

POLITICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES, Number 16, November 6, 1970

Present: B. Barnes, J. Barnes, Breitman, Dobbs, A. Hansen,  
J. Hansen, Horowitz, LaMont, F. Lovell, Novack, Ring,  
Sheppard.

Visitors: Bolduc, Kerry

Chairman: Dobbs

AGENDA:                   1. Administrative Committee Report  
                          2. Discussion of 1970 Election Results  
                          3. World Movement

1. ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

J. Barnes reported.

1. Gregorich correspondence (see attached)
2. Recommendation of Los Angeles Branch that D.P., a former member, be readmitted to the party.

Motion: To concur with the Los Angeles Branch recommendation.

Carried.

3. Recommendation of Houston Branch that H.S., a former member, be readmitted to the party.

Motion: To concur with the Houston Branch recommendation.

Carried.

2. DISCUSSION OF 1970 ELECTION RESULTS

Sheppard reported.

Discussion.

Sheppard to write article for paper.

3. WORLD MOVEMENT

J. Hansen reported.

Meeting Adjourned.

COPY

COPY

COPY

3861 Montevista Road  
Cleveland, Ohio 44121  
October 4, 1970

Jack Barnes  
Organizational Secretary  
New York, New York

Dear Comrade Barnes,

In response to your letter of 9-21-70, let me assure you that I have no intention of proceeding in the factional manner described in your quote from the 1964 Organizational bulletin. I intend neither to engage in discussions behind the back of the party, nor to draw new comrades into discussion of "disputed issues." Nor do I have any intention to "line up quickly" comrades on my views before the party convention. On the contrary, my views were openly expressed in the document which Comrade Passen and I submitted to the last party convention. And it is precisely because I am concerned with how to proceed in a correct manner that I wrote to you.

After assuring you that I want to proceed only in a manner which is consistent with the best interests of the party, let me say that I am afraid I was not precise enough in my letter of 8-19-70. In that letter I told you that I felt it was correct to: 1) correspond with other comrades on the question of sending young comrades into the industrial working class, and, 2) circulate a rough draft of the document to some comrades before the 90-day discussion period began in order to submit the best-thought-out document to the party. Your answer to this, it seems to me, is: "I can find no sanction in our organizational principles or practices for authorizing a selective discussion prior to our regular pre-convention discussion period." I did not mean to imply that I was going to begin a "selective discussion" period with dozens of comrades. My formulation was vague. The error was mine and I apologize for it.

Specifically, I intend to collaborate with five other comrades on the writing of a document. These five comrades are, of course, already in agreement with the document that Comrade Passen and I submitted to the last party convention. They feel, as I do, that another document on the subject is in order. We wish to collaborate, as I said, in order to submit the best-thought-out document to the party convention. The actual writing of the document will certainly be done by more than myself, and all who help to write it will sign their names to it. Just as Comrade Passen and I worked together last year on the document we submitted, so I wish to work together with these five comrades this year. I cannot believe that the fact that we do not live in the same city makes it incorrect for us to collaborate -- via correspondence -- in the writing of a document. I

hope that this clarifies my intentions on procedure. If you believe that the party's organizational principles forbid this collaboration, please let me know why.

Comradely,  
s/ Barbara Gregorich