moore, it seemed silly to write a long report in the middle of a hot faction fight; it disturbs me that criticism of national office functioning is implied to mean an incipient political split with the Spartacist League. I don't understand what you mean that Boston is a federated section. The only things that were sent here were sent because they were sure to be gotten here. The only work done here has been of a technical nature, we have been making available to Moore SL literature--this was done when there was nobody in the SL office familiar with international work. We just did some translations here. Who could we have cleared it with? We didn't know it had to be cleared with anyone.

Cantor: (expressed disbelief in protestations of innocence...I didn't get down what I said--sec'ty.)

John S.: We sent over a translation of the Trade Union document, under the explanation that this T.U. general line was approved by the Plenum (Robertson: It was not approved by the Plenum, this is the kind of thing that happens when all the work is done up here). This was done because Bolfra wanted to use our Trade Union document as part of their internal faction fighting and it would enable us to recruit a Trotskyist section--it is true that there is a general impression here that Bolfra is "on our side." The only other thing Moore has that we've translated here is the Youth-Party document. Things coming here (I have a complete list somewhere) are mainly 2 long Marxist Discussion Bulletins of the IKD. It is true I've been slow in terms of sending things to NYC, but I don't think that constitutes a secretariat. (John then read aloud section of a letter to him from Moore, which stated that "it is more important to have English into German, rather than German into English" translations at this point.) The two main fights at the conference were on IKD-Spartakus relations, the other was trade union work, we had documents there on those two major issues.

Stuart: Do our documents have to be secret?

Gordon: You claim you haven't got any information from Moore we haven't got. Well, the N.O. has received about two letters and an occasional xerox and that's all from Moore previous to the phone call.

You people have been functioning as Moore's personal secretariat.

He has no authority to tell you what is to be translated into what language. Further, we note some lit. sent to Moore from Boston was deducted from the Boston pledge as a "National Office expense"--all N.O. expenses must be authorized by the N.O.! What has happened is that Moore has a lot of gripes about the N.O. and therefore has decided to be it. If you don't like the N.O. and SL leadership, you struggle to replace it, you do NOT go around it. Moore is to work through the N.O. and PB--he has made an independent assessment of the situation--he wanted us to give them (Bolfra) financial support!

Moore's job is to 1) convey information to the national leadership, and 2) make political recommendations. The Political Bureau will make the decision to make alliances. When three national officers went to Europe, everything they did had a tentative nature, and they made recommendations to the PB to take action on their return. Now nobody likes the service they've been getting from the N.O. and we don't much like it either, but that doesn't authorize those people complaining to break discipline. If Moore wants anything he writes to us for it, or else he doesn't get it. You will NOT send him anything. This organization has a monopoly on the public political life of all members. Behaving in an undisciplined fashion will get Moore plenty of action, if that's what he wants.

On Bolfra: This may be a critical opportunity for us. They seem to be more open to us than the IKD is. Their operational line for Germany contains the conception that the SPD is a bourgeois party. Note the joint Bolfra-(Komfra?) declaration contains statement that you need no discipline in propoganda, only in activity, whatever that means.

So what are we going to do? First, it must be made clear to Moore that every scrap of information goes through the N.O. He got a letter from me about 1 1/2 months ago saying "What we want is information!" We don't want Moore to make our international policy for us. We could tell him to come home instantly. Perhaps Cantor's going over could help--we could also send somebody else over to talk to him. I think Moore's attempting to cover his tracks--so am not sure how far he's committed us to Bolfra. Tactical decisions, such as what literature to send and distribute, must be made by us.

Foster: Everything John S. said has backed up what the N.O. has said. We don't want to run faction fights from afar. We don't want to act like the Pabloites, the Richardson-Fender type of factionalism ripping the guts out of organizations all over Europe. Crawford and I didn't pay much attention to this thing developing in Boston because we really didn't know what was going on. The national leadership makes priorities for the locals as well. Must be sense of balance. I endorse what Gordon said.

Long: I can't understand how anyone could believe that we could operate any other way than on the basis of rigorous centralism.

Robertson: I'm glad Long's been involved in the discussion. He is getting well equipped for a long-distance operation. On the question of why Moore didn't get the material he requested from the N.O.--he probably didn't press the right levers. In the PB meeting #36 (of

13 December 1971) I was the softest on the Boston secretariat question. It is an intolerable situation, but I understand the legitimate hurt feelings of the Boston comrades. Moore's been going out of control. We would like you to continue doing the purely technical work which I believe you honestly do believe is all you've been doing. We are a very busy sub-propaganda group in process of transformation--at any point this process could be arrested. There are two separate questions here: 1) This is a bad business, could develop into the incipient nucleus of factionalism. If we get a lot of harassment in the N.O. that's all right, the problem arises if the criticism begins to go into other channels and we never hear anything. 2) The real problem is our international work, particularly the German stuff and I am here basically to insure that that essential work is carried forward. I am here to tell you what we are going to do and to tell you that we cannot afford a faction fight or even a quarrel right now. My main purpose is to un-obstruct the forward process of the international work. On the National Office--there are different types of national centers, Wohlforth happens to be very efficient, but I don't think you'd like the kind of N.O. he'd run, although it would be efficient.

We don't want to de-credential Moore, because we believe him, he is intelligent and able. But he has very little experience in seeing the development of groupings internationally. We have the capacity to make projections of development for two years ahead, don't think Moore does. Study pre-WWI Polish/Russian workers party relations to see how they managed to keep themselves at odds--it took a war and the Russian revolution to sort it all out. If we had the weight and proximity of the Lambertists and had an in, I think we could probably get Bolfra. In the case of the New Zealand SL, we have the full right to intervene fully, as we have a common political principled basis and the Longs are here--we have a whole pre-history together.

Want to write the RCL and ask them their impressions of the IKD split, also want to write the IKD and ask to know their evaluation of the split, asking how do you think this effects our fraternal relations, knowing full well the provocative nature of the question. Would like to have some Bolfra addresses; we have none.

There has been no PB decision to intervene in the faction fight, and it has been done and it's disingenuous of Stuart to say "must we hide our own politics?"

What do our ambassadors do? They gather information, make recommendations and carry out instructions. Ambassadors can become over-committed to a particular arena, but we do recognize he is in an important situation. The Germans do not have a background in Trotskyist history since the early '30's. Need to circulate Trotskyist material since then. But we must not close our options to other groups, although we certainly intend to pour lots of literature into Bolfra. When Moore was asked about an Austrian split from the U. Sec. he said he couldn't do anything because they're committed to the IKD. We can't close our options, we'd like at least to send them our documents. We don't know where they're ultimately going, neither does Moore.

On the IDB: when we get several issues out, ultimately we'd like to transform it into the Spartacist magazine of an international tendency. We have no money! Which is another reason we must have trade union implantation. We need \$500 to give Long and Robin immediately. To sum up: Moore must keep his options open!

Second round of discussion:

Stuart: Well, now things are much more clear. Moore thought he was supposed to recruit an SL tendency. Moore's been extremely busy doing personal contacting, most of Bolfra doesn't read English. We weren't intervening in any factional situation!

Cantor: Still don't believe your protestations of innocence.

John S.: I assumed Moore had the authority to make the statements he did in his letters. On the documents we sent; it was clear to me that that stuff constitutes a political intervention. Bolfra can't read English, it seemed very clear it was an intervention--I thought that's what we intended to do and Moore had the authority to do that. On what to do--we need documents we don't yet have...need a history of the factions also. I wrote Moore telling him that.

Gordon: In the fight inside the SWP, and the CT and PO factions, one of those factions appeared to stand closer to the SL--the CT. Had we at that point immediately solidarized with the CT, and cut off all relations with the other tendency, where would we be now? Because both factions were fighting inside a rotten organization, and in the midst of a still incompleting faction fight, it was impossible for us to tell for sure what their ultimate political direction would be.

On the IDB: We sensed after the Plenum that the IDB might take on a ritualistic character because our relations with the other groups had deteriorated enormously--now with recent developments (IC split, etc.) there is now a real, full content for it. I would criticize the National Office for having the conception that there wasn't much there for us, a decision which wasn't made consciously enough, so that a partly unconscious downgrading of its importance took place.

Foster: We weren't using resources we had available to assess this stuff.

Long: (pass)

Crawford: Ought to remember our status when criticizing the National Office.

Robertson: We need more discussion of the trade union document. I would like to know more about Bolfra--what political hands are using our documents as a club? We don't know who they are. They seem to be defined mainly by reaction against the IKD. I'm afraid that a bloc has been consummated with them. An analogy presents itself: the CP/KMT alliance--how did that happen? It's rather difficult to disentangle. All our suspicions and worries about Germany crystallized at the last PB, where there was a general feeling of cold fury when we realized our ignorance of a policy that was being pursued in our name.

John S,...Stuart,...Robertson,...Foster,...

Stuart: Moore walked into an organizational fight, IKD won't talk to him, what do you expect him to do? Bill didn't say Bolfra was right.

Robertson: The motive for this behavior was arrogance, for the best interests of the SL. You (Stuart) say; why would he have used me? Because he had nobody else, and you are competent to do the things he needs done. How it got by us was: you started a policy and then got bitter when we didn't support you. It was a conspiracy based on arrogance, and misuse of the name and organizational resources of the Spartacist League.

Robin:...

Stuart: The only reason Moore said to cool it on the SPD stuff was because Bolfra is politically very unformed, and Moore asked me for Trotsky on the Labor Party stuff, because they need to be educated gradually and persuasively.

(This point on the agenda was closed, a 15 minute break followed, during which more RCY and SLers came in for the final agenda point)

2. New Zealand: We have a problem that must be resolved--comrades Long and Robin are going back to New Zealand very soon, and we made the decision to send comrades back with them. The SL/NZ has a history and name that stands for Trotskyism in NZ. Given other international developments, particularly the conciliation of us on the part of the RCL and change of leadership there, and the Ceylon correspondence, we would like Long and Robin to go back to NZ via London and Ceylon, with a stopover in Perth, Australia, where we also have close contacts. We need \$500 for this, and don't have it. at the moment. Our basic income just about meets our current operating expenses, but about the first of January the surcharge comes off pledges. The Problem is money.

disc: Long, Robin, Robertson, Long, Cantor, Foster, Gordon

Motion: Recommend that the Longs return to NZ via London, Colombo and Perth, and to commit an extra \$500 to this. passed

Meeting adjourned 8:40 p.m.

[Note: Gordon, Sharpe and Robertson reviewed these notes and found them generally satisfactory although some significant omissions occurred especially toward the end through incompleteness and S. noted that the notes do not reflect fully the intensity and sharpness of the discussion at certain points.--J.R., 24 Feb. 1972]

Xerox copies of original typescript: Boston CC
Bay Area CC
John Sharpe

[Bonn]

Jan. 14, 1972

[Boston]

Dear Steve:

Thank you very much for your letter of 30 Dec. Without correspondence from comrades other than Judy it is really difficult to tell what is going on in the US let alone in Boston (also until I hear from people I'm inclined to take Judy's glowing reports with a grain of salt.) I just received today the local minutes of the past six months (which I requested be sent to me last sep. every couple of weeks). It is amazing how much clear things become just through reading the minutes. If the RCY keeps local minutes (I assume so) please send them to me, I need all the information about the US I can get. By the way Larry L. has been a very good correspondent.

From reading my letter to the PB (by the way it was addressed only to the PB and CC, an important tactical point), you know of my intense dissatisfaction with our international work. In fact, after conducting that circus of hysteria in Boston, Robertson hasn't even bothered to write me informing me of the PB's decisions!!! If I did what they claimed, presumably, it would be absolutely necessary--in order to get me in hand once again--for me to have the PB line in writing to guide our work here. But no, I'm left here without instructions. The obvious interpretation is the following: "if he (me) pulls it off, well and good, we have already taken precaution to reduce the significance of the recruitment of Spartacus (B-L) (if you throw enough mud, some sticks). If the Sp. (B-L) disintegrates (and I never said it wouldn't, nor do I defend the theoretical weaknesses of Sp (B-L)) then we can say 'I told you so.'" Either way Robertson's political bets are covered. It was absolutely necessary to raise this issue in a polemical and factional way since silence would have legitimated Robertson's criticism. It is now up to Robertson as to how far he wants to take it. For my part I am determined that these accusations will be discredited in the party and the youth as a whole. If R. wants to fight this all down the line, it will make a fractional perspective obligatory. In attempting to blacken my reputation R. was attempting in a sly, but not too intelligent way, to pre-emptively deal with my factional threat. Silence would have meant that all associated with me could have been tarred with the same brush through subtle backstairs maneuvering. My letter has brought all this filth out in the open and left R. with the decision: Put up or shut up. I have dealt with the question of whether 'a bloc' exists between the Bolfra and us in letters to John (you have my permission to read them if you wish). Said very simply: I stand guilty of distributing SL propaganda in a foreign language--propaganda which embodies the well known positions of our org., and says nothing about the factional struggle between IKD/Spartacus.

Re Seymour: I've heard the PB intends to send him and Helen to NZ; good riddance, but I pity the poor New Zealanders. But if Reuben is to be Seymour's replacement we've gone from bad to worse (Reuben has no political judgment whatsoever, apart from his other endearing attributes). Robertson's judgement on how to build the

SL organizationally seems increasingly erratic. Seymour and Helen are not good, they should be replaced at the next RCY conference, but to liquidate the existing RCY leadership, when no other alternative is available, for the New Zealand movement (!!) is incredible. They can't even supply me with lit., write letters, or get the international bulletin out, yet they turn around and plan to take key people out of our most important area of work, the RCY, and intend to ship them off to NZ, whose proletariat will never play a key role in the international movement. If they send two comrades to NZ, we should ship the entire SL to Germany (that is the scale of comparison between the relative weight of the two countries in the class struggle). Like the decision to send Marv on tour and Jim and Liz and Janet to LA this boggles my mind.

If Seymour and Helen hadn't been designated to go to NZ I think it would have been necessary to wage a political struggle inside the RCY against their leadership--this is ten times more necessary if Reuben is to succeed Seymour (Libby S. is ok in a subordinate position but has very weak political judgement, is very wooden-headed.)

I do not relish the perspective of a factional struggle, esp. in the SL, esp while I am in Europe. But perhaps the threat of a struggle will force R., at least for a little while, back on the rails. In any case the youth should not be allowed to go to pot because of the mistakes of the party.

Haven't heard from George A., how about reminding him.

Comradely,
Bill

P.S. A technical point: your letter made a somewhat strange impression when page two arrived a day earlier than page one. Letters do get lost and it is far better to enclose both parts in one envelope, also you should get in the habit of typing your letters and keeping a carbon for your files, especially, for political correspondence. You never know when you might have to know exactly what you have said earlier.

I haven't said very [much] about the situation here since you can read my letters to Judy and John.

Note passed privately during PB #42
from Benjamin to Cunningham and Reply:

Nick: Liz more or less wins the files point, but there's no question why it came up. This may have been the first J.R.-L.G. vs. M.T. fight on who runs things. Liz's answer doesn't deal w/ problem of abdication or whatever.

Dave: Quite the point.

[In PB #42, 24 February 1972, under pt. 3 d. on National Office files and after extended discussion, the following motion was adopted unanimously: "Keys to the confidential files be restricted to National Officers only."]

LETTER TO JANET R. BY MOORE

32.

[Bonn]
28 April 1972

[sent to Rogers' home
address, NYC]

Dear Janet:

Received your letter, will reply in next few days.

I think we should use the lit. sales as a revolving fund. So I suggest ordering right away 5 more of each of the Writings series and 5 In Defense of Marxism. But this time it should be sent sea post, and in medium to small packets.

Things are beginning to get hectic once again (after a brief interlude of exhaustion). B-L is pressing for a written statement of the "Class Nature of the SPD" (or "German Menshevism"--the second installment in the World History of Mehshivism, installments on the remaining 112 nations to follow). Anyway they are opening up more and more, and seem to want out advice on the tactical situation in Germany (i.e. how to and when to critically support the DKP or SPD in elections) which is very good. Considering the good situation in France, things are really opening up for us (i.e. which means more work). Well, June is coming up very fast, and there is twice as much to do here (politically and academically) than I can handle. What I need is a summer of relaxation [working] between Boston and NYC.

Bill

I am using the Post Address, as a European public contact address and return address, continue to send correspondence to old address, with exception, address to J. Stuart, etc.

Enclosed is letter to Larry L. (in Chicago) which I thought Dave might be interested in.

[The letter to Larry L., dated 6 April 1972, is 6 pages long and deals exclusively with views and references on the national question. The letter indicates that 3 copies were made; for Sharpe, Cunningham, and file.]

LETTER TO CUNNINGHAM (UNSENT)
BY BENJAMIN

Monday
6/12/72 [?]

What has just happened with us I'm afraid I see as the future for our semi-proto-oppposition whatever-it-is, and I think it's about time I faced up to that fact. As matters now stand, we aren't going to be the nucleus for anything in the SL. More hesitation, indecision, backtracking, letting whoever is most exposed at the moment get smashed at no particular cost or effort on Robertson's part is what I project. We already have a small group of people who are very deeply demoralized--at least Janet and I are--and in fact com-promised through having taken too much shit we shouldn't have for too long. And I believe you share a major responsibility for this, to whatever extent it's legitimate for me to unload some responsibility for this mess on anyone else. I don't believe I have the personal authority--i.e. the appearance of integrity and polit. courage--left to offer Robertson anything but more of same, and any more of same will be flatly ruinous to any future political perspective of mine. I think Robertson has won this round; I think I had better get out of this situation while I have enough self-esteem to fight again, somehow, another day. My leaving the SL is a drastic step, I know, but my situation, which has accumulated over the years, is much more serious than one of the recurrent psychodramas you have seen.

I know very well the arguments against this course. (Incidentally, I have no get-rich-quick ripoff schemes for political success outside the SL, so forget denouncing that straw man). Had I foreseen much earlier the situation I now face, a lot of things could have been done differently. But the only alternative, now, to my departure is simply a holding action, running at very low efficiency on nerve alone, not knowing if it will last for weeks or years. Even that I could do, were it not for the fact that my misguided efforts to conciliate Robertson and preserve myself in good grace--a move which you [and] I believed necessary, not merely the course of psychological least resistance--has left me feeling contemptible and used-up. I cannot hold out longer in this organization with the characterizations of me now current--current because I did not fight them as I should have, even at some risk to my future in the organization, a long time ago.

Well, I believe the retreat I plan now is less ruinous than any of the other options which may seem to you to be open to me. This political-personal cripple, who must be protected against himself, etc. etc. (how far things have come since 1967, and how I intuited some of the risks but couldn't handle the implications!) must get out.

LETTER FROM BENJAMIN TO
CUNNINGHAM, UNSENT

34.

[From internal evidence, written in the week prior to enlarged PB #50 (24-25 June '72) at which slate for CC was to be discussed and at which Treiger, Rogers and Benjamin were considering resigning from the SL.]

I wanted to write you of my dismay--there's really no other word for it--at your line on the phone with us tonight. I won't go into some of the more obvious stuff (how Janet and I predicted you'd react as you did, etc.) and I won't simply reiterate the standard objections you've heard dozens of times to Helene for the PB slate, etc. But your reasoning in her favor is Robertson's reasoning and prepares you once again for not fighting him, while continuing to bitch to us--a syndrome you criticize when you think you see it in others.

Frankly, I'm fed up. That statement from me is of course nothing new. What is new this time is that the only thing keeping me going recently was the expectation of a fight in which I could get some important support. I was perfectly open to suggestions from you on caution, clarity, etc.--we certainly needed them in view of Marv's impulsiveness--but I learned from the phone call that we were back about where we started. Even under favorable circumstances, I'm not at all sure that a productive or clarifying fight could be waged. Our points would probably be drowned out in a barrage of character assassinations in which I do not care to compete and in which I'm sure I would be completely outclassed, as I always have been. Now, I'm faced with making a slate fight for the record, in large part to back up my previous sentiments expressed to both the leaders and "little people" in different ways. Thanks much.

I began to realize recently, before our conversation of tonight, that you have been a major reason for what most comrades now think of me--gutless. You have not always been wrong in arguing me out of fights, but combined with your salutary advice on patience has been performances such as this. I am now holding the bag, together with Marv and Janet to a lesser extent, of being the anti-Helene opposition--precisely as J.R. wants it. One reason for my sloppiness--and it was not nearly as bad as you have probably heard and believed--re the "clique" stuff was that I took for granted a substantial measure of PB support on the question. Robertson would not have attacked as he did had he known of such support, and now it looks to me like he's not going to know about it.

You ask about our "clique" here (me, Janet, Marv). Good question. But I wonder what you and I had if it's basis was as flimsy as now seems to be the case! If you can change your position so readily in the easier atmosphere of the W. Coast, was our relationship anything more than a mutual proclivity toward shared bitching?

Don't you know enough by now to be suspicious of reports like the anti-Helene Brooklyn clique stuff, and to suspect that while everything looks fine out there Robertson is busy making damn sure here that he will face no significant opposition on anything from now

on through the Conference? Reactions like yours, as well as jobs done on me here (most recently by Stephanie and Karen) leave me feeling that I wasn't far wrong in what I did re the Bkln. clique, and that with a more conscious membership J.R. would have had a very hard time putting that one over as any kind of major point. Whatever their other characteristics, both Ann (who seems to have been the major problem) and Steve are both argumentative--political and people who have sat (by right) in a number of meetings in which the general question of the Berkeley regime came up. I don't live exactly by choice in a place from which I can't even make a private phone call. On the subject that the blowup was about, we 3 must have shared about four sentences--the only reason the subject came up at all was because Steve was getting statements from RCYers like Hal that Helene was going to be organizer. I responded that this stuff was bullshit since no body had decided such a thing, but wasn't particularly opposed to that idea. It came up before a meeting when Nedy asked Steve about it and he told her what he thought. After that--well you know Robertson. It was impossible for me to fight with the combination of your and Marv's absence and the fact--which I was perfectly willing to acknowledge--that my judgment had been poor and in a person of long political experience that's no defense at all.

But I can't extricate myself from this mess--any attempt I make only digs the hole deeper, and the only alternative is to accede to the characterizations of sliminess and gutlessness. To defend myself is to reveal too much, compromising my real collaborators who are not the "little people," or bring up old issues (which J.R. loves to have me do) or go into a disgusting psychodrama. There is no way out, as I learned well last week when Karen approached me with the accusation of simple gutlessness. J.R. and Stephanie had gotten to her on that (Stephanie, according to her own admission, did not know the difference between cliques and factions, and completely misrepresented what I had said to her--she could have "gotten" you for any of your private statements much more easily than she did me, but the J.R. campaign of the moment was against me). I have to work with Karen. Fuck her, you say. I say there is a systematic campaign, mostly successful, going on to convince everybody including me that I crawl like a worm. And I guess I will as long as I wait for some support from you before I risk a fight and my own exit from this org.

Okay--the mess is of my making--and yours--Robertson thrives on it, and it's all a big vicious circle. I literally have no idea of how to defend myself in the present configuration. I know that I cannot work in this situation--I'm running, as J.R. has eagerly noted, at about 1/3 capacity. Bullshit, you say. It's time you learned that capable people can in fact have their balls cut off and boxed into situations in which they cannot offer a decent defense, however limited, that does not in turn simply put more energy into the machine. This is Robertson's unique talent, and I have never met the likes of him in this respect.

Anyway, at the moment my perspective for the fairly near future is OUT. I do not know what that will ultimately mean for my political future; certainly in the short run it cuts it off completely, and maybe so in the not-so-short run. I do know that I will not

endure (because I can't) another 1-2 months like the last. Charges of incompetence, indiscipline, poor judgement I can take; having to acknowledge directly (by admitting the charges) or indirectly (by fighting with the only means available) charges of gutless sliminess I can't take. And you should know that this is all a carefully constructed situation, it's all working according to plan. I would like for a change to get through a day, doing anything, without having my basic integrity impugned. Turnerism? Maybe so, with different politics. But don't try too hard to convince me of that after you've left me holding the bag.

DRAFT RESIGNATION BY JANET R.

[Draft resignation by Janet Rogers written during (1st) meal break of Sunday session, 25 June 1972, of enlarged PB. The resignation was withheld from submission on the advice of Crawford and Robertson.]

Dear Comrades,

I do not see how I can possibly continue to function as a member of the Spartacist League at this time. I must take upon myself at least a tremendous part of the responsibility for Marvin's resignation, having done nothing to help and everything to block his functioning in the SL. As well as facilitating rather than acting to halt his departure.

The damage I have done to him and to SL I consider irreparable and I can only conclude from the experience of the past month that I am unfit for participation in the revolutionary Trotskyist movement.

NOTE TO JANET R. BY NICK BENJAMIN DURING 25 JUNE PB

Janet - if possible I would like to talk with you briefly after meeting. 2 dirty people. We must soon (with consultation with JR) phone DC & Geo. Rep. & explain. DC both a villain & a victim here. Try to keep a sense of balance, i.e. not simply a reversion to previous views. We did learn some things, esp. today. This is 50% bull, sorry. N.

NOTE TO ROBERTSON BY JANET R. DURING 25 JUNE PB AND REPLY

If you can think of some way or something or some proposal to make to Marv which would at least delay the impact of all this (all assuming things haven't gone too far out of this room) both inside & outside the org. (esp the LF) I think honestly--that Marv would be open to us now--if for no other reason than to give us a little time.

Janet

I don't mean this in anyway to be defensive toward Marv but as a last ditch attempt to minimize in any way possible the possible bad repercussions.

Robertson: WHAT? Keep resignation a secret outside SL & go away for six months, years. Why? What sort of quid pro quo, no savage public attack?

NOTE ON A CONVERSATION WITH CUNNINGHAM

by Jeff B., Berkeley, 30 June 1972

Re: factional development and Dave Cunningham.

Situation: D.C., G.G., and S.A. explaining to me the situation regarding M.T.'s resignation 6/26/72.

Dave C. stated that during a phone call to Janet R. she stated her intention to support Benjamin for the C.C. and asked Dave C. to write a letter to N.Y. adding his support to Benjamin's nomination. D.C. said (6/26) that his reply was no he couldn't support Benjamin. Then to us he motivated his non-support to Benjamin on the basis that while everyone incorporates both positive and negative aspects in their character Benjamin's was more extremely contradictory than others and thus couldn't make the consistent contribution required of a C.C.er. [a paraphrase]

Jeff B.

Minutes of Special Joint Meeting of Bay Area Local Committee and
Los Angeles Organizing Committee.....1 & 2 July 1972

Present: Bay Area: Paul, Jane, John B., Mirra, Rep, Sue M., Sue A.,
Gene, Delia
Los Angeles: Tweet, Danny, Duffy, Jan, Tom, Keith, Victor,
Irene, Bob, Karen, John S., Lesley, Mark
RCY: Bay Area: Rosalind, Sandra, Phil
San Diego: Marty
Central Committee: Cunningham, Nelson
Other: Janet (New York), Margie, Diana, Ayn, Jay, Nissy,
Wanda

- Agenda: 1. Organization of Meeting
2. Report of Expanded PB Meeting, June 24-25
a) Trade Union
b) International
c) Central Committee Slate
d) National Conference Preparation
e) Sunday Session
f) PB Continuation Meeting Thursday, June 29

Meeting convened July 1 at 4:35 p.m.

1. Organization of Meeting: Chairman--Gene. Secretaries--Lesley and
Sue M.

Gene: Propose 2 hours report divided between Tweet and Nelson, 2
rounds of discussion, first round 5 minutes, second round determined
later.

Cunningham: Request equal time on basis of alternate document. This
is a kangaroo court. My name is on every page of internal bulletin,
so should have equal time to make my case.

Nelson: Normally we bend over backwards on organizational questions,
but this PB meeting took two days, covered 5 subjects. Cunningham
would have right to equal time if had been present at that meeting,
or had a documentary basis for a minority. Under normal procedure
Cunningham has the right to ask for extended floor time.

Cunningham: There is a documentary basis for a minority report. I
have declared myself a minority and have a whole slate for the CC
elections. I have a factional statement with 4 names--myself, Rep,
Janet and Mirra--and a political program.

Nelson: Okay, if you want to do it the hard way. My report is to be
an extension of Tweet's report and will cover Cunningham, Moore and
Treiger also. Since Cunningham is forcing me, I will expand on Cun-
ningham in my report. Since I'm handling that part of the report,
Cunningham should be given half as much time. Propose Tweet and I
take 90 minutes, Cunningham 45.

Cunningham: I'll accept that.

Motion by Gene: All LA O.C. and BA Local members have full voting
rights; to give others voice and consultative vote. passed

Motion by Mirra: To admit Janet (on leave from NYC Local) to meeting with voice and consultative vote.

passed

2. Report of Expanded PB Meeting:

Report by Tweet: Was an expanded PB meeting. A majority of the CC was present, and all four organizers (Judson, Helene, Crawford, Tweet). Admission to Sunday session was more restricted (CC members, National Office heads of departments, and Judson representing his area).

Trade Union: We have recently sent several comrades into industry and are building a very important new union fraction. There was a general discussion on perspectives, centering mostly on Judson and Kinder--how to orient towards a caucus (loose conglomerate of disgruntled bureaucrats, ORO centrists, etc., viewed skeptically by union militants) which exists in that union: Judson thought Kinder was being precipitous in orienting towards an entry into the caucus. A comparison was made to the democratic transport caucus. The motion that passed states that we not consider entry into the caucus for at least one year. There were no serious differences. To enter (for the purpose of split) without a disciplined strong grouping of our own would be disastrous, making us a left cover like IS rather than an independent political force. Brief progress report on other fractions. Problems will arise between conflicting priorities (e.g. youth and trade union). In order to build strong union fractions, we will need strong locals (part of over-all transformation).

International: Report given by Robertson. Foster is in Europe as the full representative of the organization: to supervise, oversee and report on the activity of our representatives there. There is a left wing in the British IMG that is reported to be interested in the SL. Long and Robin have returned to New Zealand to vigorously reconstruct the SLNZ; Gager is in contact with Turner; Seymour and Cantor are to be sent to NZ. Samarakkody (Ceylon) has put us in contact with a long-time Indian Trotskyist (probably a far-left Pabloite). Sharpe has been building a study circle in Paris, which we need to evaluate. Stuart recently returned from Germany and refused to give Robertson a European report, saying "My stay in Europe was personal and I have nothing to report." She returned in the company of the Bonn organizer of Spartacus B-L, who hadn't contacted the National Office. There is a question about the nature of Moore's work in Germany; his reports are grossly inadequate. Foster will visit England to talk with the RCL, see Sharpe in Paris, then go on to Germany and Austria. The Austrians sided with the IKD in the split; Moore didn't want to talk to them. We sent a lengthy letter to Spartacus B-L and the IKD commenting on their split and inviting them to our national conference. If Spartacus B-L is so close to us, as Moore contends, why haven't they replied?

The Sunday session of the PB was preceded by a series of events. At 11:30 a.m. Robertson received a call from Treiger who said "I'm not coming to the meeting, I quit." At the meeting there was a lengthy discussion: Before Treiger's resignation he went around the country approaching people with a series of organizational gripes, seeking to line them up. He approached Nedy on the black work, say-

ing the LA comrades were not to blame for the failure to recruit the black contacts there, the PB was at fault, implied conciliation to Black Nationalism. He approached Helene saying that the PB is sterile, no significant debates, dominated by Robertson, PB members are all hand-raisers. He told Crawford that Robertson surrounds himself with yes-men, the PB just rubber-stamps his decisions. Tweet's call to the National Office triggered an investigation; Robertson began asking comrades if they had been approached by Treiger. Crawford said he had known there would be problems with Treiger, a habitual gadfly, but had thought Treiger was a hard communist deep down. SL gave Treiger every change to integrate himself, sent him on national tour, responsible assignments for press, proposed he might become National Organizational Secretary. There were problems with Treiger's functioning; attempts had been made to solve them, including a secret PB (secret so that his authority would not be destroyed) to fully ventilate irritations. Treiger was free-lancer, attempted to obstruct orderly functioning on a petty basis. An alternate slate proposal seemed to be surfacing, put forward informally by Cunningham. Rep, Moore and Benjamin were being pushed. Cunningham's letter to the PB denied telling Tweet of this proposal. The alternate slate would have tipped the balance of the CC in a consistent direction toward the "beautiful people" (Marxist intellectuals) as opposed to the "clods" (party loyalists and apparatchniks). Who are the people being pushed: Moore, an international representative who admittedly "ceased to represent the SL" and made a mess in Germany; Benjamin--a confirmed cliquist; Rep--whom the West Coast knows too well. Some brilliant intellectuals didn't make the "beautiful people" list, like Seymour and Reuben who also happen to be hard party loyalists. Stuart asserted that a Boston RCYer was being deliberately victimized by Robertson-Gordon bureaucracy because he was a Moore supporter. Original slate proposal by Robertson was: Gordon, Robertson, Cunningham, Treiger, Samuels, Nelson, Brosius, Foster, Crawford, Seymour, Kinder, 2 youth representatives (Samuels and Goldenfeld suggested). Motion passed for interim PB of Gordon, Robertson, Samuels, Cunningham, Seymour.

Report by Nelson: Motions passed at 29 June PB meeting:

- 1) To adopt the slate recommended by Robertson for full CC (minus Treiger); the opinions of comrades in the localities will be solicited regarding alternates.
- 2) To add Karen to the Editorial Board of Workers Vanguard.
- 3) That Nelson be chairman of Western Regional Bureau of CC.
- 4) Motion on Treiger. (in IIB #14)
- 5) Motion on Cunningham clique (in IIB #14)
- 6) In view of Cunningham's deception and refusal to tell N.O. about Treiger's resignation, his assignment as PB representative to the West Coast be cancelled immediately.
- 7) Cunningham is to return to NYC as soon as possible.
- 8) To authorize the release to the membership of confidential information on Treiger, Cunningham and Moore.
- 9) To note the question of Cunningham on the slate.

Treiger had systematically probed the locals for anti-regime attitudes. In New Orleans he had bragged to a contact about building a factional opposition and that his trip to the West Coast was to

raise money for that purpose. Treiger described Robertson as an alcoholic in the presence of a Stonybrook contact. Erratic pattern. Moore had declared himself a minority in December, says there's a manipulative and anti-internationalist regime. Moore did not make full reports, filtered information. Cunningham was PB's spokesman when PB confronted Moore. Admissions by Janet and Libby that Janet told Libby about the secret PB meeting and said that Cunningham had told her they were doing the same thing to Treiger that they did to Cunningham years before. Janet told Libby that there is no collective leadership, Gordon and Robertson consider the SL their personal property, a better leadership would be Cunningham, Treiger, Foster and Crawford. Innuendos of unfair use of party money. Nobody can survive the regime but broken people, empty shells, hand-raisers.

(Quotation read from "On Democratic Centralism" by Trotsky.)

The communist method of struggle raises consciousness--makes or breaks comrades. Some have no guts for struggle. A communist fight is initiated over serious issues; people take sides, polarization, perhaps factions form; determination to carry struggle through to its end--all out front. The "byzantine cellar" converted their felt inadequacies into sense of grievances; converted into systematized anti-regime attack, across political lines, unprincipled combinationism; a smokescreen after the fact to cover up own failures. Ann P. learned, explained how cliques start: unwilling to admit incapacity, convert into secret anti-regime bloc.

In weeks prior to the enlarged PB mtg. Robertson phoned Cunningham, told him about Tweet's call, asking Cunningham if he knew anything about it, told Cunningham "you seem to be involved." Robertson called Cunningham three or four times last week, reported the situation and asked Cunningham what he knew about it. During the Sunday lunch break Janet told Robertson that she had knowledge of Treiger's intention to resign, that she and Benjamin and Treiger had planned to make one last fight at the meeting and then quit. She said she had communicated this to Cunningham earlier in the week. She said she felt guilty for having contributed to Treiger's leaving. She also said Marv had phoned Cunningham, Rep and Stuart on Saturday night. On Monday after Treiger's resignation Robertson phoned Cunningham and asked him if he had had prior knowledge. Cunningham said he had known but "hadn't known what it meant." Had told Janet to pull back--thus he certainly did know "what it meant." Cunningham denied to Sue A. that he knew. Cunningham is a liar, disloyal, contemptuous of the party, despicable! I trusted you!

Treiger came into the SL with alternate perspectives and views of organization. Somewhere a relation developed between Cunningham, Treiger and Moore. A "clot" formed around Cunningham, Benjamin and Janet, with private grievances; Benjamin also gathered a clique in Brooklyn. A qualitative transformation took place when Cunningham changed his policy on Helene because she wasn't a "hand-raiser." Cunningham now denies that he pushed for Rep, or predicted Al would flop in BA. Treiger was separate but intersected the Cunningham clique--the detonator. (Quotations read from Cunningham's letter on slate): you lost Benjamin when you changed your line on Helene; you've started apologizing

for Moore although originally you condemned him.

The options open to Cunningham are:

- 1) Struggle to regain authority--the toughest option, but possible. Would involve a reversal of a degenerative process (from cliquism to combinationism) and honesty and criticism.
- 2) Remain silent, passively accept loss of authority and be discredited.
- 3) Brazen it out--"a case of factional persecution"--logically leads to Turner course. Invent "political" differences as a smokescreen. Like you told Turner, it's a spiral out of the SL.
- 4) Capitulate.
- 5) Quit (like Treiger).

We are hoping for the first choice. It won't be easy. Comrades looked up to you. Reuben said, "one of my ikons fell over."

When Cunningham came in, 1967-68, it was on basis of abstract appreciation of SL program. You stood out as talented Marxist intellectual, along with others defended program against Ellens-Turner. Transformation: strain on comrades, pressure to make leaps, stretched thin. You are cracking under strain of the transformation of SL from what it has been to what it is becoming.

Motions by Nelson: 1) To accept the report of the enlarged PB meeting of 24-25 June and the PB meeting of 29 June.
2) Regarding David Cunningham: Behind the cliquist attitude expressed, for example, by the willful refusal to inform the Political Bureau of the impending departures of Treiger, Janet and Benjamin lies a profound petty-bourgeois degeneration leading to a method and practice incompatible with communist methods of functioning.

Report by Cunningham: The transformation of the SL will not occur. I did withhold information from the PB. I was confused until two days later, but I was trying to break it up. Marv felt jobbed by being assigned document he couldn't handle to break his authority. About two weeks before the enlarged PB I got a phone call from Janet saying that Jim keeps talking about 1938-39, rumblings about a slate fight. Treiger thing was a result of demoralization. A week later there was a three-way phone conversation with Treiger, Benjamin and Janet, wanting to know if I'd support Benjamin. On Helene, I had considered Benjamin was better, but after being out here I was impressed with Helene and thought it probably wasn't her fault.

Robertson called a few days before the PB meeting and suggested strongly that I return to NYC, but gave me the option of going or not. There were problems here--unbalanced situation, no stability in BA. Jim said my name is associated with Rep, Helene, Moore, Benjamin. I was for the others but not Rep because of his functioning; I told Rep that. I had no counterposed slate proposal. I wasn't wild about Spartacus B-L, though I think the IKD is sectarian. The orientation is skewed! IKD is crackpot. I agree with what was in PB minutes. Moore is a friend of mine. I respect him. That's not a clique.

My letter (in the bulletin) is pollyanna-ish, overpraised everyone except Rep. What Moore did in Europe was wrong, but he didn't

receive enough guidance from the N.O. He was disoriented; if we had paid attention we'd have noticed his course--nobody wrote him. The Boston stuff was not one-sided.

There was an acute hard-core paranoia aimed at Robertson; I felt the PB was incompetent to handle it and we might be minus three people instead of one. When Janet realized her error she started sounding like a zombie so I asked her to come out here. She told all kinds of people all sorts of things. I respect Janet though; when I saw what she had been put through--if I wasn't political I'd have gone after Robertson with a gun.

There was a thing aimed at Treiger, and he knew it and it drove him nuts; Benjamin and Janet locked into it. I didn't know what it meant; I thought it was paranoia; I can't discount the subjective element. I have never been in communication with Moore; I have never written him a letter, though Janet did. I did talk to Treiger a bit on the West Coast. He was depressed because of the document he was supposed to write. I, more passively, didn't know what the transformation stuff meant. I didn't really understand it because I wasn't close to the central leadership.

Federalism does not exist in a local unless there is a lack of leadership. It cannot happen unless there is a flaw in the leadership. Despite Tweet's calls to the N.O., Los Angeles is a nightmare of sectarianism, which is also due to a lack of functioning in the center. Tweet is the source of everything here, verifiable or otherwise.

The four priorities set out at the last plenum have not been fulfilled. Two of them have not been dealt with at all--black work and international work. Union work is no good without the other two, so the paper's the only thing, and the paper is too narrow and sectarian.

The SL has a formally correct program. I am not a leader of the organization; there are two leaders, Gordon and Robertson. They make all the decisions, oversee everything; thus there is an inability to delegate responsibility which has produced a lock-up in the center. Seeing the contradictions between our rapid growth and the lock-up at the center, I thought the situation would explode. This kangaroo court is designed to break my authority before there's a chance to formulate a full program. It's designed to make me capitulate and I won't. There is an attempt to "get" people--Treiger, Moore. The international work is not real; the union work is only a toe-hold, I'm not convinced of a great upswing.

All the power lies with two people; this meeting is to teach you a lesson on what happens if you go into opposition. I'm a hard opposition. The thing to do is to take me to a party court, not in front of non-members. This is a mockery. This meeting has a star chamber quality. What happened to Benjamin, what happened to Janet? Benjamin is half nuts and Janet is half nuts and afraid to go back to New York, she wanted to quit. You correct people but not with grueling 12-hour meetings and six hours of crying. Bolshevik hardness is politics, not this stuff. Bolshevik politics is conscious-

ness, not capitulation. You've all been lined up.

I don't have a clique; I have a few friends. If Moore were here I would discuss forming a tendency with him. Not with Treiger, or Rep, maybe with Janet, and I don't know about Mirra. Who wants to start an anti-regime war? SL program is abstract, because it hasn't been carried out. We don't have a program on black work, on international work. You learn about the world by intersecting it and we don't. We have one document on black question--out of print. The consciousness here is one that sits back and waits and then comes down organizationally hard. When the Nixon talk happened and all the locals called in but L.A. didn't, the N.O. should have known something was wrong. The leadership has a wait-and-destroy attitude and just smashes everything! This is non-directive in the best case, and destructive of cadre in the worst case. Helene came in and they dumped on her; Moore was cut off til he made a mistake and then they came in and dumped on him because they had a good hard case. The national leadership has a wait-and-destroy attitude of smashing and disarming. Everything starts in cliques, around griping. If you can't communicate then there is something wrong. That is not communist politics.

This is a kangaroo court because none of you believe me--two weeks ago yes, but now no--because teams of people have been going around and lining up people. This is anti-Leninist! Faction is a dirty word in this organization! It means split--means I'm Harry Turner. A course is charted for you before you start.

Why is it necessary to crack me? All this slander, all this garbage. I didn't badmouth Nelson. I came out here to build the local. Gene did not know of a single organizational difference I had. Robertson told Treiger he was going to break his authority in the organization and he was going to line up the cadre to do it. There is a history of this, in 1922 Paul Levi's letter and Radek's reply. They went for his guts, drove him nuts, then used it for a whitewash.

"You can talk to the National Chairman but don't say it out loud." Why do they want to get Moore? Because he was so critical he got on people's nerves. Stuart and Denise told me Nelson was coming to get me, to attempt to break me, not so I could put forward my ideas, but to get me tired, nervous, off guard, with people already lined up against me. That's not education, that's the destruction of this organization. The revolutionary party cannot be maintained this way!

Motion: For a one-hour break.

failed

Motion: For a 30-minute break.

failed

Motion: For a 10-minute break.

passed

Session recessed at 6:55 p.m., reconvened 7:11 p.m. First round - 5 minutes.

Mark: I am shocked. Cunningham's charge of kangaroo court, everything decided, people lined up is absurd. I'm not lined up. I only had a short call from Jim; I haven't even read the documents. This meeting was designed to destroy your authority? Your presentation

destroyed your authority. It was contradictory and profoundly anti-Leninist. You lied, you bypassed the PB. In a Leninist organization you fight it out first in the PB, then you bring it to the membership. You admit you bypassed the PB. I heard no hint of differences you had; today you made a series of charges that go back two years: no blacks, no international perspectives. What would you have done differently, what would you do, what will you do? How could we have gotten the black cadre in LA and why didn't you raise it to the PB? LA didn't respond on Indochina? People looked to you as PB representative--you were there! Like me, you didn't respond fast enough. No political debate? What about the Ellens-Turner fight? What about fights with Seymour and me?

Rep: Time is too short. On international work, look at the documents and PB minutes directed at Moore--why not this energy directed at the international bulletin? The RCL says if we won't get it out, they'll do it for us, shows the incompetence of the N.O. Federalism is a burning issue; document I was assigned to write will put the brunt on the N.O. Robertson, Gordon and Kat and Helene had a 5-hour discussion of criticisms of functioning of the BA and Kat's document. Main charge was that Kat wanted to make a bloc with the N.O. against the local leadership; Robertson and Gordon sided with Helene even though 90% of what Kat said was true. The document was suppressed, not discussed. Precedent was set for Gene's letter to the N.O., no lesson was learned. BA federalism is a direct result of the N.O.

Paul: Moore wrong on Germany: equated his authority with PB's, inadequate reports, implicit bloc with Spartacus B-L. SL program correct. For a PB member to lie is vile. I see no real political fight from Treiger or Cunningham. Helene's BA regime: lack of collective leadership.

Janet: Yes, Marv was probing, checking out the SL. This fight has been pushed on all of us. All these accusations of deceit, disloyalty, maneuvering--either bring them up on charges or retract it. Yes I knew about the PB meeting with Treiger. What drove Marv up the wall was the stuff with Moore and the proposed position of National Organizational Secretary; Robertson defined it as "internal opponents work"--to break up factions before they know they're factions. Jim told me that there would be a secret PB meeting. To protect Treiger? No, to break him. A slate is supposed to run on positions. If the PB has a slate before positions are even out, of course there will be a bloody slate fight. We're anti-Robertson? We're trying to keep people's minds open before things are clamped down, before we're denounced, so we can have time to develop positions.

John B.: Why a secret PB meeting? Why are slates drawn up before the documents are out? Rep is dead wrong about Kat--90% right? No, 90% incoherent. What would Cunningham have done differently on black and international questions? SL regime does delegate authority--if there's someone to delegate it to; has pressed RCY would-be leadership to take initiative itself. There are occasions when Bolsheviks have to break discipline to uphold principle. If Cunningham was right, withholding information could have been keeping the comrades in the organization. But if he was wrong, then at best that would be misguided; at worst, greater loyalty to a particular person than to SL politics.

Delia: There was an attempt to line people up before the meeting--Tweet condescending, John "blood and guts" attitude. This is no kangaroo court. I haven't heard any politics. You said this is a kangaroo court because nobody believes you--well what do you expect when you lie to the local organizer, the PB and the National Chairman? As Nelson said, the SL leadership didn't get its program through the mail.

Philip: Pleas for open-mindedness, but I haven't heard any political basis.

Mirra: I didn't hear about this until very recently--Dave didn't tell me--I heard it on the other end of phone calls. Janet was in terrible shape after the meeting Sunday. Kat's document was hardly discussed; Kat didn't understand the process she went through--she was skeptical then, but not now. Why didn't the N.O. catch the cop question instead of Stephanie?

Sue A.: You haven't made your case. Nor arguments, just self-fulfilling prophecy. Only conclusion: you have nothing to say. The party was pushing the question to bring it to a head. There is no evidence of organizational measures to destroy comrades. A Bolshevik's loyalty is to a program, not a party. You're not explaining how you're different from Turner.

John S.: If we were Stalinists just "out to get you," would there have been so much material put out? We've been urging people to talk to you.

Victor: Cunningham--too much whining. Point to specifics in program that we have betrayed. Marv could have fought. Your statement that every pre-factional political discussion is a clique is not true. We want tendencies of discussion in the party, we do not want cliques--or factions, though we recognize the right of factions to exist. There are "no fights in the organization"--whose fault is that?

Bob: All you can counterpose to the SL program is the devil theory of two nasty leaders. A bloc with Moore would be rotten.

Gene: Agree with a number of Cunningham's points on the Bay Area. Found it difficult to believe Dave could go off the deep end. You've taken a non-serious attitude toward the party, reflected in the way your tendency came together. You withheld information on the basis of friendship--cliquism! The party has the right to know. You are cutting your own throat. Can't take Rep seriously--if Kat was 90% right, she should have been the organizer or leader of BA, that's the logical conclusion.

Keith: I haven't been a member long enough to be a Robertson hand-raiser. Have contempt for Dave's behavior. His main point was the terrible bureaucratic regime. But you were a part of it, and never said anything before now. Why weren't you raising those objections in the PB, then to the membership? Rep did not strive to transform the BA.

Tom: No proof either side is right or wrong. Lining up is a bogus argument--we're political people, we get influenced by political ideas.

Karen: (not recorded)

Rosalind: (not recorded)

Irene: (not recorded)

Jane: Clear that an anti-leadership clique has been formed. All members of this clique have a history of inconsistency. The cry of bureaucracy tends to hold together people with nothing in common aside from hostility to leadership. Cunningham's statements against Ellens-Turner could be used against his current stance. SL leadership does not "wait and destroy" but seeks to correct at every point. On black work: Didn't Al propose flying down to LA each weekend to intervene in the black study circle? International: How about Seymour and Helen going to NZ? Mirra's position is subjective, in contradiction to her previous positions.

Lesley: There is no political basis for a faction. There have been disagreements in the PB--e.g. Ireland. Moore and Cunningham decided to bypass democratic centralism (Moore ignores PB instructions on Germany; Cunningham withholds information from PB). Both are seeking to leave the SL. Nelson's motions are correct. Cunningham should have presented his document.

Sue M.: Gene is correct--Cunningham has taught the local a lot. But there is no political basis for his conduct here. Rep can't be believed. John S. and Tweet have tried to line people up. Cunningham has been caught with his pants down. He has succumbed to passivity--the very vice he accuses the leadership of. Making Janet cry shouldn't be used against the leadership. Cunningham can't provide an alternative to the present leadership.

Sandra: Lying not wrong in itself. Why you lied is a personal reason. You have not raised concrete examples of your charges of bureaucracy. Tweet and Nelson's analysis is not very good but there is nothing to work with. Why didn't you bring things up before?

Wanda: I didn't get that much from Tweet and Nelson's report; when I heard Cunningham's report I saw why--there's nothing political to work with.

Marty: I've been brought to tears a number of times. If comrades are so fragile they can't fight a bureaucracy, that's a very serious weakness, after being in the SL for years. If there is a bureaucracy, what is its basis, how did it form? None of us are so stupid that we were bulldozed.

Duffy: You've been under strain, reacted subjectively. Treiger quit without a fight--loss is very damaging. Try to reintegrate yourself into the leadership, we need you. Should have presented your document earlier.

Diana: I'm always suspicious when people just have organizational criticisms--there are always politics behind them. In an organization people are sometimes hard on one another--that's not enough to build a faction on or quit--subjectivity.

Jan: No political thrust. Atrocity stories--why only now? You've had these differences 2 years; doesn't that make you a hand raiser yourself? If you bloc with Rep and Moore you'd better have a strong document differentiating yourself clearly.

Margie: Dave has not presented any political thrust. Am mystified over Treiger. What was the situation in Germany?

Jay: No basis for the faction. To raise a criticism of the national leadership is political, but there was no documentation or clarification on the charges. Lying, even with the highest loyalty to the program, was tactically stupid, and has led to their discredit, into a corner. Our responsibility to bring out the politics.

Cunningham: I will withdraw my document on the basis that it is insufficient.

Chair: Note the document was never read before the body and therefore I rule it be read to the body and attached to the minutes.

Nelson: Chair should rule that document be read, appended to the minutes, noting in the minutes it was withdrawn as insufficient.

Chair: I agree and so rule.

Motion by Lesley: That we accept the withdrawal of Cunningham's document as insufficient, and that it be read and appended to the minutes and its withdrawal and motivation for such be noted in the minutes. passed

Motion by Cunningham: That the document be withdrawn on the basis that it's insufficient and that it not appear in the minutes. failed

Motion: That summaries, if necessary, and a second round be held tomorrow morning; that the rest of the documents be passed out for the comrades to read for this discussion. passed

Session adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Minutes of Special Joint Meeting of Bay Area Local Committee and
Los Angeles Organizing Committee.....1 & 2 July 1972

Second Session convened July 2 at 10:45 a. m.

Attendance - same. Secretaries - Lesley and Danny.

Motion: To have a five-minute second round, followed by summaries:
Cunningham--25 minutes, Tweet--20 minutes, Nelson--50
minutes. passed

Motion: That the second round be preceded by reporters' statements:
Nelson--15 minutes, Cunningham--7-1/2 minutes. passed

Report by Nelson: I withdraw my motion of yesterday's session; in-
stead I put forward the following:

Motion by Nelson: To condemn Comrade Cunningham for his actions over the past weeks which have been dishonest, disloyal and deeply unprincipled: 1) he knew of impending split of Treiger, Rogers and Benjamin; 2) he did not notify the Political Bureau; 3) he admitted he lied to comrades in the Bay Area branch; 4) he went into instant opposition to the Political Bureau from having been a totally "loyal, intimate collaborator," i.e., he formed a secret clique when caught out on points 1 and 2; 5) his first formal declaration of opposition was a statement (24 June 1972) devoid of any political content other than "opposition to the present leadership."

Votes should also be taken on accepting the reports.

Cliquism is a perversion of normal channels and social ties-- therefore not subject to disciplinary action, but must be condemned politically. This is the purpose of the motion. There can be no "penalty" for voting against the motion--its purpose is to be an indicator of consciousness, to raise consciousness through inner struggle. A cliquist fight is by nature unclear, acrimonious, hard to grapple with; it therefore harms the organization.

Cunningham has deceived and lied to the party. The voltage is upped because he's a PB member. To regain his authority in the organization, Cunningham must recognize what he has done, beginning by voting for the motion.

There was talk yesterday of "lining people up." A Bolshevnik looks to be lined up--that is, to hear both sides, evaluate critically, in order to himself take sides, come to grips with the issues, have a struggle. Generalized skepticism, doubting, is a way of avoiding hard positions, holding off struggle.

A clique produces self-reinforcing guilt; bitterness builds up. It damages people, erodes them, causes them to lose the respect of their comrades. Some comrades have been damaged--e.g. Libby--must prove themselves again. We're not trying to punish Cunningham.

Report by Cunningham: I can't vote for the motion. What is central is the political conception of leadership. It is not dishonest or

disloyal to challenge the leadership. I should not have lied to the Bay Area comrades; it was despicable, based on "funk."

My document was not devoid of political content. I do not have a "doubtist" attitude, but rather an interventionist outlook on the world. I have no intention of capitulating. I recognize that my authority is damaged; I will have to fight to make comrades believe me. I am not a cliquist; until the Treiger thing, I didn't even hint at forming an opposition. No connection with the "Moore clique." There is no evidence of a "Cunningham clique," no evidence of disloyalty. If I had been disloyal for years, it should have shown in my work. There has been no deterioration; some of the best work I've done has been in the last six months. There has been no corrosion. Gordon's document is character assassination, raises a question of whether its supporters and I can exist in the same organization. I do not intend to leave the organization, at least until this thing is fought out and clarified. I intend to get a document out in a week--with proof.

Discussion: second round--5 minutes.

Mark: Still no politics. My impression is that Cunningham hadn't been a cliquist, but is one now. There is no basis for his opposition. I don't see why Cunningham can't vote for the motion, since he admitted to most of it. Yes, there is now an attempt to destroy his authority. The PB has a right to do this, as he has been operating in secret and the PB had to bring it out into the open. Cunningham doesn't have strong organizational qualities, and couldn't run the party better than the present leadership.

Rep: My characterization of our formation is a "bloc for democracy," in opposition to a fabricated struggle over the slate which was calculated to break the authority of Cunningham and Treiger. Cunningham never came out with a definitive position on the slate; the rumors originated with Tweet. The PB minutes camouflaged the nature of the discussion on slate, comparisons with 1939-40. Robertson attributed a slate to Treiger and threatened to wage the fight in his place, if Treiger wouldn't do it himself. There were no counterposed documents. The charge that Treiger planted land mines in the locals in order to sneak in a slate is untrue. There was trouble between Treiger and Robertson since we joined the SL. Treiger proposed the orientation to our major industrial concentration; Treiger wrote most of the articles for WV; he was not a disgruntled element.

Paul: I have nothing really new to say. Cunningham's judgment led to dishonest, disloyal acts, leading to cliquelike formations, although he is not a chronic cliquist. I am in basic agreement with Nelson's motion, but it should be expanded in terms of the breach of democratic-centralism and the petty-bourgeois cliquist approach.

Janet: I can't vote for the motion. There are two organizations in the SL; in New York we were convinced of everything that was said here yesterday. Gordon's paper is an attempt at character assassination and lining people up other than on a political basis. It is based on out-and-out lies--e.g. secret correspondence with Moore; in fact there was only one letter between Rogers and Moore and one

reply. There has not been a "Cunningham clique." A clique is a group of people getting together with no common program; comrades have the right to gripe together.

John B.: Everyone agrees with points 1-3 of the motion. The motivation and the last two are what are controversial. If Cunningham was right about the PB's incapacity to stop the defections, his withholding of information was valid. If he was wrong, either he is an incredibly bad observer of the PB or Nelson's characterization is right. The evidence presented by the co-signers of the minority document is inconclusive.

There can be bureaucratic actions in an organization without a material basis. I am inclined to attribute the difficulties in Germany to Moore rather than to the N.O. Likewise for the Bay Area federalism problem.

Delia: Don't agree with John's point about possible justification for lying to the PB. What Cunningham did undermined trust among comrades, and undermined the PB's ability to function. There are principled ways for an oppositionist to wage a struggle against the leadership, but Cunningham's aren't in this category.

Philip: It's just a series of unsubstantiated organizational gripes.

Mirra: I can't vote for the motion; agree with Cunningham, Rep and Janet. I don't like this approach: if you vote against the motion a comrade will sit down with you to help "raise your consciousness." Paul and Mark say Cunningham wasn't a long-time cliquist; Gordon's document claims he was! There is no proof. Full of slanders--e.g. Cunningham's inability to write for Spartacist. Cunningham was correct in not telling the PB; the PB would have used bad judgment. I object to "lining up" on the part of Nelson.

Sue A.: The opposition's objection is that the leadership is incapable of carrying out the transformation document. No one has done less than Rep to implement the transformation of the SL. I can't take Janet seriously when last week she spoke of leaving politics. There is certainly some evidence of cliquism. Suggest amendment to point 2: "in an effort to protect personal associates from political confrontation."

There is an error in the document (p. 13) on the role of the local: I wanted to hold a local meeting to break the news of Treiger's resignation. Gene said we should wait until Saturday, because of advice from the N.O. On Wednesday Helene said information on Cunningham should not be circulated. Cunningham lined up Rep and Mirra; no evidence of anyone else being lined up. Cliquism is anti-consciousness; Cunningham is proposing rules for a debating society, not a party.

John S.: Cunningham has destroyed his own credibility. Rep is being formalistic about slates; paralleling Turner. Last week's events forced the clique into the open. On the Bay Area: Cunningham was not consciously lining everyone up, but ran into parallel thinking here because of prior problems here; I detected a note of suspi-

cion among the comrades at the presence of Tweet and myself. Cunningham is a doubter toward the party.

Victor: I support the motion. It is unprincipled to falsify information; if you believe the party is fundamentally flawed--i.e., incapable of being the vanguard, centrist--you can withhold information. Cunningham should have subordinated himself to the party even if he thought himself more competent on the question of dealing with Benjamin-Treiger-Janet. We have an obligation to the party; I have a loyal position toward the SL.

Rep is the "King Midas in reverse" of the minority--everything he touches turns to soft garbage. I tend to believe that Cunningham was pushing for Rep being on the CC.

Bob: Who circumvented the PB and now cries out for democracy? What are Cunningham's credentials for being a better leadership than the "Robertson-Gordon clique"? You never actively struggled in the PB.

Gene: Cunningham has to make the case for a qualitative degeneration of the regime. The same regime has existed for years; how can it be wrong organizationally for years and still be right politically? Libby has not been forced to abandon her criticisms. Rep knew Treiger had criticisms--why didn't he raise them to the PB? Now it's post-humous. It's democratic to discuss slates in a pre-conference period.

Rep isn't serious; he hasn't been active; he prefers to be in a minority so he can write documents, keep up intellectual pursuits instead of bumping into the real world and getting a job as the local assigned him to. Rep probably shouldn't have been sent to the Bay Area in the first place. His motion is toward something like New Left Review; "bloc for democracy" is a bloc for something else.

I had a centrist position on the party. You do not lie to the party; it's like lying to the class. It blunts the party. Comrades have the right to "line people up"--that's struggle. I had taken an agnostic position.

Keith: It cuts into the minority's credibility to call documents from the N.O. lies, persecution, purge. The PB had good cause for suspicion and had every right to investigate. There may be some truth in the charge that Tweet came up here with knives sharpened but that's not a criticism of Robertson and Gordon; I was on the phone when Robertson told Tweet to go easy in the Bay Area, just find out what was going on, not put anybody up against a wall. Cunningham never raised any criticisms of Robertson-Gordon in the PB. I would like to see a statement of loyalty to the party from Cunningham. Rep attempts to cover up Treiger's resignation.

You want to counterpose yourself to the SL leadership with this motley rotten bloc? Cunningham--who lied to PB and to comrades? Janet--who was ready to quit a few days ago? Rep--who can't even get a job and has done more than anyone else in the Bay Area SL to hold back the transformation? Mirra--who has never had any differences with the leadership and is now acting completely out of subjective ties?

Tom: Cunningham has not been cliquish in the past. But a clique does exist now--the present alignments cannot be taken as anything but a clique--there is no programmatic unity. The burden of proof of the minority's charges rests with the minority. I support Nelson's motion. Cunningham has raised the possibility of an organizational rupture with the party; this is Turnerism because there is no programmatic basis. Cunningham should make a statement of loyalty to the party.

Karen: The N.O. will have to prove its charges of clique correspondence. Cunningham is charging Robertson-Gordon with mostly unsubstantiated charges. Nelson's motion does not depend on Gordon's charges, but only on a recognition of what Cunningham has done. I disagree with "lining up" by Tweet and John; comrades should hear the arguments first.

Rosalind: There must be a departure in the organization to produce this rupture now: Cunningham, Moore, Treiger and cliques.

Irene: Cunningham is a cliquist; did not make open factional struggle. Common gripes against the leadership, as put forward in Rep's presentation, are not the basis for a minority faction. I agree with the motions. Cunningham must vote for some sort of loyalty to the party.

Jane: I agree with Nelson's motions. The accusation is made that the N.O.'s sending out of documents is part of bureaucratic methods. This is the same as Turner's charge. By its thrust a clique will attract (if anyone) the same type of people as were attracted to Turner. I am critical of Cunningham's functioning here; he didn't attempt to intervene in caucus or talk to party members about it; I am critical of Mirra's participation in the caucus. Mirra's participation in this faction is an encapsulation of her weakness--she wasn't independent, followed Cunningham, relied on him to cover her own weakness.

Lesley: I agree with Nelson's motions and Sue's amendment. Rep has been a hindrance in the BA local; he sat back as the local intellectual. It's a bad alliance. What are the political criticisms of the leadership?

I'm dissatisfied with this discussion. It was supposed to cover the trade union discussion in New York, international work, etc., not just Cunningham.

Sue M.: We need an understanding of how to handle Treiger's quitting. Cunningham was caught out, has been reacting since then. It's obviously a clique, considering the basis on which Cunningham got his followers. There should have been a meeting right away; it would have eliminated rumors. I agree with Jane's characterization of Mirra. For Rep, this is a cop-out.

Sandra: It's wrong to lie to the party unless you see it as basically flawed. If Cunningham felt he could handle the clique situation better than the PB, he should have gone to the PB and asked if he could handle it. I disagree with John's insinuations that the

hesitancy of the local comrades indicated a tendency to support Cunningham.

Wanda: If Cunningham had criticisms of the PB for two years, why didn't he tell anyone about them. I'm also critical of Mirra's functioning in the caucus.

Marty: Cunningham did know better than the PB, which is why he should have told the PB what he knew concerning the defections. I second the comments by Dale, Victor and Sandra on lying to the party. The motion does not ask Cunningham to retract his criticisms of the leadership, but to make them political. He should vote for the motion, as he has violated Leninist principles. I incline toward agreement with Keith's criticisms of Tweet.

Duffy: Cunningham's criticisms of the leadership may be good, but first he has to reestablish his credibility. He should vote for Nelson's motion and reassert his party loyalty. The N.O.'s reaction to the Bay Area after Treiger's resignation was understandable and justified considering Cunningham's holding back of information.

Diana: The minority is a rotten bloc--differing motivations. Rep seems to be on a different wave-length from the other minority comrades. The group's politics seem to be nothing more than a "bloc for democracy."

Jan: Cunningham's act of indiscipline is an acute lack of judgement. It's hard to take Rep seriously; he has shown a lack of willingness to implement the transformation document. It's a clique which is now searching for a political program, probably won't find a sufficient one. I still want clarification on the slate question and the Moore-Cunningham correspondence. Cunningham must prove that the SL has degenerated organizationally and politically in the past few years.

Margie: I support Nelson's motion and wish the minority comrades would. Mirra's positions seem a flip-flop from all her previous politics.

Jay: There is no basis for a faction; the formation is subjective. Cunningham was blunting the SL by lying; was being disloyal and dishonest as it stated in the motion.

Summary by Cunningham: My authority deserves to be damaged. I must take responsibility for my actions. I realize this is a clique, which is why I withdrew the document. The basis of my relation with Rep is political, but he isn't ready for the CC.

Gordon's document is a complete falsification; charges of long-standing "Cunningham clique," charges of Moore-Cunningham correspondence are false. I have to answer these charges; there has to be an element of trust.

I am a competent, conscious political person, responsible for many of the SL's breakthroughs--e.g. I ran the SL/RCY intervention at the SDS Convention in Boston. I couldn't have been sour while

doing all that good work. I am willing to sign a "loyalty oath"--loyalty to the program. Factions don't necessarily mean split--sometimes they mean a deeper fusion. I don't have an IS conception of organization as a discussion group; I'm one of the politically hardest people in the SL.

I haven't changed my line on Germany. I think there is a big quantitative (at least) difference between Spartacus B-L and the IKD, the latter having adopted a neo-Mandelian line.

I didn't like what John said about automatic loyalty to the party, an identification of the party with the program. I agree with most of what Victor said, but parties do degenerate and then there is a separation between the organization and the program. Blocs for the protection of democracy are standard in the Leninist movement--e.g. the bloc of the RT with Weiss in 1963.

With Treiger it's more than skepticism; Treiger doesn't think there can be a revolution. Rep knew that Treiger had considered resigning, but thought he had talked him out of it. I will fight to stay in the SL.

Summary by Tweet: Cunningham is an arrogant, one-sided intellectual. He doesn't want to accept a reasonable evaluation of himself, wants to save his honor. His arrogance has wasted the time, money, energy of the party, disrupted a discussion on union work, international work, transformation of the SL.

In LA, Cunningham built an unprincipled bloc with Joe Johnson and Fagin. He allowed Johnson, then Fagin, to be the political spokesmen for a bloc when the SL had the forces. Cunningham tried to defend Keith's soft speech at the rally, where Keith didn't attack the CP. I don't believe Cunningham's "left-wing" credentials.

Cunningham called me a liar--prove it or take it back.

Maybe John and myself exceeded our instructions from the N.O., but it was necessary to fight the clique. I fell into Cunningham's frame of mind to the point of suggesting Rep as a CC member.

To stand aside from the party is centrism. To object to "lining up" is to object to the concept of a vanguard party. Cunningham intersected the Bay Area's softness. Defense of the party is primary. The party can't be slighted or damaged for personal reasons. You must prove a programmatic departure before you decide that a party is degenerating. Cunningham predicted an eruption. Narrow circle aspirations erupted against the growth of the SL.

We must repair the damage. Cunningham should go to Boston and defend the organization against the Moore clique; we should raise the money to replace what has been spent.

Summary by Nelson: It has always been Robertson's policy to say things openly. Cunningham internalized the criticisms made of him. Cunningham says he knew the axe was going to fall on Treiger; Cunningham shares heavy responsibility for Treiger's departure by rein-

forcing his gripes and doubtism. Cunningham must vote for the motion or he will end up rationalizing the rotten role he has played the last few weeks.

Cunningham's justification for not informing the PB about impending departures was that there would have been "three instead of one"--PB would have driven them out. But Janet wrote a resignation during lunchbreak of PB meeting, came to Crawford and Robertson with it. They asked her to wait, not to resign.

(Janet's draft resignation letter read.) (Janet: Where did you get that? I never signed it or gave anyone a copy.)

Janet requested to meet with Robertson on Monday and Tuesday to discuss Treiger, Cunningham, the criticisms by herself and Benjamin about the organization. Robertson requested Janet to urge Cunningham to pull back. She promised she would call Robertson within 48 hours; she never did.

On Janet's crying, Robertson's "torturing" Janet: There was a contradiction within Janet. She was pulled between Treiger and the SL. She came out here and found herself in a similar situation with Cunningham.

Lies: that Treiger was given assignment to write the Conference document because Robertson knew he couldn't handle it; that National Organizational Secretary is a hatchet job; that there has been no attempt to integrate comrades into the organization, into the leadership. Cunningham, Janet, Libby, and others have been pushed to the forefront--Cunningham at the time of the Ellens faction fight. If Robertson and Gordon run the national organization, it's the fault of no one else taking responsibility. Cunningham has been part of the regime, part of the problem. Nelson-Robertson-Gordon-Cunningham basically constituted the regime. On black work: there was a strong attempt to win over Joe Johnson's circle in spite of Treiger's skepticism. On international work: we are trying desperately to get Sharpe to do this work; a new Spartacist will help service the international arena. Cunningham did change his line on Moore; Moore wanted the international discussion bulletin to reinforce his bloc with Spartacus B-L. If Cunningham rips off Janet and Benjamin it would be a serious roadblock to the transformation of the SL--the press.

The bloc with Weiss is different from the present bloc. Weiss simply came to the defense of the democratic rights of the RT. Cunningham doesn't see any difference? He's getting all his rights: oral debate, discussion bulletins, etc.

So Rep did know about Treiger's resignation!

There has to be a consonance between the regime and the party. Cunningham hasn't found it; is simply counterposing himself to the leadership. He has outraged the comrades, questioned the foundations of democratic-centralism. He suddenly decided the PB was incompetent. He didn't raise to the national leadership his fears that the organization would blow up in six months.

John B.'s remarks are a rationalization for lying to the party.

Tweet should draw up a list of Cunningham's charges against her. We will get written statements for the Control Commission. Cunningham is instructed to return to New York as soon as this is wrapped up. I advise Cunningham and the others to pull back.

VOTING:

Motion: To accept the reports of Tweet and Nelson. passed

<u>Bay Area:</u>	<u>Los Angeles:</u>	<u>Consultative:</u>
<u>For:</u> All except	<u>For:</u> All	<u>For:</u> All except
<u>Against:</u> ---	<u>Against:</u> ---	<u>Against:</u> ---
<u>Abstaining:</u> Mirra, Rep	<u>Abstaining:</u> ---	<u>Abstaining:</u> Cunningham,
<u>Not Voting:</u> ---	<u>Not Voting:</u> ---	Janet, Margie
		<u>Not Voting:</u> ---

Motion: To accept the report of Cunningham. failed

<u>Bay Area:</u>	<u>Los Angeles:</u>	<u>Consultative:</u>
<u>For:</u> ---	<u>For:</u> ---	<u>For:</u> ---
<u>Against:</u> All except	<u>Against:</u> All	<u>Against:</u> All except
<u>Abstaining:</u> Mirra, Rep	<u>Abstaining:</u> ---	<u>Abstaining:</u> Janet, Margie
<u>Not Voting:</u> ---	<u>Not Voting:</u> ---	<u>Not Voting:</u> Cunningham

Amendment (by Sue A.--see above): Withdrawn.

Motion: (Main motion by Nelson--see above). passed

<u>Bay Area:.</u>	<u>Los Angeles:</u>	<u>Consultative:</u>
<u>For:</u> All except	<u>For:</u> All	<u>For:</u> All except
<u>Against:</u> Mirra	<u>Against:</u> ---	<u>Against:</u> Janet
<u>Abstaining:</u> ---	<u>Abstaining:</u> ---	<u>Abstaining:</u> ---
<u>Not Voting:</u> ---	<u>Not Voting:</u> ---	<u>Not Voting:</u> ---

Motion by Tweet: In view of the depletion of the party's treasury by the factional struggle: that comrades seriously consider a fund drive to replenish funds. Passed unanimously

Motion: That Nelson give brief informational report on how to publicly handle Treiger's resignation. passed

Report by Nelson: Treiger indicated he wants to stay out of politics for six months. There's no reason for us to raise it unless he surfaces politically. If we're asked: It's for personal reasons so far as we know.

[No adjournment time given.]

Factional Statement to Joint California SL Meeting

July 1, 1972

"The SAP is without a program. We are not discussing the matter of a formal document; the program holds water only in the event that its text is tied up with the revolutionary experience of the party and with the lessons gained from battles which have entered into the flesh and blood of its cadres. The SAP has none of these. The Russian Revolution, its separate stages, the struggle of its factions; the German crisis of 1923; the civil war in Bulgaria; the events of the Chinese Revolution; the battles of the British proletariat (1926); the revolutionary crisis in Spain--all these events, which must live in the consciousness of a revolutionist as luminous guideposts for the political road, are for the cadres of the SAP only murky recollections culled from newspapers and not revolutionary experiences lived through and assimilated."

L. Trotsky
The Struggle Against
Fascism in Germany

We stand on the document "Memorandum to the Central Committee on the Transformation of the SL." The formal SL program is not a correct program but an isolated, self-contained, self-consistent, self-serving collection of positions totally divorced from struggle to buttress a bureaucratic, centralist cliquist regime which has neither the capacity nor the intention of carrying out the transformation of the organization but rather seeks only to preserve its cliquist character.

David Cunningham
 George Rep.
 Janet Rogers
 Mirra M.

* * *

Disposition of Factional Statement at End of 1 July session:
 [extract from minutes]

Cunningham: I will withdraw my document on the basis that it is insufficient.

Chair: Note the document was never read before the body and therefore I rule it be read to the body and attached to the minutes.

Nelson: Chair should rule that document be read, appended to the minutes, noting in the minutes it was withdrawn as insufficient.

Chair: I agree and so rule.

Motion by Lesley: That we accept the withdrawal of Cunningham's document as insufficient, and that it be read and appended to the minutes and its withdrawal and motivation for such be noted in the minutes.

Motion by Cunningham: That the document be withdrawn on the passed basis that it's insufficient and that it not appear in the minutes. failed

draft BOSTON SL LOCAL MINUTES.....2 July 1972

Present: Boston SL: Bob S., Carl L., Susan S., Bob P., Barry J.,
Judy K., Lynne M., Victor V., Crawford, George A.,
Foster, Steve G., Stuart;

Other: Boston RCY: Melinda L., Alice L., Weezie P., Sandra O.,
Mark L., Keith A., John S., James S., Ken R., Paul C.,
Richard C., Marianne; Boston W&R: Fran, A.M.;
PB: Seymour, Robertson; CC: Schaefer (NYC);
NYC-SL: Nancy R., Cantor; NYC-RCY: Denise

Meeting convened 3:20 p.m. Secretaries: Bob S., Cantor

Special Meeting: Report from the Political Bureau on the Internal Situation

Motion: To have a 1 1/2 hour presentation by Robertson, followed by a 1/2 hour presentation by Stuart, followed by rounds of discussion (suggested time for first round 8 min.), with summaries in reverse order, of 20 min. and 30 min. passed

Presentation by Robertson:

We have had within certain limits a crisis within the organization in the past two weeks, of a strikingly revealing character. This presentation could be titled "the regime meets the Byzantine cellar." Have little to say about Treiger, Crawford's remarks in the second session of PB#50 caught most of his character--the most lurid revelations of what he was up to were revealed by Kathy, a contact from New Orleans. Obviously Treiger had a sense of extreme frustration in the SL. He had, and has, a very considerable talent as a public propagandist, enjoyed tours and he wrote rather heavily and substantially. He was something of a disappointment to us though, as we had hoped to find in him the material for a national officer, but he never showed any interest in actually doing the work. He seems to have thoroughly scanned the org. in a brilliant way, looking for weaknesses, and he found the "Cunningham clot" and expropriated it.

Methodologically speaking, probably the conception Treiger had in mind for the org. was a certain randomness of political discussion, he wanted free contention for its own sake. But for us politics is a workaday responsibility. Seymour's contributions are made for the purpose of enriching the discussion in order to arrive at a decision--Treiger didn't have this conception. Treiger said PB meetings tended to come to unanimity on discussions, and that Robertson always made the motions representing the synthesis of disc., which Treiger said proved the sterility and emptiness, etc. of them. But when Crawford asked him if he had even seen a better motion defeated because Robertson was against it, or if he himself had ever had another motion, Treiger said no.

We had one particularly valuable discussion in the PB, on the Irish question, and Treiger played no particular role there. Cunningham and Benjamin both contributed, although Benjamin couldn't carry over the results of disc. into the paper, so the PB minutes of that meeting are much tighter and richer. It is rare that we are

able to make extensions of Marxism like that meeting. Well, the Marxist movement has been around over 100 years--would that our capacity was such we could make those extensions even 3 times a year. But Treiger's time-scale as well as purpose seemed of a much fore-shortened character.

Two weeks before the enlarged PB (held Sat. & Sun. 24-25 June), I came to Boston for a "quiet" weekend--or so I had hoped. Carter, the N.O. listening post on the West Coast, phoned up and said, "there's a slate proposal being pushed on the West Coast"; that Cunningham was spoken of as superior to Foster for the post of deputy national chairman, that Robertson was trying to appoint his successor because he was dying of emphysema and alcoholism and degeneracy, and the slate additions for full CC are Rep, Brosius, Benjamin and Moore as full. There'd been a similar slate being pushed on the East Coast. Benjamin had been running a clique whose thrust was that Brosius must be stopped. We had the usual 7-hour discussion with Benjamin, and he abjured his clique, and Kamkov defected from it--she had thought it was a faction. Ann P. and Steve S. were the others in it. It was a useful experience for them, to see what they had gotten into. That was a little thing though--Benjamin is a compulsive cliquist and talks to everybody. Benjamin said that Cunningham and he believed Brosius was not a Marxist. So I told him to wait until the PB when all comrades could be present (at that time Nelson, Treiger, Cunningham were all out of town, Brosius was coming in soon, Seymour was gone too). A motion was made to that effect, with Benjamin's concurrence and agreement to lay off. But then this report came in from the West Coast.

At this point (right after Carter's call, while I was in Boston), Crawford mentioned that Treiger had approached him a few months ago, saying that Robertson surrounds himself with "hand-raisers," the PBs were sterile, etc. At this point I began delicately debriefing people without letting them know why, as didn't want to destroy Treiger's authority. Treiger began spending all his free time with Rogers, and would disappear for hours at a time with Benjamin.

A funny thing happened with Schaefer--I had gone over to see her and some other comrades, and she asked 'what's wrong with Moore as full CC?' and I believe she said Treiger had suggested it. I blew up, but didn't raise the question of Treiger with her, because he was at that point a respected member of the PB.

The Friday night before the expanded PB (which was effectively a plenum, the branch organizers from all over the country were there, a large proportion of the Central Committee--was a 2 day session, 12 hours each), Brosius arrived from the West Coast. I asked her to listen to a phone call--I called Treiger and told him that things had been brought to light indicating a pressure operation on his part, and I wanted to confront him at the meeting Sunday with it, and that I was telling him first, because I intended then to also consult with other CC members who would be at the meeting. Then I told Brosius, that I figured Treiger had undoubtedly approached her, sounded her out, as she was known to have had considerable criticisms of the leadership and had had a confrontation with us recently. She finally opened up and presented what Treiger had told her, that he had char-

acterized the org. as utterly sterile, lifeless, etc., composed of a combination of apparachnik "clods" and a few empty drained shells of once prominent intellectuals, Benjamin being the prime example.

The week before this I had called Cunningham (remember the characterization we had made of the division of labor established in the SL: that the base of stability of the org. is the division of labor established between Nelson, Gordon and Robertson, supported by Cunningham), and said a slate was being put forth, and his name was attached to it. He denied it, and said he couldn't come to the expanded PB. I called again in mid-week and he said he'd send a letter with his views on the slate. Saturday night I called him, told him there was strong evidence he was somehow involved in it, and he denied it again--I gave him a full report of what I knew then also.

Sunday at 11:30 a.m. Treiger called and said he was resigning from the organization, and wouldn't be at the meeting but would bring in his resignation that day.

Immediately before the meeting began Sat. I went out with Rogers, and then told her about the phone call to Treiger I had made--she had known nothing about it from me before that point, nor had Cantor--I told her as she was going to be in the closed meeting Sunday. She didn't say anything at that point. On Sunday, during the discussion Benjamin and Rogers appeared to be going to pieces rather rapidly, and by the end of the first round were in a deeply disturbed emotional state. At the break, I went out with them--it turned out that there had been a group of three who had resolved there was an evil regime in the SL, and with mounting pressure had resolved to have a last-ditch fight at the Sunday meeting and then quit or get thrown out--except it hadn't come off. (The three were Rogers, Benjamin, and Treiger). Rogers talked with Crawford and me--she wrote up a draft resignation (read aloud), but withheld it on the advice of myself and Crawford. During the next two days following the PB, I talked with her; this was the beginning of a hair-raising week of confessions. Benjamin had actually begun it on the second round of discussion Sunday, when he got up and said, "Comrades, I have dirty hands." Then we got three successive confessions from Benjamin--until we found out he was actually beginning to enjoy confessing. Rogers exposed the real depth of the situation when she said that in the last week before the PB, when it seemed that Treiger, Benjamin and Rogers were going out of politics, Cunningham had launched a private struggle to save Rogers. She said, she had never told us that she thought Robertson and Gordon considered the SL their own private property, and that they had destroyed Cunningham.

I was appalled by Cunningham. I had thought he was a loyal and trusted collaborator--but he had nurtured deep resentments for years; a terribly corrosive thing. I asked him why he had denied knowledge of Benjamin, Rogers and Treigers' plan, and he replied, "I didn't know what it meant." But he did know enough to seek to deflect his wife from leaving. This cast a new light on the situation.

Meanwhile, on Sat. night it turned out Benjamin, Rogers and

Treiger had all been in phone communication with Cunningham. (Sue M. overheard the calls on the West Coast). Treiger also called Stuart and Rep that night--indicative phone calls--obviously to people he thought would be sympathetic. Of course nobody called the N.O. That by itself merits a certain political conclusion. Cunningham however denied he had any knowledge of it. Monday he told Sue A. (on the West Coast) he had no knowledge, and he told two others he hadn't recommended Benjamin for full CC. Operationally what happened was he got caught in a personal organizational situation he couldn't cope with, then got caught out lying, couldn't take it, and has been in a frenzy ever since. I called him this morning, and told him that to continue the fight was bad, and could only be masochism on his part. I told him his only chance was to freely acknowledge that his conduct in the past weeks had been totally irresponsible (this includes deceit and lying to the N.O.), and that he must also bring out into the open his locked-in grievances against the org. and argue for them. Otherwise how can the SL ever look at him with any respect ever again?

When in a faction fight, which is a struggle for power, every means consistent with your program is permissible. Including military-tactical ones. So when Denise called Cunningham, informing him that Nelson was going to the West Coast earlier than Cunningham had expected, she objectively sided with Cunningham. I therefore assume Denise, who's at this meeting, will tell him everything she can, and so she'll have to be treated as a minorityite.

So what's happened to Cunningham? I don't care about Treiger, I don't care about the Moore clique--yeah, like it says in the PB minutes, it's time to clean out Boston. Treiger's defection had remarkably little effect on our org.--if we ever get his resignation we'll print it with a suitable response. One clique gets an honorable mention here--the Brosius clique. When its cliquist character was exposed, it abdicated and its core voluntarily moved to NYC, in order to develop Marxist understanding.

Yesterday Cunningham admitted to the whole West Coast membership in joint meeting that he had lied about his knowledge. We are getting a statement from Sue M. and Sue A. of what he told them, his lies. We are asking all CC members who were in the room Saturday to sign a statement that Cunningham had admitted he lied. There are political programs where this kind of dishonesty is on the order of the day--but ours is not one of them, and we must ruthlessly expose lying.

So why? Cde. Ann P. made a perceptive speech at the NYC local which discussed the internal situation. She said she was shoved into a job she couldn't handle, everybody knew it, she knew it, but nobody confronted her with her failure, so she brooded and began to blame the org. for it. Part of our weakness is seizing upon anybody with the least bit of promise and shoving them into jobs they can't handle. Nelson admitted he couldn't handle the T.U. job, but that requires a high level of consciousness, and there is a tendency for the thin-skinned, the egotists or just plain inexperienced comrades to blame others. Cunningham got caught like that. In Iowa he had demonstrated capacity as a prolific and interesting writer, so we

brought him in as editor of Spartacist--he was useful, Gordon got out 2 or 3 issues a year with him. We also found out in the Ellens fight he had an excellent political mind. But he never really could handle the editor job--and for nearly 1 1/2 years he was supposed to work on the reply to "What Is Spartacist?" by Wohlforth, and he couldn't do it--for years! Considerable scars resulted from that experience.

Cunningham got Benjamin and Rogers all churned up, but he held them down, developed a slave mentality--he continually encouraged their resentments, but refused to let them express them openly, because they had to find a political basis, or the time wasn't right, or something. Cunningham fancied himself slightly above and removed from the rest of us, he saw himself as the left guardian-angel and conscience of the SL. Samuels, Kamkov, and George A. looked up to him in this role. When Samuels read the Cunningham slate letter, saying Moore was right in Germany, he said one of his idols had fallen. In the March Moore confrontation, we were united in confronting Moore. Cunningham and Samuels had the position then that Bolfra probably was still new-leftist. The PB arrived at a consensus that the nature of Bolfra was not proved, as most cdes. thought on the basis of available evidence it was not proven. So Samuels raised the question as to whether there was a question of motion in Cunningham's changed position. Then Benjamin said that for a year or two Cunningham and he had the position that Brosius was not a Marxist, and he asked Cunningham if he'd support him, and Cunningham said "No, she's at least not a hand-raiser for Robertson, never mind her positions."

What are the sources of this political degeneration? Cunningham has said that the perspective embodied in the "Transformation Memo" was a correct perspective, and that the SL program is correct, but is abstract, because it can't be carried out by the present leadership.

Moore/Stuart/Cunningham/Benjamin were a thin layer we were glad to win at the time--they're the "Class of '68". They adhered largely to the SL on the basis of the purity and beauty of our program. Now, we are involved in a transformation. A section of the "Class of '68" (or a hardened clique like the Moore one) went into insurrection over the increasing tempo and heavier demands imposed upon them, not by a heavy-handed bureaucracy, but by the needs of the transformation itself. Cunningham has an incapacity to function as a well-rounded communist, and he fell apart. This behavior of his is a shock to Boston, but not to NYC, where we know him better. He has certain self-crippling qualities, he topped out at the level of an average PB member--but apparently this festered in him. In view of his past value, we'd like, if Cunningham's not gone too far, and on the basis of an open fight on his part, to salvage him. The party is NOT the Byzantine cellar Benjamin thinks it is.

The most recent word on what Cunningham's doing is the following statement which was read yesterday at the Bay Area-L.A. meeting, and signed by Rep, Mirra, Rogers and Cunningham (statement read aloud). The statement was withdrawn in the course of the meeting as being "insufficient." Cunningham's a tremendous moralist, and was

caught in a lie. I told him he must stop his present course--I don't know what he'll do.

On the damages of cliquism: We have Schaefer here, the model for what happens to cliquists. Abern had a clique operation for years in the SWP, and every bright young comrade ran into genial Abern, then was the inevitable explosion and an exodus. Abern had a reason, too. He was a better administrator than Cannon, and it ate on him. But the SWP regime was fairly healthy and he was good and they used him. But Abern must have run through many comrades like Schaefer. You can't ban a clique by legislation, because the tools of cliquism are the elements of personal private political intercourse which is inevitable and necessary. But a clique gives this interaction a closed character. So what are we to ban? We must be very careful--I'm getting a lot of pressure right now, the NYC local would vote right now for wire taps, steaming open letters, etc. In a real sense the SL has lost its innocence. But we must resist this--we want to educate the comrades out of this clique experience, we do not want to and will not institutionalize bureaucratic forms--for example, the SLP has an effective device against cliques. No member of a local SLP unit can send a letter to another member in a unit except by going through the N.O. first with the letter, where it is opened and read, and either held or sent on. Of course they have cliques anyhow, they just use different methods.

We've had an eruption of the self-styled petty-bourgeois radical intelligentsia. Seymour, certainly one of our finest Marxist intellectuals, didn't make the beautiful people list, but that's because he's a party man. Samuels is well-educated, an intellectual--but he's a communist, is not a self-styled intellectual. It's important to avoid falling into a workerist deviation in reaction to this. We don't want a witch-hunt against the "intellectuals"--we don't live without party intellectuals--but stripped of all the academic, competitive, invidiousness.

I'll read you a couple of typical clique letters. (Excerpt read aloud from Schaefer to Treiger letter, another excerpt read from Moore to Rogers, dated late April--addressed to her at home). This letter of Moore's to Rogers contains a brief but lucid report on the Bolfra--a report we never got in the N.O. It said Bolfra wants our advice on the KPD and SPD--whether and how and if to give them critical support. Moore did write us as to our position on that question--but didn't say Bolfra wanted our advice on it. I don't believe what Moore tells the N.O. about Germany. It's like Treiger--who told a contact, Kathy, about a secret PB meeting--the other CC members didn't even know about it. We're suspicious. And the Moore clique is the oldest and hardest one, right here in Boston. Stuart/Moore are at least fighters--like cornered rats. At least you've got that. Moore told us once or twice to fuck off. I'm sorry he's not here today--I expect Stuart to fight today.

These various cliques were feeling towards each other, until Treiger blew the whole thing up by fleeing. The contemporary Abern (Moore) would be the guy to run that lash-up, but it never got that far, because this isn't 1939 for us, because we're growing, because we've tripled our size since 1968. There are people here in this

room, and in the org. at large who, although subjectively committed to the SL program, haven't yet totally broken from the old Maoist, Stalinist, New Leftist, etc. ideologies they've come to us from, and the exposure of these cliques and this fight will be a hardening process and useful if comrades will learn from it.

Presentation by Stuart:

Based on what Robertson said, I don't think I'll need 30 minutes. What's going on is an attempt to tar everyone with the same brush. On a factual basis that falls down. There is no evidence of a link-up between Treiger, Moore and Cunningham on a clique basis. No letters were exchanged between Treiger and Moore. No letters were exchanged since Moore's been in Europe between Moore and Cunningham. There have been between Moore and Rogers, but it's because they're sleeping together and I know about it, so that doesn't embarrass me. On the letter Robertson read from, I think that's why he sent it to her, because of a personal relationship. I think the lit. orders mentioned in it were official. The letter to Larry L. mentioned was about questions Larry had had on the national question, and Moore referred him to an article in WV. (I have a copy of that letter, it's in Germany right now, it was kind of boring).

My basic point of difference is I don't see what's wrong with Moore as a full C Cer. We've had criticisms of the functioning of the N.O. Moore has always had criticisms, we've never raised them privately until they were raised to the proper bodies, and never outside the SL. I don't see what's unprincipled about that. It seems Moore's criticized the N.O. and therefore he can't be a full C Cer.

On my phone calls with Treiger; he said he was 'thinking' about leaving, and I told him to take a leave of absence, don't quit. I thought it was of the same caliber as other phone calls I've got from comrades who felt demoralized and felt like quitting sometimes. It was no big thing.

I'm not aware any clique exists. I don't think I've ever acted in a cliquist way. When Moore had a principled difference he declared a faction, it was resolved, and he admitted he was wrong and dissolved it, and he came back to take his medicine. The Robertson/Moore letter has been defended by Moore in Germany.

I categorically deny any lines of communication exist between cliques. There are different definitions of what a clique is here--Seymour earlier defined it as a group which doesn't admit its differences publicly, and now Robertson defines it as a systematic and closed personal political circle. But when questions are raised, criticisms are made--I don't see how it's closed. Party intellectuals are needed stripped of academia--yes, Moore's asked for a long time to be stripped.

On the info. on Bolfra in that letter, that was also mentioned in a letter to the N.O. Also PB #48 on Germany contains some factual mistakes, I'd written correcting them.

What have we done, Robertson? I want to see it, I want to hear about it.

Discussion:

Seymour: I am less worried about the outcome of the faction fight as a power struggle than as to whether we'll change the consciousness of the comrades involved, as well as of those going through it. I know the faction declared is made up of inept comrades.

Was disturbed by the moral climate of the Boston Monday meeting. Felt was a lack of understanding of the importance of the issues at stake. Was a certain studied agnosticism expressed by Denise and Susan S. later privately. A faction fight or serious clique fight is a struggle for power. Cannot separate or divorce the SL program from its actual personnel and leadership. "Every decision has to be made on the basis of one's own understanding"--that's the kind of attitude being expressed. Well, Denise works in an industrial plant; if she came in with suggestions for work, related her experiences, etc. we couldn't all go out there to see for ourselves. Essential to our functioning is the assumption that comrades are truthful, and so we must accept what they say.

In a sense we can't prove what Stuart wants proven, we must make a judgment on the basis of incomplete information. Part of making that judgment depends on the respect and attitude one has toward the party leadership. On the Moore clique; one of the characteristics of a clique is that a lot of things are said secretly to people believed to be sympathetic and members of it are protected.

George A.: My role in all this from last Monday on is somewhat ironic. I went through the Monday meeting supporting the Moore cliquism. But after hearing Stuart's presentation, thought that was dishonest--have functioned since as a "party hack" for Foster along with Barry.

I'm the "Class of '72"--was recruited by Moore out of a history seminar on the basis of the intellectual coherence of the SL program. Had an idealist conception of leadership, over-emphasis on literary ability and a competitive (invidious) attitude--a "publish or perish" mentality. I came into the Boston local at a sensitive juncture of the fight between the Moore/Stuarts and Kinder/Foster. Moore/Stuart used this immediate political issue to poison the atmosphere of the Boston local--they picked up me, Larry L. and Joe N. They said Kinder/Foster are a couple of fuck-ups, who destroyed the Boston local, and that Robertson is coddling these guys--that was the attitude. By the founding RCY conference I was a hardened member of the Moore clique.

Following the fuck-up at the RMC Conference, over Boston problems with youth-party relations, there was an exchange of letters between Cantor and Moore. Moore said the fault lay with Kinder and Foster because they wouldn't do RMC work. Also he had exchanges with Stuart, saying stuff like Treiger and Robertson would clash. He wanted to have been at the Plenum to wipe the floor with Seymour. The "left" was himself, Cunningham and Benjamin. Benjamin called Moore's analysis of the Plenum the best he'd seen. I spent a lot of time in NYC with Rogers and Cunningham--heard a lot of things about Seymour and Schaefer--mutterings about "brotherhood of Trotskyism" re the OCI article. There was a lot of correspondence

between Moore and Stuart culminating in a factional letter--Steve and I were shown it by Stuart. Moore sent a letter to Steve on the RCY, saying Seymour and Cantor were no good, and that Samuels had no political judgment at all.

Moore and Stuart posed the possibility of Cunningham or Benjamin defending Moore on the PB. I wrote to Moore, saying that I had criticisms of the sluggish functioning of Foster and Crawford, and outlined a factional line-up--of the "apparatus" against the "left." Moore congratulated me on my political maturity--told me I was too soft. In March I also had disc. with Steve S. (NYC) to the effect that Robertson was an old fart. I thought it was common in the SL to call Seymour a Menshevik; I got that from Cunningham.

A couple weeks ago Steve G. and I talked, thought Benjamin and Moore had to be full CCers. But now I think Seymour's point on agnosticism is good. I'm a trained historian and know what documents mean, and there is plenty of evidence in this internal bulletin to corroborate Gordon's conclusions.

Victor V.: I feel Stuart's been lying to us. There is a pattern involving an anti-party, anti-leadership cliquism. Stuart is using a combination of lawyer's arguments. First she defended Moore's positions in Germany before the March PB meeting, and his methodology. First I thought she'd over-reacted, but I think there's a basic hatred of the SL there.

It seemed that stuff in Germany had stopped after the March meeting, but was a vulgar cliquism still there. That methodology revealed by George A. is still there--are too many things that link up. The Cunningham thing with Moore--it is a link up, plus George A.'s revelations. I want a direct statement from Moore, on the "Robertson and his cronies" thing.

Lynne M.: My remarks are based on reading the blue (internal) document. I can't understand, Stuart, how you can say there's no evidence of a connection--the PB slate letter for example. Cunningham had felt before Moore was wrong, but in the slate letter is no mention that he had violated on democratic-centralism. George A. mentioned he was aware of communications between Moore and Cunningham.

Crawford: I don't think you understand--state's evidence has been turned! It's incredible--Stuart, you expect us to be fools! You call Treiger saying he was going to quit "no big thing"? That's demagogic. Who expressed disgust to you before anyhow? I know who Treiger called, and he called several others, but they have all criticized themselves, you're the only one who's defended not telling the N.O. in a flippant manner. "Who cares" is your attitude. Thought you'd develop a more sophisticated argument since Monday but you haven't. Stuart made the case against herself. She defended Moore's whole conduct--the same defense I'd heard in the Boston secretariat meeting.

Did Moore capitulate or agree when he came back in March? You say there are documents coming in, you've typed them yourself--but you know the translation capacities in the N.O. are limited. You

underrate the people in this meeting. When I got here it was clear there was a clique. Larry L. came up and told me there's a plot in the org. to keep Moore off the CC.

From what I could ascertain you take an agnostic position on Cunningham and what he did. How do you feel? The whole thing about the RCY--that popped up continually. You say the reason why that opposition proposal from Boston was brought up at the RCY founding conference was not because people were ignorant, but because of alienation of the leadership. What was the relation of Kinder, Foster, Judy K. to RCY? You're asserting the RCYers made a conscious opportunist error, then.

You say there's been a 'misfunctioning' N.O.--that's bullshit! You're talking about 'cronies'--you're talking about destroying the N.O. I would say the Boston secretariat was a cliquist operation. It's a coherent pattern that's been developed. When a good half of the people in this room know it--do you take us for fools? We've been sitting on this thing for a year because we hoped it would disband itself in conditions of new forces coming in, more growth, etc. but it hasn't and now this clique has transferred itself to our international work.

Denise: Robertson said I'd be treated as a minorityite. I'd not declared myself on either side. Seymour said I and Susan believe that every decision must be made on the basis of one's own personal knowledge; said the CWC and SL couldn't have fused if that was true, that this was a denial of the collectivity of the org. But Robertson quoted Shachtman [a quotation from Lenin, Robertson had said Shachtman had probably dug it up--sec'ty] that "anybody who takes anybody's word for it is a hopeless idiot." Therefore, yeah, I do think my decisions have to be made on the basis of my knowledge.

Destroying cliques is messy. Think it was an error for me to have called Cunningham, because I have no intention of joining a rotten bloc. I didn't know Cunningham's positions. I knew calling him would implicate me in the eyes of the N.O. I called Robertson the next morning about it, and he told me it was my right to call him. I think it was an error now though.

I heard a characterization was made of Treiger at another meeting by Crawford--he said "Marv's been a big wheel in a lot of bad orgs., and isn't used to being in a Leninist org. He has a history of leaving groups." Is this true? I've known him 2 1/2 years, intimately, and thought that wasn't an accurate characterization of him. He has left orgs. quietly--I did too, with him in RYM II, and we agreed it was a good idea. We didn't wage a fight, and I still think that was correct, because we didn't understand the issues. Marv was in the CP 5 years, left writing a document, waged a 3 month struggle, and the top CP leadership is tough. He has waged courageous political struggles. Further, he waged a struggle in the RU, and was threatened with physical violence. I don't know what he'll do; I don't have any more information than any other cdes. But I have developed confidence and trust in him. He wasn't top dog in the RU or CP, and it was correct that he left those orgs.

On agnosticism--we should all try to seek out and understand whatever we can. I don't know how much these things get distorted as they go from mouth to mouth. The document said Treiger questioned the financial records of the SL--Robertson said he thought Treiger was making an imputation on Robertson's honesty. But I heard \$1000 was found (by a mistake)--which means we do need to examine the books. (interjection by Robertson: Watch it! Those accusations destroy the fabric of trust in this org. You can be expelled like any other cde. for slanders like that.)

Denise (cont.): I'm not accusing anybody. The trip to L.A. for the blacks wasn't itemized, but on a master charge--but I think they should have been itemized.

Barry J.: Frankly I can't believe what Denise said about Treiger. He ran around systematically trying to undermine the authority of the SL--on top of that, when he had an opportunity to air his complaints, he left--that's cowardly! That defense is a crock of shit. On the Moore clique--Judy says she wants to talk about Moore on the full CC, not about the clique. In Lessons of October there's a section on selecting leaders, using opportunities to test their performance. Well, Moore was tested in Germany, and he broke democratic-centralism, and now you want to elevate him to the highest body of the org.! Okay, the clique has no substantive political differences--its based just on subjective hostilities and loyalties, which seem to be motivating the present course of action. I believe the continuation of cliques in a democratic-centralist organization is totally counterposed to the concept of Leninist organization.

Karl L.: Why did Cunningham's estimation of Moore change so radically? He's forgotten points he himself raised. Judy said all criticisms of the N.O. were raised by appropriate channels, but seems obvious they were raised not only in that manner. Is a sniping aspect here, thrust seems a personal one. There's no discussion of what a projected alternative leadership would do. Think Stuart's statement is at least naive.

Ken: I agree with Barry and Karl. There must be a link between Moore and Cunningham. See the PB minutes, what Cunningham said then and now the change. What do you see as the weaknesses which Moore can rectify? The Boston secretariat was inefficient, like Treiger himself said. How can somebody who breaks democratic-centralism be a leader? Stuart, you lied to us last Monday, or at least said half-truths--on the documents you said you mailed--but you didn't tell us they were in German.

Cantor: Denise is both arrogant and ignorant--she should learn from Stuart's experiences. Do you think we are idiots? Stuart denies the Cunningham-Moore tie, but the letter reveals the clique connection. I knew you had a clique, when I was visiting up in Boston, a year ago--the only thing was, I didn't close up my end of it. I was a disappointment to you. A clique is exclusive. For example: when Chris was up here, it was cliquist behavior when you didn't invite him to Bill's going-away party. Robertson came up to Boston to see Bill then, and you didn't tell Chris that R. was in town and Chris was a full member of the CC! Re all this agnosticism, we have plenty of letters which prove all the charges made. Look at the

cliquist behavior displayed in the George A. case and then compare that to the treatment Nancy got, over the issue of her getting an abortion--absolutely savage--because she was not a member of the clique. You deny a clique, but I got endless complaints from Bill and Judy, on the phone, and finally had to write to you that you had to bring it out in the open, and you didn't talk to CC members--Liz and Al were in Boston the same weekend you called me, but you wouldn't talk to them. You deny any connection between Marv and Bill, but in Bill's letter to me of 22 Sept '71 he writes "hopes Marv will shake up the N.O.". He tried to use his personal friendship with me for his own ends--for example, he asked me to send him uncorrected PB minutes. He writes about the RMC, says "No one else would do RMC work" and that Chris tried to set up a party fraction in the youth--whole defense of cliquist behavior. This all proves Bill is unworthy to be a full member of the CC. Judy should comment on the whole history of repeated hostility to the party leadership by Bill and Judy. I find this disgusting, keeping criticisms private is very wrong.

Schaefer: This is a communist org., Denise, it's not the place for people to demonstrate they have pride and independence. You said the collectivity of the org. has been minimized by the fight--so you act in a way to help that process along. Further, that's why things like that were kept in the PB--what you said demonstrates you don't know why you're in the SL. Stuart said the phone call from Treiger was "no big thing." For newer people, maybe--but when a leader of the org., a PB member, says something like he's thinking of quitting, that's a serious thing.

Wish to clarify my own involvement--Rogers had told me there had been a secret PB, that she thought there was no collective leadership in the SL, etc. At that time I had just moved to NYC--Rogers has had a lot of authority and so has Cunningham. I talked to Treiger about it. Shortly before he went to the West Coast he raised a whole series of criticisms of the SL, I told him to talk to Robertson, he promised to. But I didn't report it either. At the expanded PB I was embarrassed to, and weak, because I hadn't talked about it for so long, it was hard to then.

Denise, about the books--I looked at that section of the document, and it doesn't mention anything about any \$1000, so where'd you hear it--I assume Treiger told you, so I assume he told you a lot of other things, and I'd like to know what they were. On cliques--I think the cdes. here generally have a good attitude, but there's been a lot of subjectivity going around. We're all about building a communist org., not about who we like, or "getting" people--let's get rid of all this personal griping. I sense uncovered feuds of a petty nature are perhaps still in the air.

Foster: I'm pretty angry, on what Denise said. Treiger is a cowardly deserter--he went underground and I think that stinks. Treiger wasn't all evil--so what?! Where do you stand on Cunningham, we want to know.

About the clique in Boston--I've got grey hairs from that. George A.'s testimony gives the lie to what Stuart said--it's just

bullshit that things were raised to the local or to the nat'l leadership. That letter that Cantor quoted from--the way the Boston local leadership found out about Moore/Stuart's acute criticism of the local, was that Cantor got a phone call from Moore/Stuart, she phoned Robertson, who phoned me on the West Coast, and that's the chain. Nelson and Gordon were in Boston one weekend, and nothing was said to them about any of it! On the Treiger-Benjamin-Cunningham slate--thought it was a bloc of mutual back-scratching. Treiger brought it all to the surface--all anti-regime bitches with no political basis.

Cunningham's hand was forced--Cantor made a useful point earlier--he says in his statement, "events have made it necessary"--what events? Not the Paris Peace Talks! No--it was Treiger's defection. That letter from Moore to Rogers--that information's not in our N.O. file. There were connections there. Moore's functioning--if, after the March PB, he had really begun functioning as our rep., then the question of his being full CC would certainly be legitimate. But what about all the other questions--George A.'s testimony, etc. You didn't write to the leadership--but to people you thought might be sympathetic.

Hope comrades learn something from this about the nature of cliques. A program is coming to his clique--it's now disaffected elements without a political program. Think it's true Cunningham shows a certain political degeneration. Cunningham would have condemned Brosius two months ago--but now is for her; cliquism blinds people.

On the Boston situation: There's been a real aftertaste in the youth org. because of the Moore/Stuart clique. It's NOT the case that you're the center of the world. You constantly make invidious comparisons of cdes. contributions--if you really want a bureaucratic regime, that's just the way to get it. It turns the party into a jungle. The cliques were blocing only because all were disaffected. To put those characters in charge of bettering the org. is like putting Hitler in charge of bettering the condition of German Jews--as relates to how more efficient they would be.

Keith: We now have a faction and it doesn't have a political basis. Agnostics should read the Turner documents to see the process of a faction fight. Should take a position now, we can't wait 2 years until all the documents are in and then decide. The basis for the fusion of 2 cliques is that both have this same ill-feeling with no political basis. This faction must be destroyed, because it will take on a snowballing effect, I don't want to see Cunningham out of the org. because I can't see any other political future for him.

Alice: I think we could characterize the people in the cliques now as petty-bourgeois intellectuals who have separated their intellectual ability from the question of organizational functioning. Rep has no org. ability, Moore in Germany acted on his own, Treiger is a freelance artist, he had no intention of wanting to be National Org. Secretary. I couldn't figure out how Cunningham has divorced the program from party politics. I conclude that by calling the program "abstract, and couldn't be implemented" he implied that he was only

talking about politics--he ignored the question of organization, and that's how he made that division.

Nancy R.: On the Moore clique--now we have concrete evidence, particularly the Geroge A. statements, and Stuart's still denying it. Do you think we're a bunch of fools? Seems Moore and Stuart criticize others for their own weaknesses. Moore says in a letter the Boston local was built by himself and Stuart in opposition to 4 others. Kinder was criticized last spring about informing cdes. & contacts of the past history of the Boston branch--and then you went around and did the same thing to contacts. On us "refusing to do RMC work"--the local decided not to assign us to it. We were met with hostility repeatedly, we were refused access to certain RMC documents. When Stuart was in women's lib. work she didn't show up very much to meetings she was supposed to go to.

On Denise's intimations about money--she seemed to imply the money was "found" under Robertson's pillow or something. We go over the books regularly every month, and make weekly checks too--it was a simple arthimetical error in the checkbook, that was caught in the routine checking process, that's all.

Fran: I'm new to being involved with the SL. It's amazing that people I'd thought were commies would put personal stuff over political judgment. And that seems to have been going on with Treiger and Moore. Seems obvious a leadership must be judged by its functioning and judgment. I see no reason to get rid of the present leadership. I would like to see a lot more on the Cunningham stuff--what people say seems correct. Would be a shame if he can't change the way he's been functioning.

Weezie: I don't understand your reasoning, Stuart, on why Moore should be full CC.--"because he raises criticisms." But the leadership's criticism of Cunningham is that he didn't do that. If Moore really did agree with the PB after March he should have been translating documents for us to read. Denise; I thought you were incredibly weak on Treiger. Seems in a faction fight people should be familiar with the documents--but we have the documents, and Cunningham doesn't have a political basis and that points out it was a rotten clique.

Melinda: I just had a question; why should Moore be a full CCer if he broke discipline?

Bob P.: Want to start out by quoting from the Trotsky document appended to Gordon's article (quote about "fillips on the nose" not being basis to judge party). When I first started working with the SL, I played a pretty active role. I had the attitude that the leading SL members in Boston were incompetent, that John S. and I were more org. competent than the full CCers Foster and Kinder, and made lots of suggestions. But I was really a babe in the woods, as I now realize. I knew nothing about how a national Leninist org. functioned, and had a bad estimation of the cdes. Moore and Stuart did nothing to correct my initial impression. Many people contributed to the building of the RCY. Foster was on the West Coast working on the CWC fusion--I didn't appreciate the importance of that. I had the

same unmeasured criticisms of Kinder--all I heard about Kinder was hostile and I was left with that until I saw him produce an excellent union article in WV. We must measure comrades correctly. Moore/Stuart didn't correct any impressions I had. This retarded my getting a picture of a real Leninist org. I had a sense the Boston secretariat was under PB direction--I did a lot of mimeoing for it. I knew when the Bolfra split occurred there was a lot of enthusiasm around here, the feeling that "we'd" really pulled off something. When I found out the org. didn't know anything I was extremely upset; I didn't know that.

What kind of thing is this attitude of Treiger, Rogers and Benjamin, of resigning? There's nothing behind them--what's with people with grievances who talk about resigning. That attitude is worthless.

On the Transformation of the SL--I had thought it was just that we'd all have to work harder, but now I'm beginning to see what it really takes. We've been wrenched by the industrialization, is a real lesson in terms of the Ellens-CT, etc. 'instant industrialization' attitude. Our capacity depends on the congealing of a national leadership and cadre and the maturity of the membership, and I think we've got to learn from this, and come to some understanding. I don't think the cdes. now in opposition have done anything to further that understanding, and have hurt us.

Mark L.: Moore admits his errors--but after very careful reading of his statement I found his acknowledgment of his break in democratic-centralist functioning pretty weak. Wish the Moore-Cunningham connection could be proven stronger--but the evidence seems to be mounting and mounting. I don't think Moore should be a full CC--don't think he really broke from his prior functioning, don't think he's demonstrated exceptional efficiency. PB is still recommending him as an alternate anyhow. I agree with Gordon that the transformation process as a whole is something we can be proud of.

Judy K.: Think there's conscious destructive vindictiveness on the money question. You threw your comment out in a way that implied Robertson had taken it. I don't believe you think you were wrong, I don't trust you. Don't you have any conception of what the SL is, what it means to stay in it--not the RU or something? I'm glad all this clique stuff is coming out. It's not true there is no clique in Boston--I don't think you believe there was a clique because you didn't think there was an organization--you thought you and Moore were the organization. It was anarchy when Stuart was the organizer--non-members were put in positions, etc. and you supported it.

I did youth work, so did Foster, before you two came to Boston. We researched for the 'Chinese Menshevism' article--we did leaflets before, for Boston SDS. True, of course we all made a lot of mistakes, but the local decided Judy K., Nancy and Foster would be doing women's work. Stuart refused to do women's work when it was decided--she did go to some meetings--but not with me, with some girlfriend of hers. Foster wrote all the articles for the RMC Newsletter from Boston. When Foster was on the West Coast, it's true Kinder, I and Nancy pulled back from the RMC, but it was because we were treated to hostility at all meetings. We insisted on going to the study

group, and we asked for some RMC material, and we were refused it. Seemed to be a great distance between the SL and RMC. We weren't as active in it as we would have been desirable, but it was because of this cliquishness--people literally wouldn't talk to us. Moore and Stuart did not recruit all the people recruited in Boston.

I don't remember a lot of political differences in Boston, there was one I remember, where Foster and Moore had a difference with Kinder. It's a lie you brought everything to the local.

(Robertson at this point presented the 2 motions on Moore/Stuart and Cunningham which were voted at the end of the meeting.)

Motion: To have a 1 1/2 hour dinner break, and people not back in time will lose their speaking rights. passed

Second Round Discussion:

Seymour: The stability of our leadership is as important in a sense as the continuation of our politics. The question of our leadership should be approached in a way not qualitatively different from approach to our politics. Suppose you run into Fender and he says Robertson is an incompetent bureaucrat--hopefully the comrades all feel they must defend the org. against that accusation. When it was discovered Treiger came into the org. with some of Turner's criticisms--well, he shouldn't have done that, shouldn't have joined us with such major doubts. One can't go into a faction fight without certain pre-dispositions.

George A.: On the Boston RMC--I think most of the RMC contacts were worked over by both Moore/Stuart and Foster and Judy K. I was contacted by everybody. Another piece of slander is that about the Mass Strike and who brought them. I heard Jon B. wouldn't join the SL because of Foster's bad functioning--would like to know the truth of that. On the political development of the Boston RMC, think part of it's failures were Judy Stuart's fault; she was the leadership of the RMC in lieu of anybody else. I think people with paranoid feelings about PL were responsible for the bad motion at the RMC National Conference. I would like to reiterate Seymour's point about agnosticism. When Robertson and Gordon write documents on what happened, I believe them, as I have no reason to doubt their veracity. There is certainly sufficient evidence here to make a judgment, the political implications are obvious.

Victor V.: I don't say that after reading those documents it's possible to be agnostic--clearly it's not. It is a cliquist formation. All I disagreed with was at that Monday Boston meeting we were asked to take a position before we read the documents.

Lynne M.: To Denise; I don't see how you can defend Treiger's methods in the SL. When I read the documents, the only response I had was "what a coward." To defend him is inexcusable. I think everyone should express what their position is.

Crawford: Want to reinforce what Seymour said on agnosticism, particularly to Victor. Denise says, "when somebody declares a faction,

the party stops and then you decide." That's not how it works. When somebody brings up a criticism, very good--but one must also develop a substitute policy. We're not a debating society. Doubts are not enough--must have an alternative. We cannot proceed on doubts. When a minority is declared, remember there is a leadership, elected on basis of the trust of the membership. It's up to the minority to prove its case, I think. In fact the situation is the reverse of what Denise suggested--instead of helping weaken the collectivity of leadership, your duty was to help consolidate it. I was disturbed by the Monday meeting here, felt a number of people agreed that the issues were clear, but nobody except Barry took a strong position. A lot of people knew a lot of the story--a lot more is coming out now. I didn't get a sense from that Monday meeting that people thought the org. was in a crisis and they must fight for it.

At the Saturday meeting Victor had a basically agnostic position. But the point is that the very fact that Cunningham had been a part of the leadership for 3 or 4 years, and then forms a faction suddenly after not ever bringing forth his criticisms should have brought forth a response of indignation. There may be times, after all, when we won't be able to have a full reading of all the documents. For example, can you imagine the Bolshevik Party in the midst of the revolution in the grip of agnosticism--the leadership goes on. Denise expressed the denial of that concept. I think we've been through this before with Denise in the CWC. If you pursue the course you're on you'll be out of the org. in a very short time. I think you know what it is to be a communist--your ties to Treiger can not hide the fact he's acted as an enemy to this org., which is supposedly your life.

One of the points that hasn't come out yet on the Moore/Stuart stuff is--did Moore really agree, or did he capitulate at the March PB meeting? Your (Stuart's) defense of his prior behavior (and I don't buy the bullshit that you don't really represent Moore), is still going on, but you said also, that his behavior in Germany has not hurt our international work. If you really believe he was involved in an attempted Pabloist rip-off, then you have to agree that the SL was involving in Pabloist behavior, and that our reputation is now tainted. Either you don't understand what you're saying, or else you don't give a damn.

The basic assumption you have (and Moore shares) is that short-term success is the basic criteria of a policy. I believe that's Cunningham's approach too in the slate letter. I support the motions.

Robertson: This is a point of information. I just received word that on the motion to condemn Cunningham, which was just voted on the West Coast by the LA and BA joint meeting, that Cunningham and Rep voted for it, and Rogers and Mirra voted against it.

Denise: I didn't mean to imply I thought Robertson was guilty of some sort of rip-off. I have confidence in this leadership. I don't understand why people think I was making this accusation. On Treiger; I didn't defend anything he did in the SL, and my position is he's guilty of vicious destructive slander and incorrect behavior. I'm not an apologist for the way he resigned. On Cunningham--he

broke democratic-centralism, and I think what I did (calling him) was incorrect, based on the fact I have confidence in this leadership and he's a minority of the leadership. It was simply a question of tactical advantage--it reflected my lack of experience in faction fights.

Yes, I recognize the difference between the SL and RYM II--I am a loyal member of the RCY and have confidence in the SL. I was going to ask what exactly was the course of events in Germany but I got a sufficient explanation at dinner. I've only read a few documents, my only familiarity with Germany is the letter we sent, which is in part the reason for my earlier agnosticism.

Barry: To a certain extent Seymour's first presentation here wasn't that clear, on dealing with agnosticism. When I joined the SL, it was on the basis of our documents, I had read about the R.T., etc. I saw collective functioning, during the SDS conference here, for example. I read the Ellens-Turner documents, it's clear it was an unprincipled combination. When I heard about Treiger's functioning, it didn't seem right, because it didn't jibe with my experience of the SL. We feel here like we're pushed forward too much, not suppressed. I've expressed disagreements with Geroge C., had fights--there's a lot I'm pissed off about but I have respect for the org. nationally. Somebody had to prove to me that something's wrong with the leadership--yes, the burden of proof is on the minority. I felt loyal to the party--but I didn't suspend my critical judgment.

Karl L.: I agree with Barry. Our understanding here was on the basis of the SL program, but we should have assumed that the elected leaders of the org. know what they're doing. This is the main point on agnosticism--Barry took a strong anti-agnostic position and he was correct.

Ken: I agree with Barry--I realize now the burden of proof should be on the minority. There are questions I have; I've heard a lot of criticisms of N.O. functioning and I'd like to hear a response to Moore's charge that for 2 1/2 months he was given no information by the N.O.

Cantor: There's a saying that "the end justifies the means." Lenin wrote somewhere about that, and he said that it's true, but that only certain means, and not others, will get you to your desired end. That's true of revolutionary politics--the revolutionary party cannot be built by lies, by deception, by slander--because those kinds of things, because cliques will never make a revolution. The question of Leninist organization which cliques are counter-posed to, is also a political question.

Schaefer: Thought Cantor's remarks were to the point. This has been a good discussion; cdes. must understand Seymour's remarks. Things don't come to a halt when a faction's declared. I don't think loyalty to the party means one is a hack. I think the Workers League will do something with the Treiger defection, and it's a pain in the ass and we'll deal with it. But Wohlforth's charges will be proven false by the other CWCers who all stay. When Treiger resigned, we had been worried that he'd been making a big impression on

circles of contacts, etc. In New Orleans, where he'd been a lot, it turned out that the N.O. people were indignant, and said they were recruited by SL politics, not some star. He didn't hurt us.

When Moore came back in March, several cdes. noted the hostility and contempt of his earlier letters in contrast to his mild tone at the PB. His letters were so strong, demonstrated a fundamental opposition to the leadership and a whole attitude towards the org. Moore has had that attitude for a long time, and I think it was a capitulation in March to buy time to short up his clique.

Foster: If we wanted to purge this org., we could do it, but we want to combat this thing politically. We want to destroy the faction--we want a struggle because we want to save Cunningham and Rogers. We will subject these cliques to merciless exposure and censure. This can be a good basis to strengthen our cadre, it is a test, an educational process. It has already given us through struggle a couple of people in Boston who've become a real part of the party.

On Germany; our record is now tainted because of Moore's actions, and that should anger the comrades! We didn't tell the membership as a whole about it. Moore and Treiger and Cunningham have all been protected. We had a secret PB on Treiger because we didn't want to destroy his authority before the membership as a whole. I was in fact surprised the PB put up with as much as it did. Treiger's actions lent credence to ORO's attacks on us. Treiger was the sacred cow of this org. We do have a policy of protection. I endorse Crawford's comments 100%-- we don't suspend our critical faculties, but the response to this stuff should be--just what are these guys up to anyhow? Barry and Crawford had real questions--they called up, asked for the story. So if you aren't sure, don't just sit there, call up, ask us. On the "Byzantine cellar"; one danger that could come out of this experience, is that cdes. may fear that if they raise criticisms they'll get crushed. It's a difficult process, but cdes. must recognize struggle is not easy, but cliquism is profoundly more destructive and corrosive.

Keith: When I said we had to destroy the faction, I meant that Cunningham, faced with forming a faction, had put himself in a position where he couldn't stay in the org., and I meant we had to destroy the faction to save him.

Alice: I support the motions. Where does Sharpe stand?

Nancy: I thought Seymour and Crawford's comments on agnosticism were excellent. Was impressed with the openness of discussion and information being out fast. If people can't take a position now, I think they're de facto siding with the minority.

Fran: I think people are beating a straw man with this agnosticism stuff. I'm not an SL member, but at the Monday meeting I felt before I could really defend a position I wanted to look at the documents. I feel, yes, in a factional situation it is the responsibility of the minority to prove it, but also I feel that before I will feel really capable of taking a strong position, I have to have a while to think

about it. I support the motions.

Weezie: I support the motions. I'd like to compare the leadership's actions with Cunningham's--the leadership gave him every change to express his disagreements.

Melinda: I'd like to know what, if any, were the political differences between Moore and Foster in Boston? It seems to be a lot of personal stuff--what was the original dispute about?

Bob P.: I support the motions.

Mark L.: Denise--I don't think she meant to impart a financial accusation. However, to take it up in the context of Treiger's betrayal is extremely irresponsible. This whole discussion experience can be a positive thing. I feel a tendency towards deviations is probably inevitable in these periods; we should remember there can be workerist deviations as well. Our lives are political--cdes. should remember that, and try to treat their personal grievances accordingly. I support the motions.

Judy K.: It's false that Moore did everything with Mass Strike. Jon B. met with Foster and me--he also met with Bill and Judy. Jon said he didn't join the SL because of arguments on the character of Mass Strike. According to Bob L. Kinder and I recruited him. I met with Mark L. and Mary Ann--it's just false to say one person did the whole thing.

I agree this has been a helpful meeting, and we're all under a lot of pressure, people have been pushed into filling slots, but I think this has had the effect of consolidating the party very well.

Bob S.: Stuart said on Treiger's resignation that she didn't think it was important. But I know it's not true that that's how you react to that kind of phone call. I called you once feeling demoralized and you told me, when I wanted to resign, to attend an exec. meeting and discuss my reasons. People must be able to make decisions. One of key things is confidence in our leadership--our leadership has been tested in struggle. I now feel it was wrong that I didn't speak on Monday; will try to take clear positions.

Sandra: I agree with Seymour, that the question of leadership and program are related. I stayed with Judy K. when I moved to Boston, and I never heard Stuart/Moore criticized at all in any way--I suppose they could have used me, but they didn't.

Susan S.: On agnosticism--I've not been agnostic on the minority slate--I'm opposed to it, was opposed last Dec. when the Moore German thing came up. I was not convinced only on how deeply Cunningham was implicated. I'm ashamed to be connected with you, Denise, on your position. This isn't the only time Treiger's walked out. He walked out of an org. once while telling me to stay in another 7 months and fight. I believe the "Robertson" regime exists and I support it. I see our program and the R. regime as being the same. My doubts came from maybe a bad methodology developed with Treiger--I don't know for sure. I don't think Treiger made a qualitative leap

when he joined the SL. Gene G., Victor, me--we had a lot of Stalinophobia in us. I wasn't aware that I had possibly had reservations until now. About the clique fights here--when it was decided I was coming to Boston, it was discussed in L.A. I was aware of it and afraid to get caught up in it. Were fears of cliquism in this local-- I had strong feelings it was going on, but I remained neutral, and tried to suppress fears but they existed. I'm glad this came out, and I understand why it was suppressed before. Monday night I was silent, I wanted to hear both sides. I think the resistance in the local Monday may have been because of this overhanging clique-fear. I talked to Seymour the next day, told him Benjamin's admission of a rotten bloc was sufficient not to support him, was opposed to Moore full CC too because of the German stuff. I couldn't say about the clique then, though--perhaps was my lack of understanding about cliques. Sat. a.m. a new element was added, that Cunningham is on a factional basis--that was a complete shock to me. I wanted to see the constitution of the SL, and to see the basis for the faction. My feeling is that even after seeing the document, there's a lot Cunningham had to account for. But I still wasn't convinced he was fully implicated--only now today, when I understand he's been lying, do I now understand it. I agree with the motions.

Steve G.: Seymour's right on agnosticism. The fact that I balked earlier at taking a position was wrong. I also am deeply convinced by Cunningham's lying and admission of it. Those Moore letters to Rogers and Cantor aren't just personal--whole lot of things cloudy before are clearer.

Mary Ann: Has been very informative--especially on the differences between personal and political commitment. But I'm still confused after hearing Susan. I don't think you're that clear on how supporting the program of the SL implies supporting its leadership. Was impressed with Barry and the way he's handled himself through all this.

Summaries:

Stuart: This is obviously somewhat schematic, but I feel it's necessary, in view of Susan and Melinda's questions, that a brief history of the Boston local be gone into (I've written this out): Moore joined the SL in 1968, had perfectionist views, on everybody, particularly me. In California he criticized the N.O. when Spartacist didn't appear, but made the assumption that that was based on lack of forces and resources. In 1968 he moved to Boston; he was in isolation, I tried to help him. I wasn't political in '68, because in '67-68 I was in Chicago, met Moore, and the SL there of Dave R. and Steve S. My knowledge of that mess and the non-resolution of it left me with a bad taste. I tried to come to grips with it though, and joined the SL in 1969.

After Foster and Judy K. came a situation developed where personal problems were demoralizing the O.C. A lot of antagonism could have developed from raising it consciously--it's unpleasant to have to tell somebody their personal life is taking the wrong course. Moore wrote the N.O. about it, asking them to intervene. The suggestions we made were not implemented. We weren't talked to about our

criticisms--the situation was let hang. We felt the N.O. was temporizing, and major paralysis of the local did occur.

There was a clique at that time--of Nancy, Kinder, Foster and Judy K. against us. Moore and I were socially ostracized, were being excluded. And was no political interaction. There were exec. meetings I wasn't invited to, and I was on the exec. The situation deteriorated to a pre- or proto-factional situation. This involved an attempt by Kinder to try to line up candidate members--he alleged there was a capitulation to petty-bourgeois intellectuals on our part. I was still considered to be "implacable" or "subjective." Personal relations were strained to the utmost, and Moore was leaving for Europe. There had been an ad hoc tradition of parties in the local, there was no suggestion of having a party for Moore, and I resented this. I was asked if I was having a party, and I did, a party which was almost exclusively a private party. I don't even think Robertson was invited. I didn't feel hypocritical enough to have a party for my husband with people I didn't want to socialize with.

I thought Moore would be a valuable addition to NYC. We asked if we could come to NYC, and the N.O. said no, on Moore doing T.U. work, the N.O. said no. He didn't go to Europe against the wishes of the SL. I received some letters from him, and typed up excerpts for Robertson. He didn't speak German when he got there. The IKD wouldn't talk to him. Robertson was shown a letter where Moore asked me to be a "mini-secretariat."

People say I defended Moore's actions in Germany--no, I defended his intentions. I think he made a mistake, he inadvertently fell into it. I've never known him to make such a mistake before. He had to convince me he had--he was convinced himself last March, he didn't capitulate.

When he was called a liar, a conspirator and splitter he was outraged, felt he had a basic difference in operation with the SL. He said there was an error in the N.O., and felt such errors wouldn't arise unless something wrong in the N.O. (he had never made allegations of an N.O. clique before). He was wrong, and withdrew the whole thing--his statement was drafted in consultation with Robertson. He did break democratic-centralism in December; he didn't carry out the non-instructions of the PB! People said he broke it when he didn't function; but he was a minority whose veracity had been challenged. He stopped official org. to org. contacting. Seemed the PB thought he'd split--so he had informal discussions with anybody who was interested. May have been precipitous of him to send the factional letter to the N.O. after he got my letter--but you have to admit it was principled! He thought he had a difference and he raised it then and there.

On George A.'s letters, on the clique, first I'd like to see those letters, not what George A. says they say. I can't recall every calling Robertson a pervert, for example, as he alleged. Moore did make an assesment of a future struggle in the org. Thought something was wrong with an org. that took a talented person (him) and didn't put him in the N.O.; he thought there would be a left vs.

right division, i.e., "left" is criticizing negligence as opposed to "right" justifying negligence. He made assessments of cdes. to cdes. That's perfectly permissible. It's possible to be in a Bolshevik organization without liking anybody in it. I'd like to contrast that to indications that I was being characterized as subjective to non-members (the CWC)--they asked me about it.

On the "clique"--Cantor made an interesting point--well, we knew she talked to Robertson, and that Benjamin talked to everybody--if we had wanted a closed clique, we wouldn't have talked to those people! We raised criticisms when they came up. If we wanted to build a secret clique we wouldn't have talked to those people. I thought it was good they talked to others. I think non-functioning can have bad results. Anyhow what did we do with our "clique"--we never ran "our" people for office.

On the RMC. Robertson said it was incorrect for SLers not involved in the work to just drop in and lay down the line, that that could generate hostility.

On George A.--I defended not George A., but criticized that meeting--on the basis of Cantor's letter, if no one knew anything about that meeting but what was in the letter, it sounded bad--and I didn't like the motion that was passed. Robertson didn't like it either--isn't that heinous of me?

Cunningham did not change his position on Moore's Pabloist functioning, but I believe the question was one of Moore's intentions in Germany. I don't think the SL leadership needs to be replaced. If I thought the leadership was non-revolutionary I would have said so. If Cunningham's lying he's got a lot to answer for. I don't lie to the party.

On my saying when I returned from Germany, "I have nothing official to report" I think was basically a misunderstanding. Robertson didn't let me finish what I was going to say. I wanted to propose that I go to Boston, get my notes, complete them and come back to NYC. When I did meet with Robertson that afternoon I tried to relate my impressions. I wasn't allowed to make that proposal though. I have a question for Crawford; what Saturday meeting are you talking about? On Mass Strike--Joe N.'s allegations don't carry much weight, I don't care what Joe says.

Why weren't any letters written to Moore asking him to sharpen up his reports, learn German faster if that was the problem, etc.--he couldn't translate.

The point is, I wonder why it is, that as soon as it looked like he'd made a mistake he was called a liar, accused of splitting, creating a power base, etc., when there'd been no previous indications. Brosius made a fundamental mistake on the SL line, but I don't think she got that kind of treatment. In the Boston Secretariat meeting Moore was called a "liar, splitter, conspirator" where comrades were just free to wander in.

If cdes. are not allowed to carry out criticisms of the function-

ing of the national leadership, if cdes. are not allowed to criticize each other, if cdes. can't write polemical letters to the PB, what can can they do? I am distressed--Cantor, I wrote you a 5 page letter (19 May, 1970)--

(interjection by Cantor: What letter? I never got any letter from you then--you said over the phone you had written one but never mailed it)

Stuart (cont.): well, never mind. Those documents of the RMC Judy K. was talking about--those were xeroxes of the history of the socialist youth movement, for a class, and there weren't enough (interjection by Judy K.: no, it wasn't you I was talking about, somebody else refused to let us have the RMC conf. document)

Stuart (cont.): If Cunningham thinks he's lying, then I do. I won't vote for the Moore clique motion, but for the one on Cunningham.

Robertson: I don't know exactly for how long, but for at least a year or 18 months there's been frictions in Boston. We had relays of PB members coming up here, and it was not easy to tell--there were 2 couples, all the cdes. seemed valuable and talented. Kinder and Nancy arrived here. Over last summer incident took place where, it was true, Kinder had violated the instructions of the senior cdes. and went to the candidate members. Gordon and I went up and did the job on Kinder, because he was wrong. There was a resistance there to giving Moore and Stuart credit for the work they'd done. But a PB shortly thereafter, after much discussion, determined that the primary source of the frictions in Boston was Stuart and Moore. But at the same time, Stuart was interested in becoming the organizer, Moore was going to Europe. Moore and Stuart's motion was carried at that Boston meeting, but we were still disturbed. Since we are a regime, not a clique, it was necessary for us to "spring the trap" on Kinder. The PB concluded however that a recrudescence of this same sort would lead to a sharp attack on Moore and especially Stuart. We had an opportunity to break out of the closed circle in Boston, believed the system would work if Stuart could develop a close political collaboration with Foster. At the same time I told Stuart, "if there's any more of this stuff, we will destroy you like a mad dog" and we meant it.

Then came the German events. We knew there was a cliquist formation. Stuart made a case tonight like nothing's happened. But there are 2 separate worlds here--look at Cantor's letters, George A.s evidence. For example, Moore's statement "We were right and still are." These comrades live in a vicious world--they assume all the others are vicious too. Stuart thinks everybody else is like this. (Moore's letter on the "Machiavellian hand" of Robertson giving Seymour the "task" of writing a position on the women's lib. work). That's the kind of world they live in, naturally they'll form a clique. About Moore in Europe--we have no confidence in the correspondence the N.O. gets, when we see these lurid private letters particularly.

On the questions raised, is the N.O. inefficient? How come we didn't write Moore for 2 months? Well, Pabloism isn't just an abstract cuss-word. We didn't really know the organizational side of Pabloism until we went to Europe. The lying, double-dealing, etc. that goes on, all the European groups stab each other in the back and expect others to. But we had a formal fraternal relations with the

IKD, and Moore was apparently brain-trusting the opposition while keeping pretense of formal relations with the leadership. But he assumed it was okay, too, to stab the org. in the back. So Moore announced he was a minority. While we had several possible analyses, we didn't know what he was doing. Finally, John S. kindly sent us a letter Moore had sent him, wherein Moore justified what he'd done, and we moved very fast then, because we finally had something to confront him on. We had to reach a plane of intercourse, we spent a lot of time and effort then with Moore.

He demonstrated objectively bad faith. In the 20 Dec. letter he has insistent demands for precise instructions. Then in Feb. in answer to a statement of ours, he wrote in effect, "Ha, you can't fire me, don't you know I quit (as your rep.) in December."

After all that there was a resumption of the same pattern. (cdes. can look at the files). We worked very hard on the joint letter to IKD and Bolfra. We have never got a word of reply from Bolfra. We know nothing about them. As for Stuart I honestly don't think I've every heard any other cde. say "this fucking organization."

So what's the clique link-ups? The linking of hands over the slate question, Treiger's phoning pattern, the correspondence links--it's just there.

Want to resist any move to remove Moore as an alt. CC, because he does have certain leadership capacities. I've been in orgs. where oppositionists are shoved into the ranks, and that's bad for the org. I'd rather hear his opinions in the CC than coming from the ranks. Moore and Stuart are outspoken--I think she's incorrigible. We'd better not take punitive action which is a disservice to the org. Urge cdes. to resist that tendency. But to reward Moore for his behavior--I would be happy to form a dead-end faction to fight that.

We should consider urging the locals to set up study groups to try to get a grasp of communist organization life, using the historical technique--lot of history of the U.S. communist movement, parts of the collected Trotsky writings are good, Shachtman on the Oehler fight, etc. We'll have a certain amount of damage from this. Will try to regenerate damaged cdes. We're cut back on our international capacity--must try to convince John S. to come into NYC to work as part of an international section--he has the capabilities to drive that work ahead.

We must find substitutes for Seymour and Cantor in going to New Zealand. Seymour will have to be a major staff writer for the paper, and be the senior political leader for the Midwest. Our recruitment rate continues, there are pressures on all the local organizers, on the composition crew, and on the RCY, which has found itself taking over more of the party work in the face of our industrialization. We'll have to hold off on additional geographical expansion until we consolidate our present locals.

One point: cliques practically never get to power, but regimes do. When a difference develops in an organization, you'll find the

people in a regime fought for the programmatic difference, with a prior commitment to fight. Regimes are therefore not inheritable. Regimes can renew themselves. Samuels' rise in the org. has been meteoric. Regimes don't push everybody--they have values. We have a real bias against people who are "place-seekers" and morally corrupt. For example, Nancy is intelligent, devoted and devoid of personal ambition, and has shown talent for editing, and we are testing her now. Weezie shows perhaps some promise too, has been spoken well of. We're alert to these things.

Another thing about a regime, as opposed to merely the biggest clique of them all, is that a regime must be prepared to admit to weaknesses. Of course, there are weaknesses. Foster needs to be part of a collective leadership. We are not ashamed to admit that; we're not ashamed to admit that; we're not afraid of fighting and brawling.

Things cdes. must not learn from this experience: no, you mustn't believe that you must shut up or the regime will get you. It is psychologically difficult to seek to change the policies of the org. by open struggle. If you have a position you think is correct, don't change it in the fire of struggle. Go home and think about it, and when and if you do change, let people know early on. When this is applied then we get a real struggle. This is the hard road, but all in the framework of scrupulous democratic rights. No slanders. Of course it still isn't fun, but it is the only way, among communists, that it is possible to develop the conscious extensions of Marxism that must occur if the org. is not to ossify into a bureaucratic and sterile regime. Or else you get this messy bunch of cliques.

It was sickening what Cunningham did, and there's a lot of bitterness over it. But comrades should continue to be a little bit trusting, a little gullible--it is much better. Don't do what Moore did, don't assume the "Machiavellian hand" is everything and that whatever seems to be happening isn't really what's happening.

What does John S. think--where is he on this? Well, he's been doing a pretty good job. He seems to be what Stuart and Moore claim to be. We are trying to create a career crisis for him. He seems to have the kind of qualities that might, after some experience, emerge as national officer material.

On N.O. functioning; of course we have kinds of inefficiencies. Gordon and I were involved in this present crisis for one solid week--got important letter off to John S. at last minute because of it--but was a question of whether John would have an org. to represent. We determined to get the paper out no matter what. My immediate problem is--what kind of flooring for the new office? This is a vital matter--we're paying rent on the place, the cdes. are jammed together downstairs, it's a crisis. Where is Cunningham going? I don't know. I tried to tell him we weren't pushing him into a corner. One of the weaknesses of human beings is our memories are fairly short.

Yes, Seymour made a valuable point on the relation of the regime and program. Certainly the organizational question as a whole includ-

ing values of the existing regime are one of the half dozen or so decisive aspects of the program. Recollect the slogan of the class-collaborators in the Russian Revolution, for example, "For participation of the Bolsheviks in the government without Lenin and Trotsky."

I'm revolted by Denise's insinuations. Presumably somebody stole \$200, too--the same checkbook misaddition happened again, entirely independent of and a long time after the incident with the books Treiger referred to. Was particularly nasty to make that insinuating link-up. Somebody had added a figure wrong--fortunately we could break it down. I heard another story about the black contacts we brought up to the Bay Area. Somebody assumed because we used a Master Charge, was no record. But a Master Charge is a perfect record. Our comrades bleed for the money we raise. Any suggestion that it's being spent thoughtlessly is really poisonous. May be true Denise is inexperienced, but even in such orgs. as the CP or SWP, generally they're fanatic about honesty over money.

I don't know what to do about that question--it's ugly and I'm sorry it was raised. Money lubricates everything--that money is the congealed lives of our comrades.

Motion: The Boston local committee condemns the hardened clique of some 2 years standing of Stuart/Moore which has been centered on this SL local.

for: Bob S., Melinda, Karl L., Alice L., Weezie, Paul C., Susan S., Schaefer, Sandra O., Mary Anne, Mark L., Bob P., Barry, Nancy R., Judy K., Lynne M., Keith A., Seymour, Richard C., Steve G., Fran, Robertson, Victor V., John S., George A., Crawford, James S., Foster, Ken R., A.M., Cantor

opposed: Stuart

abstaining: none

not voting: Denise

Motion passed

Motion: Considering 1) that cde. Cunningham knew of the projected split of Treiger, Rogers and Benjamin, and did not notify the PB, and 2) then denied having this knowledge, and 3) went from "loyal intimate collaboration" i.e. secret cliquism on the PB, to instant opposition when caught out on 1) and 2), and 4) that of his two opposition documents, the first contained no position whatsoever, and the second attacked the regime and which he withdrew immediately in light of discussion, therefore:

we move to condemn David Cunningham for his actions over the past weeks which have been dishonest, disloyal and deeply unprincipled.

for: unanimous

Motion passed

Motion: That Seymour and Cantor be accepted into the Boston SL local, transferring from NYC.

passed

Meeting adjourned 12:10 a.m.

Summary of Documentary Evidence
on the Moore Clique
Statement by George A.

Boston

4 July 1972

(Cde. George A. made a series of revealing remarks detailing the existence of the Moore clique at the Boston local meeting of 2 July 1972. Several comrades after the meeting felt it would be useful if he would write up his comments. On 4 July he submitted the following statement to be attached to the minutes):

Following the RMC Conference last Sept. there was an exchange of letters between Bill, Helen and Judy Stuart. Helen wrote analysis of Boston's problems. Bill wrote back scathing attack. More significantly, Bill wrote to Judy presenting a clear-cut factional prognosis on the basis of Helen's letter (He said that Helen was only reflecting Jim's opinion, which was erratic, clumsy and bureaucratic to the point of creating syndicalist reaction in youth.) He gave the factional outline:

1) the apparatus--old guard--Nelson, Foster, Kinder, Helene--will apologize for Jim.

2) Jim and Liz--the "center"--on them depends whether SL can hold together--must overcome wretched, dilettantism, work habits.

3) Seymour "bright-boy revisionist seeking to ride someone's coat-tails into power" "I'm sorry I wasn't there to wipe the floor with Seymour--his pretentious arrogance only hides his combination of ill-digested Marxism and wunderkinder revisionism."...Unless the NO can function better, there will be a struggle for power between Robertson and Treiger."

4) "the left--Dave, Nick, and I. I intend to write a long letter to Nick which I want to keep entirely private." Nick called this, "the best analysis of the Plenum I've seen." Judy repeatedly referred to Dave and Nick as "the only people in NYC with any judgement, rationality, etc."

I spent a lot of time with Dave and Janet in NYC--Dave did a lot of bad-mouthing of Seymour--"Menshevik, revisionist, rightist, academic, etc" and Libby--"woodenhead who belongs in the Workers League." A lot about org. conservatism and unimaginativeness. A few remarks about Nelson--"doesn't play a leading role any more" "bully" etc. Mumbling about "brotherhood of Trotskyism" position on the OCI.

There was a flurry of letters between Bill and Judy over the international question--raising possibility of Dave or Nick defending him in the PB. Steve and I were shown factional letter. Bill wrote Steve a letter on the RCY--"Mark and Helen are not good." "If they weren't leaving, it would probably be necessary to wage a political struggle against their leadership--this will be even truer with Reuben--Reuben has no political judgement. Libby is good in a subordinate position but very woodenheaded."

I wrote to Bill criticizing sluggish functioning of Foster and

Crawford--discussed political collaboration in faction--outlined prognosis similar to Moore's.

Moore replied congratulating me on the maturity of my political judgment--"severally, your thinking parallels mine point for point, and to some extent that of Nick." Disagreed that apparatus was solely responsible for "present org. chaos"--Robertson-Gordon clearly responsible for org. incompetence--"especially clear on int'l question, where nearly no work has been done, for almost a year." IDB not out, Broue article not published, etc.--"Robertson must detach himself from Nelson-Foster-Kinder and let more org. competent cdes. run the NO or there will be a full-scale factional fracas." "Robertson is primarily an agitator...it is ironic that of all the SWPers, it would be an agitator, without theoretical, polemical or organizational genius, who would lead the fight against revisionism. The balanced leadership of the SL which should have existed--Mage the theorist, Wohlforth the polemicist, White the org. man--is dead. With the departure of White in 1968, the SL lost its last top cadre who could have provided a balance to Robertson's weaknesses...Now Robertson's weaknesses are getting the better of his strengths--why all these idiotic accusations of 'splitting,' etc." "...Unless this situation is rectified the youth, CWC or both may react in a frenzied syndicalist way against the inherent Social Democratic routinism of party apparachniks."

END

Excerpt from draft minutes, NYC Local Committee Meeting of 4 July 1972 on the Internal Situation:

MOTIONS AND VOTING

- (1) Motion: This local endorses the Boston LC's condemning of the hardened clique of some two years standing of Stuart-Moore, centered in Boston, also expressed in New York.
 Roll call vote:
Full vote, NYC SL-
for: John H., Jack, Nedy R., Stephanie K., Charlotte, Toni, Anne K., Reuben S., Ann P., Bruce A., Chris Todd, Helene B., Liz G., Nick B., Karen, Walter J., Richard C., Joel S.
against: 0 abstaining: 0
not voting: Lisa D.
Consultative vote, NYC RCY-
for: Norman, Paul, Pat, Denise, Steve
against: 0 abstaining: Ken not voting: 0
Cons. vote, NYC W&R-
for: Cassie
against: 0 abstaining: 0 not voting: 0
Cons. vote, other-
for: Kathy, Igor (LA RCY), Doug (1124)
against: 0 abstaining: 0 not voting: 0
- (2) Motion: We condemn Treiger's cowardly departure which was the culmination of a mounting secret campaign of slanders, innuendoes, vicious personal manipulation, gross breaches of discipline, all in the search for a rotten clique formation to elevate himself.
 Roll call vote:
Full vote, NYC SL-
for: John H., Jack, Nedy R., Joel S., Stephanie K., Charlotte, Toni, Anne K., Reuben S., Ann P., Bruce A., Chris K., Todd, Helene B., Liz G., Nick B., Karen, Walter J., Lisa D., Richard C.
against: 0 abstaining: 0 not voting: 0
Cons. vote, NYC RCY-
for: Norman, Paul, Pat, Denise, Steve B., Ken
against: 0 abstaining: 0 not voting: 0
Cons. vote, NYC W&R-
for: Cassie
against: 0 abstaining: 0 not voting: 0
Cons. vote, other-
for: Kathy, Igor (LA RCY), Doug (1124)
against: 0 abstaining: 0 not voting: 0
- (3) Motion: Regarding David Cunningham we note:
 1. That he knew of the impending projected split of Treiger, Benajmin and Rogers.
 2. That he did not communicate this knowledge to the National Office and PB; that he denied such knowledge when it was demanded of him. Furthermore, following Treiger's defection, he denied such knowledge to the Bay Area comrades.

3. That when found out and confronted on these points, he went from "loyal intimate collaboration" (i.e. secret cliquism) as part of the central leadership to instant, unlimited opposition to the PB.

4. That of his oppositional documents; the first contains no trace of a political line and the second centered on criticism of the regime was withdrawn after one round of discussion in the joint meeting of the Bay Area LC and the LA OC.

Therefore, the New York LC condemns David Cunningham for his actions over the past weeks which have been dishonest, disloyal and deeply unprincipled.

Roll call vote:

Full vote, NYC SL-

for: John H., Jack, Nedy R., Stephanie K., Charlotte, Toni, Anne K., Reuben S., Ann P., Bruce A., Chris K., Todd, Helene B., Liz G., Nick B., Karen, Walter J., Lisa D., Richard C., Joel S.

against: 0 abstaining: 0 not voting: 0

Cons. vote, NYC RCY-

for: Norman, Paul, Pat, Steve B., Ken

against: 0 abstaining: 0 not voting: 0

Cons. vote, NYC W&R-

for: Cassie

against: 0 abstaining: 0 not voting: 0

Cons. vote, other-

for: Kathy, Igor (LA RCY), Doug (1124)

against: 0 abstaining: 0 not voting: 0

NOTE: Hal L., NYC RCY, left the meeting shortly before voting but declared himself for all three motions at the 6 July NYC RCY meeting. Bill F., NYC RCY, was not present at the meeting but declared himself for all three motions at the 6 July 1972 NYC RCY meeting.

Present but not voting on the Cunningham motion were the following comrades who had already voted on a similar motion at the 2 July Boston local: Jim R., Libby S., Nancy R., Denise

Present but not voting on the Stuart-Moore motion were the following comrades who had already voted on a similar motion at the 2 July Boston local: Jim R., Libby S., Nancy R.

Denise, who was recorded as "not voting," on a similar Moore-Stuart motion at the 2 July 1972 Boston local meeting, changed her vote to yes at this meeting.

PB MOTION SUSPENDING JANET ROGERS

PB Motion (by consultation: Gordon, Robertson, Cunningham; endorsed by Seymour, Samuels) of Sunday 09 July 1972: To suspend Janet Rogers effective immediately for gross indiscipline involving substantive harm to the SL. As head of the whole circulation department and the only completely knowledgeable comrade involved in the work, she has defiantly refused to return from one week leave at the time of maximum urgency around the mailing of the summer WV issue. In addition she is in default of her post of NYC party representative to the RCY local. She has refused to even meet with the Bay Area leadership and/or CC representative in connection with her default. Presently, following her deep involvement in the Treiger defection and the abortive Cunningham opposition in the Bay Area, she is variously reported to be considering resigning from the SL or asking extended leave and is believed to now be in Southern California in Treiger's company.

Rogers is not being expelled at this time in order to give her the opportunity to reconsider her course out of the SL.

Entered in minutes PB #52,
13 July 1972

LETTER TO PB OF 8 JULY BY JANET

Los Angeles
8 July 1972

Political Bureau
Spartacist League

Dear Comrades,

I have been in a state of some confusion and anxiety over the past three weeks due to the combination of events leading up to the PB meeting of 24-25 June, the meeting itself the rupturing of a long time personal relationship, the meeting of the July 1 weekend, etc.

Nevertheless, I am not interested in dropping out of the SL or out of politics. However, enormous pressures are on me in New York--some personal, some subjective, some perhaps symbolic. I would like to stay in, but not in New York.

Therefore, I am requesting an emergency transfer to the Bay Area local preceded by a short (2-3 week) leave of absence for personal reasons.

Fraternally,

Janet R.

cc: Nelson
file

PB MOTION ON ROGERS' TRANSFER REQUEST

PB Motion re. Janet Rogers letter dated 08 July requesting leave and transfer to Bay Area: To maintain her suspension (i.e. forfeit of all democratic rights and obligation to fulfill all responsibilities of SL membership) e.g. excluded from all internal meetings, but required to pay full SP and carry out normal assignments) both to protect the security of the SL and for a testing period in accordance with her declared desire to transfer to the Bay Area local committee. This testing period is for 6 months (if suspension still found necessary at that time then expulsion). The principal criterion by which she should be judged is whether she has demonstrated a positive resolution of her deep-seated ambivalence between a party perspective and her appetite for a personal life alien to political responsibility--with all of the contradictions implied and cowardly dishonesty in concealing them, that have scarred her past as a party member.

Adopted unanimously (including
Cunningham and Benjamin) by PB #52,
13 July 1972

RESIGNATION FROM POLITICAL BUREAU

13 July 1972

Comrades of the Central Committee:

Considering (1) my prior knowledge of an incipient split projected by Treiger et al. in New York and my concealment of that knowledge from the National Office and the Political Bureau, and (2) my consequent week-long abortive opposition which was devoid of a principled stable basis, therefore I believe that the interests of the organization and of my own future contribution as a Marxist would be facilitated if the Central Committee would accept my resignation from its leading subcommittee, the Political Bureau.

David Cunningham

[submitted to PB #52, 13 July 1972, for a polling of the CC. As noted in the minutes of PB #53--First Session, 15 July 1972:

"2. Internal Situation:

- a. Cunningham: The last PB meeting (No.52) received a proposal from Cunningham to resign from the PB. The Central Committee has been polled; the PB recommended accepting Cunningham's resignation and proposed an alternate PB for the interim period until the national conference. Had we not gotten an unambiguous and clear-cut majority on the proposed PB we would have convened an immediate CC plenum. However, of the 16 present full CCers, 14 have been polled; Rep we could not contact, and Foster was in Europe so we did not attempt to contact him. The proposed interim PB consists of: Seymour, Gordon, Robertson, Kinder, and Samuels as youth rep., with Foster as first alternate and Nelson as second alternate. Full CCers voting for Cunningham's resignation and this proposed PB were: Brosius, Schaefer, Samuels, Robertson, Gordon, Vetter, Sheridan, Small, Goldenfeld, Cunningham, Seymour, Nelson, Crawford and Kinder. Alt.CC voting for were: Kelley, Salant, Jennings, Carter and Benjamin. Moore records his vote in favor at this meeting.

Motion: To acknowledge the results of this poll of the CC in favor of Cunningham's resignation from the PB and the projected interim PB. passed"]

NB MINUTES (No.21)-Extract.....14 September 1972

Present: Full NB: Samuels, Schaefer, Cramer, Kamkov, Friar (frat.),
Robertson (party rep, first half of meeting),
Gordon (party rep, second half of meeting)
Alt NC: Petersen
Other: Todd (NYC RCY exec. member), Bruce (NYC RCY organizer)
Meeting convened 6:45 p.m.

Agenda: 1. Organization of Meeting
2. Personnel and Organization
3. RCY Conference Memoranda
4. BMC
5. Rochester
6. NCLC Conferences

2. Personnel and Organization:

e. Denise: Todd reports on reasons for her resignation (see appendix 4).

Motion: To expel Denise on the following grounds: (1) she wilfully slandered the organization; (2) she lied to the LA organizer in denying her political contact with Treiger; (3) she justified her lie and said she would continue to lie to the organization, in accordance with her own conception of democratic-centralism; (4) her whole relationship to the organization was a lie since the time of Treiger's defection, when she denied her close political collaboration with him.

Motion: To note Denise's hypocrisy in voting for Treiger's condemnation in a NYC local meeting. passed

Motion: To append to this set of minutes the relevant documents concerning Denise: (1) NYC SL local minutes, 4 July, section on condemnation of Treiger; (2) LA RCY local minutes, 5 August; (3) Duffy's statement; (4) Todd's report. passed

NYC SL LOCAL MEETING July 4, 1972 (excerpt from minutes)

.....

4. Internal Situation--Jim: Last Sunday a meeting of the Boston LC was held concerning the internal situation. A motion was passed condemning the hardened Moore clique. Over the weekend a joint meeting of the LA-BA comrades was convened. Cunningham, Rogers, Rep and Mirra issued a statement for the purpose of trying to get time at the conference for a minority report. A motion was passed condemning Cunningham for his dishonest, disloyal, and deeply unprincipled actions over the past weeks. Cunningham and Rep voted for that motion; Janet and Mirra voted against. An RCY comrade broke from the Moore clique, handing over information substantiating a hardened clique. Helen also submitted her letters from Moore. We are determined to root out cliquist behavior in a Bolshevik manner; that is, bringing it out in the open. The organization must be protected against future cliquist occurrences. The present struggle is educational for comrades. Cliques don't form around political positions, they acquire them later. Moore will probably stay and fight. Cunningham was urged to reveal real differences to comrades at the appropriate levels.

Motion: This local endorses the Boston LC's condemning of the hardened clique of some two years standing of Stuart-Moore centered in Boston, also expressed in N.Y. passed

Motion: We condemn Treiger's cowardly departure which was the culmination of a mounting secret campaign of slanderous innuendos, vicious personal manipulation and gross breaches of discipline, all in the search for a rotten clique formation to elevate himself. passed

Motion: Regarding Dave Cunningham we note 1) that he knew of the impending projected split of Treiger, Benjamin and Rogers; 2) that he did not communicate this knowledge to the MO and PB; that he denied such knowledge when it was demanded of him; furthermore following Treiger's defection he denied such knowledge to the BA comrades; 3) that when found out and confronted on these points, he went from "loyal intimate collaboration" (i.e., secret cliquism) as part of the central leadership to instant unlimited opposition to the PB; and 4) that of his oppositional documents: the first contains no trace of a political line and the second, centered on criticism of the regime, was withdrawn after one round of discussion in the joint meeting of the BA-LC and the LA-OC. Therefore, the NY-LC condemns Dave Cunningham for his actions over the past weeks which have been dishonest, disloyal, and deeply unprincipled. passed

Voting: [The minutes listed the names of all comrades present and recorded their votes on each of the three motions as "yes", "no", "no vote" or "abstain." Denise voted as follows:]

	Motion #1 (Moore)	Motion #2 (Treiger)	Motion #3 (Dave C.)
Denise*	yes	yes	voted in Boston

* Denise changed her vote, from a previous vote in Boston.

.....

MINUTES: LA-RCY Special meeting Aug. 5, 1972
first draft (uncorrected)

Called to order: 7:50 p.m.

Present: Tom M., Larry L., Victor G., Bob L., Danny U., Irene G., Karen W., John S.
(party rep)
Other: Denise C. (NY RCY, LOA), Duffy M., Tweet C.
Absent: Debbie D. (excused)

1. Organization of Meeting

MOTION: to admit Tweet C. and Duffy M. as reporters to the meeting. PASSES

2. Personnel: Disc. of Denise C.

PROCEDURAL MOTION: 10-min. reports from cdes. Tweet, Duffy and Denise, discussion, summaries. PASSES

a) Report by Tweet C.

Denise had asked to be allowed to see Marvin T. for personal reasons, swearing she would not have political discussions with him. She was granted permission, but was told she must report on her discussions. This she hadn't done, although asked to by Tweet.

Last Thurs. evening, 3 August, Tweet and John confronted Denise in Duffy's presence, asked her about Marvin's perspectives, and if she had any criticisms of the SL regime. Denise was evasive; the only criticism she raised was that she believed it unnecessary to forbid people to see Marvin. At that meeting she was told by Tweet that she would have to break with the clique in order to become a loyal RCY member.

On Friday, 4 Aug., Duffy reported that immediately before and after the conversation with Tweet and John, Denise raised privately with him some far-reaching criticisms of the SL, questioning the validity of the Transitional Program and stating that the Secret PB Meeting was held for the purpose of breaking Marvin T.

The NO agreed with the local leadership that Denise should be suspended, as she seems to be Marvin's agent. Speaking at this meeting is a privilege: the RCY organizer suspended her last night.

Believes Denise was trying to recruit Duffy into clique and out of organization.

b) Report by Duffy M.

Has seen Denise twice during last 2 weeks. The first time there was no political discussion. The second contact, Thurs. evening 3 Aug., Denise expressed certain doubts on her mind concerning SL-RCY, adding that she didn't expect to be in RCY much longer. Her arguments were nothing new: there is a bureaucratic, repressive regime which breaks people and which can't publish an International Discussion Bulletin. Denise concluded that leadership of organization must be changed. She also stated that Marvin was self-critical over his way of resigning, had wanted to persuade Dave C. to lead the struggle against the leadership as Marvin hadn't the experience in Trotskyism to do it. Besides this, she didn't say anything about Marvin. Denise also claimed that what Dave C. was doing was the right thing, although she did not clarify just what she meant.

After the conversation, Tweet and John questioned Denise. She was secretive, defensive, didn't volunteer information, didn't bring up what she had just brought up with Duffy.

c) Report by Denise.

Should not be suspended because has been neither inactive nor disloyal, which are the grounds for suspension. Approach was to be honest and open with organization, raising her criticisms and trying to stay in, but nevertheless felt she would be suspended.

As Denise and Marvin are political people, their discussions naturally dealt somewhat with politics and Denise never swore not to have political discussions with Marv T. However, Denise's attitude was one of a loyal RCYer, defending the line of the SL. Doesn't think people should need permission to have political discussions with Marvin, so long as political collaboration isn't involved.

Does not suspect Jim R. of embezzling; does not think Marvin did, either.

Should not be expected to report all her political discussions with everyone. If Marvin was forming a competing political organization, then she'd report it. Did not want to report Marvin's views, as he is writing a resignation document himself, and she prefers his opinions be transmitted straight to the SL through this rather than possibly be distorted through Denise.

d) Discussion Round: Victor, Tom, Karen, Irene, John, Bob, Danny, Larry.

John: Questions to Denise:

- 1) How does she characterize Treiger's departure?
- 2) How does she characterize regime?
- 3) Wants clarification on exactly what Denise told Duffy.
- 4) What kinds of political discussions did Denise have with Treiger?

e) Summary by Denise.

Only lie was a lie of omission.

Not a member of a clique; if she were, she would have dropped out as they did. Willing to break off relations with Treiger if organization feels it interferes with her political work.

Ideas, opinions about SL are unformed, as she hasn't seen much of how we function. Nevertheless, conduct of the SL in recent period has raised doubts in her mind. People have been lined up against cliques; discussions around them have not been political or consciousness-raising. On warning Dave C. of Al Nelson's trip: feels secrecy about trip was to gain a psychological advantage, playing on Dave's supposed fear of Al. This submerges politics, something which should be avoided.

Thinks Transitional Program is valid, but naturally some parts need to be updated. This does not conflict with SL position.

Repeats: has not been inactive or disloyal, which are grounds for suspension.

Marvin says he has not contacted Klonsky. Does not seem from conversations with Marv that he would contact Klonsky. Treiger has no clear political perspectives, is still, however, interested in politics and is writing a resignation from SL.

f) Summary from Duffy.

Tended to weaken toward Denise, as Denise tended to weaken toward toward Treiger. Denise was correct in urging Treiger to write resignation document. Wants to see document.

Fears that Treiger is fighting the SL, has an organizational perspective, thus is an obstacle to revolution.

Would prefer that LAOC had dealt with George Rep and Denise, had taken position on them, rather than let MO execute it.

Denise's statement that she would rather break relations with Treiger than be suspended is given the lie by the facts.

Denise told Duffy that Jim R. was so concerned about expenditures of others, but when Jim, Liz and Janet went on tour, they spent money lavishly on fancy restaurants.

g) Summary by Tweet.

Denise affirmed at this meeting everything she was accused of, justifying future expulsion. Lie of omission--withholding information from a revolutionary organization--is grounds for expulsion. Denise's statement concerning Klonsky bears out that she has had substantial political discussions with Treiger.

Believes Denise will promise to break contact with Treiger et. al. in order to stay in organization and act as an agent. Denise must and will be expelled.

Slander on Jim R. about misappropriating money (spending tour money on fancy restaurants, etc.) is also grounds for expulsion.

Believes Treiger brought a clique into SL from CWC; Treiger, Rep and Denise.

h) Second Discussion Round; Same order as 1st round.

Tom; Klonsky at NPAC Convention told Tom that Treiger had called him and told him of his resignation.

i) Summary by Denise.

Prediction that she'll be out of RCY is becoming a self-fulfilling prophecy. Probably will be expelled, which is too bad; considers herself a communist, a Trotskyist, and upholds the Transitional Program, does not wish to leave politics or the RCY.

Believes she did tell Tweet that Treiger was writing a resignation; did not keep it secret.

Did take a position on Treiger's exit; voted for "cowardly desertion" formulation. Doesn't think Treiger was trying to build something within the SL, otherwise he would have done a better job.

Reiterates point on warning Dave C. of Al N. trip to Bay Area.

Is not making the case that there is a bureaucratic regime which needs to be overthrown. However, as far as John and others demanding to know her position on regime, she could hold that regime is bureaucratic and still stay in RCY, although that's not her position.

Does have one criticism of organization; question of protectionism among top levels. E.g., there was no reason for the Secret PB meeting's attempt to protect Treiger. Ranks should know his errors, since they elect leadership. Protecting leaders is not a democratic conception.

j) Summary by Duffy.

Not sure about need to expel Denise. Hopes Denise won't be expelled, but her attitude toward the organization must change. No conception on her part that she should have reported on Treiger to the organization, as a loyal member would do.

Has the feeling that Denise is protecting Duffy by not bringing up the areas in which they agreed. Duffy shares certain doubts, but raises his criticisms constantly with Tweet and John. Denise told Duffy it was necessary to replace existing leadership; Duffy disagreed with this conclusion, saying we must either struggle to improve leadership, or replace it on the basis of program. At any rate, Denise stated tonight that she did not have a position on the regime. She says one thing to Duffy, one thing to Tweet, probably another thing to Treiger, Cunningham, etc.

Still in favor of struggling to maintain Denise as, or transform her into, a communist.

k) Summary by Tweet.

Denise's attempt to recruit Duffy resulted in testimony that will provide grounds for her expulsion.

Treiger and Rep are intellectual dilettantes who made a contribution for a short period of time by leading CWC into SL. Denise is sufficiently apolitical--not seeing a political basis to the clique fight--to make a good agent. We have to expel her, otherwise she will continue raising things with Treiger.

We are going forward, carrying out the transformation of the SL. An episode in SL-RCY history is now over; we can proceed to the National Conference and implementation of the Transformation document.

Motion (Bob): LA RCY confirms the suspension of Cde. Denise C., and defers future disposition of the matter to the National Bureau. PASSES UNANIMOUSLY

Motion (Larry): LA RCY thoroughly condemns actions of Cde. Denise C.
 WITHDRAWN

Roll call vote for motion:

Full votes: Karen W.: yes; John S.: yes; Tom H.: yes; Larry L.: yes; Victor G.: yes; Irene G.: yes; Bob L.: yes; Danny U.: yes.

Consultative votes: Duffy H.: yes; Tweet C.: yes.

3. Good and Welfare: Financial crisis of national organization and pitch for contributions.

Statement by Duffy M.

Los Angeles
7 August 1972

Having been instructed by my organizer to produce a signed document reporting the political essence of my conversations with RCY comrade (currently under suspension) Denise C. I shall now proceed forthwith:

The first night we had political conversation was Wednesday, July 26, and our conversation was limited. Her attachment to Marv Treiger, or, more to the point, her respect for and adherence to his political consciousness, was apparent. I struggled with her on this pointing out that she should have a more objective and critical attitude towards him. She maintained that his manner of leaving the SL, though less than noble, was understandable and, further, did not in and of itself preclude the possibility that he might have valuable political criticisms and contributions to make.

The next time I saw Denise was Thursday night, August 3. At that time I mentioned that I still didn't know much, or anything at all for that matter, of her personal and/or political involvement with Treiger. She said she had a lot to tell me if I wanted to listen. I said, sure I'll listen. She then proceeded to give what was essentially the same series of criticisms which I had heard in the Bay Area, at the joint Bay Area/LAOC meeting some weeks prior. In a disconnected and nonpolitically oriented discourse, she ran down a series of criticisms of the SL running from bureaucratic manipulation and "breaking" of members to inability to carry out the transformation. She criticized the SL for not producing the International Discussion Bulletin as originally projected. She repeated a story, apparently told to her by Janet Cunningham, about Jim, Liz, and Janet eating well and drinking wine on party funds while on tour. She felt that she wouldn't be in the SL for long as she was being driven out. She also referred to the Transitional Program as an "outdated" program. That same night, she had a conversation with Comrades Carter and Sheridan, at which I was present. When asked what were her criticisms of the SL, she was decisively evasive, only going into the question of bureaucratic manipulation, protesting an alleged SL policy of forbidding members from talking with Treiger. It became apparent that Denise was having political conversations with Merv, the scope and content of which she was endeavoring to conceal from the organization, though not from selected individuals, such as myself. I don't think she gave me the whole truth either, however.

The gist of her politics was clear, however. She felt that the SL was bureaucratically controlled by a tight social clique which had no social base (in the traditional Trotskyist meaning of "bureaucracy"), but which rendered the tasks of transformation, more likely than not, unrealizable.

Duffy M.
11 August 1972

P.S. Sunday, August 6, we went to the beach and she said that she thought she was in political solidarity with the cliquists.

Report by Todd on Discussion with Denise on her Resignation, 28 August 1972

When Denise declared her resignation from the RCY, her initial reason was, "I would have been expelled anyway." A few minutes later she said that it was "principled" for her to leave because of her pessimism about the SL actually carrying through its transformation. Also, it would be "unprincipled" for her to stay in because she is "not organizationally loyal." She still defended her right to veto information to the organization, upholding her right to decide what is relevant and irrelevant. Hence, to demand a full report from her is not democratic centralist functioning. Since the SL is not democratic centralist, she does not have to be organizationally loyal.

I asked her to turn in a written resignation. She answered that perhaps she would sometime but first she wants to see if Janet, Dave and Marvin write anything. She said she knows what she thinks, but does not feel "competent" to write anything. She agrees with Janet, Dave and Marvin on their criticisms of the SL, but is "critical" of the manner in which they left.

Some things she raised:

- 1) George C.'s remarks about Treiger's history in political organizations is untrue.
- 2) The organization runs a "protection racket" towards the leadership.
- 3) "What does Jim do with his time?"
- 4) Jim went to the West Coast for the CWC and blacks when he should have been doing international work.
- 5) She doesn't know whether one should be in the same organization with "someone" like Tweet.
- 6) The Work Stoppage Committees (WSC's). To have believed we could have "organized" a strike against the war was wrong from the start. No trust to Jim for that putsch.
- 7) Women and Revolution will be liquidated just because Liz says so.
- 8) "The Transitional Program needs updating."
- 9) "There doesn't have to be an alternative program for there to be a faction fight."
- 10) Interventions in the anti-war movement are "sectarian," "narrow" and "ineffective." We do not establish ourselves as a pole of genuine Marxist authority. Too much attention to the WL. Not enough historical references. We encourage mediocrity among our comrades when we urge them to speak even if they just read the demands.
- 11) More orientation towards the CP and SWP. Workers have never heard of the NCLC and WL.
- 12) Workers Vanguard is not popularly written.
- 13) Her future:
 - a) Into an ORO
 - b) Out of politics
 - c) Sympathizer to the SL/RCY at interventions; willing to "bloc."
- 14) Black and Red needs updating.
- 15) The NYC RCY local's treatment of Hal L. is bad.

This is, I believe, a full record of points which Denise raised and about which we argued for about 4-5 hours on 28 August 1972.

Todd N.
14 September 1972

CHRONOLOGY OF DEPARTURES
OF TREIGER AND/OR CUNNINGHAM CLIQUISTS FROM THE SL/RCY

Marvin Treiger--25 June 1972, in NYC, by phone to Robertson
Janet Rogers--26 July 1972, in Bay Area, by phone to Sue A.
Mirra M.--29 July 1972, in Bay Area, by phone to Sue A.
David Cunningham--31 July 1972, in NYC, by phone to Lisa D.
Nicholas Benjamin--31 July 1972, in NYC, in person to Robertson
George Rep--1 or 2 August, in Bay Area, in person to Nelson
Denise C.--28 August, in NYC, in person to Todd N.

No statement of resignation was ever offered to any party body,
either orally or in writing, by any of the above individuals.