

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

A few facts: Four groups, including Franklin's Bill Haywood Club, were planning the issuing of Turning Point before the convention, July 1st, to be exact. So, according to the arguments of G.F.&F. The Bill Haywood Club was in on this opportunist blitz, putsch, etc. Franklin objects to what he calls our appeal to CP'ers to work with us in a factional manner. This is proven hypocrisy in the reprint of a small section of a Franklin letter--in this issue. Franklin doesn't really think that SPARK or Fore 'N' Aft are leaders of a faction. He wrote around the country TP's formulation of the bogey of factionalism after consultation with the PR Club--before TP was ever issued. That letter is reprinted here. Franklin takes a fit over rash, insolent, irresponsible TP which wrote the C.I.B. a letter. What Franklin omits is that he offered to help write it. He also agreed with us, off the record, that the Bering article wasn't good. "Wasn't good!" What diplomacy. Franklin, too, is afraid of the C.I.B. as of something above the Communist movement--not part of it. If Franklin looks to the C.I.B. for leadership, as he should, he should find his tongue. The C.I.B. doesn't need mannikins.

Franklin wants criticism and self-criticism in the TP setup. So do we. That's why we insisted that Franklin should write his criticism of TP, and we would circulate it. Franklin refused. The crux of the problem here is why did Franklin pull out of TP with the B.H. Club. The draft of TP's Declaration embodied the rules governing the political control of TP. These were left out of the printed Declaration along with a lot of other material because of space limitations. Since the rules were not immediately necessary to the statement of our program, we reserved them for another time. We wish to include them here:

"1-Immediately following the Lenin quote on page 2, 1- All purely editorial material (i.e. unsigned) represents the unanimous agreement of the groups through the Editorial Board. As a solution of minor but pointed disagreements (involving tone or various types of emphasis) an article which is not completely agreeable to all the editors will be signed, thus having its editorial function lessened, but still generally representing the publication. Underlying this rule is our belief that majority-minority voting at this stage would be a misrepresentation on our part since we do not yet represent substantial groups of comrades, and a mere majority on our editorial board would not necessarily represent the correct position in any disagreement.

"2-The problem of raising a difference openly in the magazine will be discussed upon the request of an editor. If there is unanimous agreement that the difference is of minor importance and not a matter of timing or of immediate airing, the discussion may be delayed pending further discussion in the editorial board and in the groups represented. In the absence of a unanimous decision to delay, upon the request of an editor,

the publication will throw the question open to discussion with equal space given to each of the different ideas.

"3-- We look forward to help from Contributing Editors in different parts of the country. A Contributing Editor must identify himself with a group or publication so that his policy is clear and in the record, so that our basic agreement is clear. Contributing Editors will have full rights to participation in discussion. However, since this publication is a local one, representing local groups, final decisions on editorial policy will be made only by the local groups represented through the Editorial Board.

"4-- The paragraph following the Lenin quote on page 2 of TP's Declaration was taken--as a bridge in the cutting--from this point. We urge groups in New York and around the country to endorse our views so that the ideological and organizational unification we desire nationally can proceed systematically and visibly. For this purpose, we also, will endorse groups and publications with which we basically agree. Representation on our Editorial Board of other groups in New York City will proceed from the open statement of their policies, personal contact, and the unanimous agreement of the Editorial Board."

These rules were accepted by Franklin and the B.H. Club, but only until the first disagreement occurred. Then He opposed the rules for the first issue--we could use them after that. Franklin told us that the CP members must not see our disagreements. We spit on that! After failing to agree on the question of the raising of the perspective of a new Party, the 3 groups suggested to Franklin that we use our fine rules and according to the 2nd rule, print a brief statement of both positions. This would be an indication of the seriousness and honesty of TP. But Franklin absolutely refused, and the TP of 4 groups died. We thought it over and went ahead with 3 groups. (See note below on the subsequent developments. This whole mess is indicative of a fault in the expelled movement. It hasn't learned to practice what it preaches. The wastefulness of this attitude of hiding problems is proven in the fact that the discussion is raging anyway--but under less orderly conditions.