

## MAJORITY FACTION BULLETIN # 1

1. The Christmas Holidays marked the end of the first round of the faction fight. Overall, the Steering Committee of the majority faction believes that we clearly won. The faction announced its existence on 12/8, after having been organizing underground for over 3 months. Their existence and the fact that they organized an apparently disciplined faction before raising any of the politics created a sense of a crisis within the I.S.

However the majority responded extremely well. Among various sections of the leadership - the E.C., the organizers, faction leaders - past and relatively less important differences were put aside in order to defend the I.S. In branch after branch, the membership rallied aggressively to defend the politics of the organization.

A majority caucus was formed, a great deal of travelling has already been done, and debate and discussion has taken place in every branch. The "Left" Faction has been soundly answered in many, many documents, by both the leadership and the rank and file. By the end of December, with few exceptions, the lines have been drawn. Because of the rapid, hard political response, and the extensive internal discussion, most of the membership has already made up its mind.

Over the New Year's Eve weekend, meetings were held of both sides. The minority met in Cincinnati. A meeting of majority NC members, organizers, faction leaders, and representatives of branches otherwise not represented, met in Detroit. (Reports to follow) These meetings concluded round one.

2. The Minority Meeting - 49 people attended the "Left" Faction meeting. Of the 49, 4 were Black, half women. They claim 68 signatures to their document at this time, not including Portland.

The tone of the meeting was serious and no longer hysterical. They have backed-off of talking about a split. In fact, they passed a motion against a split and called on the E.C. to state it would not split if it were in a minority.

In general, their politics have solidified against industrialization and against priorities. Much of their membership can argue those questions in a clear sharp manner. They show much greater confusion on the question of mass work. Discussions on Sadlowick and Teamsters were relatively low level and confused. "Left" Faction members disagreed as to whether or not we should have attempted TDC.

Their politics have not yet advanced beyond criticism of the I.S. majority. They can list all of our mistakes but have, as yet, no real alternatives. Their declared strategy, at this time, is to stay in the I.S. and conduct extensive debate. They claim that their ideas will not be taken seriously under the current leadership and would like to change the E.C. They put up no slate. They did, however, state that they would attempt to block with any other forces in order to dump the leadership.

They put forward no motions as to how debate should be concluded or political differences resolved. Their only expressed position is to attempt to recruit another 12 to 20 signatures by the N.C. and to attempt to block with anyone on no political basis other than hostility to the E.C.

The Steering Committee believes that although the tone of the meeting was far more political and less hysterical than "Left" Faction members have been in political debate with majority caucus members, the real point of view of the leadership re-

mains the same. Their primary political loyalty is to the "Left" Faction, not the I.S. They would love to win a majority but know that is impossible. They are therefore for staying in the I.S. as long as they can, to recruit and to further develop their cadre.

It is extremely important for majority caucus members to understand why they want to dump the E.C., and what their strategy really means. Within the majority there are many comrades who would like to see changes in both E.C. membership and functioning. They will fight for their positions within the majority and it is correct for them to do so. They will be arguing for a change in the leadership based on their conceptions of how to move the I.S. forward. However, the "Left" Faction will be arguing for a change in the E.C., not to move the I.S. forward, but to break the barrier they have reached in the rank and file's defense of I.S. perspectives. They want to destroy the possibility of effective leadership and normal-functioning organization, and open up the I.S. so that everything, and every position, is up for grabs. It is a strategy to break the I.S. as it is presently constituted.

They argue for a changed leadership body to "carry out debate", not to lead the organization. Let's be clear, a leadership elected on no other basis than to carry out internal debate or to represent widely different political strategies would be a paralyzed body. It could not lead the organization. This would be a disaster for the I.S. majority, although not for the "Left" Faction. They already believe our current strategy is "doomed," therefore inability to carry it out does not worry them. In fact, paralysis is a perfect breeding ground for them to continue to recruit to their ideas.

Majority caucus members should therefore understand that for any section of the majority to consider blocking with the "Left" Faction on the question of the leadership would result in total paralysis of the I.S. and cannot be allowed.

Discussion of changes in the existing leadership can only take place within the majority.

Part of the reason that the "Left" Faction has moved away from talking about a split is that the "Left" Faction leadership knows they do not now have the necessary ingredients for a separate organization. They do not have the cadres or the leadership. They also do not have space on the left in which to differentiate themselves. By staying in the I.S. they hope to be able to buy enough time to resolve these deficiencies. This strategy is known as entrism.

By staying in the I.S. as long as possible, an entrism tendency would be able to consolidate their politics and develop their cadre while being carried by the organization. Their members would have time to learn the politics thoroughly and the faction as a whole would be able to sharpen their political ideas in debate with the majority.

A situation of indefinite internal debate is to their advantage and our disadvantage. For the I.S. majority the existence of an entrism tendency would be like having a monkey on our backs. They would always be their waiting for a mistake and then recruiting to themselves out of those mistakes, and then trying to create divisions within the majority to break it up. Meanwhile, as their ideas are never being tested, they never fail - but can continually paint their strategy as the solution to all problems.

Majority Faction Bulletin #1, Page 3

And as they have a completely different strategy, the entrust tendency has no commitment to the work going well--they can be counted on to violate the spirit, if not the letter of our political strategy

An open-ended or long-term faction fight would disrupt our external work and prevent any recruitment. It would demoralize many comrades involved in the strengthening of that work and lead to the loss of some of them. It would mean that the minority has won, in reality, in moving us away from proceeding to a workers' combat group, and back to an internal propaganda discussion group.

The majority caucus meeting (report following) called for a special convention to resolve the political differences. There was no discussion at that meeting on how to deal with a deep entrust tendency. The steering committee is now discussing this question and will shortly put out a document for discussion within the majority.

However, we do feel that it is important for majority caucus members not to be taken in by the new tone of the "left" faction.

The steering committee believes that their tone has become less hysterical because of 3 reasons. 1. They did not get the response they expected. Many of their members expected the whole organization to go through some sort of rapid conversion after they read their document. When this did not happen, they were forced to re-assess and back off. 2. Steve Jeffries has clearly played a role in calming them down. He understands they do not yet have the resources for a separate organization, and convinced them to change their strategy. He has also been convinced they should not split because they can possibly pick up more signatures among possible third forces. 3. Their rank and file put a great deal of pressure on them to come out against a split. Many of them had signed the document not knowing about the implications of faction fights. When "left" faction members began talking split they felt used and demanded the faction come out against a split.

In summary, we believe the tactical turn made by the "left" faction is precisely that. No matter how much the talk of peace, they are still plotting war. They lost the first round, and in the next process tipped off the majority of the organization as to what they are about. They are now backing off trying to find a new basis for remaining in the I.S.

They are floating ideas about indefinite debate on a series of specified questions, a new EC to administer extended debate and some form of coalition leadership. These proposals have nothing to do with moving the IS forward, but are proposals to further develop their group.

3. Steve Jeffries and Joan Smith are currently travelling around the organization. Although Steve was supposedly coming as an observer to check out the accuracy of the ISGB's critique of us, this is not the case. Steve is here as a factional organizer, both to help the "left" faction. He played a major role at their meeting in Cincinnati and claimed to a majority caucus member to have encouraged BW and CW to organize a faction while they were in Britain.

At the Cincinnati meeting Steve claimed that the ISGB has nothing to apologize for in their intervention in our organization as they have only intervened to "save" us. We think otherwise. They have a great deal to apologize for. Fraternal relations do not mean a license to organize against the existing policies and leadership, to

encourage the formation of a faction with a split perspective and to threaten the continued existence of the I.W. This has been their method internationally, in Portugal, Italy, Ireland, Canada, and here. Some leaderships have collapsed under their attack. Others have not.

The rotten methods of international work of the ISGB are extremely serious - not just because the effect they have on smaller groups than themselves - but their ruptured political relations with the most important revolutionary groups in the world today. Their methods make it much more difficult for them (and us) to politically influence other tendencies.

At the same time, we are closer to them politically than any other group and share basic political assumptions: the self-emancipation of the working class, the class nature of Stalinism, the role of the revolutionary party, the role of the rank and file movement.

We wish to maintain fraternal relations with the ISGB, however the specifics of those relations will have to be worked out as part of the resolution of the faction fight. Mark L. is currently in Britain speaking with their leadership.

Jeffries should be treated as any other factional organizer for the "Left" Faction. He should be argued with aggressively. Majority faction members should make him understand that the politics of the "Left" Faction are way off the mark and do not speak to building a revolutionary workers' combat group, in this country, in this period.

Jeffries must also be made to understand that although there are disagreements within the majority, they are not on fundamentals of our strategy and that there will be no way forward led by a section of the majority and the minority.

Majority caucus members should not discuss differences within the majority with Jeffries.

A meeting of leaders of the majority caucus met in Detroit over the weekend of Jan. 1 and 2. The meeting included N.C. members, full-time organizers, factional leaders, and representatives of branches otherwise not represented. The purpose of the meeting was to attempt to work out a perspective for moving the organization forward. Membership in the majority is based on agreement of the fundamentals of our strategy for building a revolutionary workers' combat group in this period - industrialization, priorities, and mass work. Those attending the meeting came together on the basis of the above plus the following: 1) Agreement that the fight in the I.S. today is between the minority and defense of our basic strategy. Those who saw themselves as a "third force" could not be part of the majority. 2) All agreed to discuss differences within the majority and that the majority would decide the limits of the discussion throughout the organization. The majority would also strive for a common program. 3) The discussions at the meeting were considered closed, to be reported only to majority caucus members.

The first session was a report on the fight itself, the nature of the majority, the steering committee's assessment of why the fight, its specific development in each branch, and what the meeting was for. In general these ideas are discussed in point one of this report.

The second session on economic and political perspectives was based on a first



draft prepared by the E.C. The document laid out that the slow pace of the recovery and the absence of strong capital investment has kept inflation below our expectations. We expect that there will not be double-digit inflation, at least not before the end of this year. As a result there has not been as strong a push for higher wages and national contracts have been signed at about 8% wages, which is well within what the employers have wanted. We don't expect contracts this year to upset this, at least not until the UMW contract until December.

The major aspect of the employers' offensive has been on productivity and working conditions, consequently we don't expect major struggles in this bargaining round to be around wages in national contracts. Rather our rank and file work will be more local around working conditions and grievances, and union struggles, as well as job security. Recruitment will not be rapid, but is quite possible on this basis. Moreover, we can expect more rapid recruitment from these sectors heavily hit by the crisis, blacks and young people.

Action by the Democratic Administration will not be noticeable until the second half of 1977 or early 1978 - too late to have a real impact on this bargaining round. At the same time the Carter Administration will probably grant some concessions to labor and federal aid to urban areas. Illusions in the Democrats will be widespread, as everyone gives Carter a chance, at least for the early part of 1977.

The above is highly schematic. A final draft will be available, hopefully, by 1/10/77.

The ~~second~~ <sup>third</sup> discussion was on the way forward for the I.S. Several documents were introduced by the E.C., Joe F., Sam F., and Joel J. None of them were used as the basis of amendment although the general outlines for a direction forward posed by both the E.C. document and the Joe F. document were generally agreed upon. These included: 1) The expansion of the central leadership both by the expansion of the E.C. and the establishment of a midwest-based Central Committee to meet monthly. The C.C. was seen as a way of bridging the divisions between the E.C. and the leaders of our industrial work, by bringing the leaders of the industrial work into a position where they can play a greater role in giving a general lead to the organization. 2) The development of a midwest organizers' council 3) Much greater focus on the cadre development and the secondary leadership 4) A commitment to the maintenance of a national organization and dealing with the specific problems of the smaller, more peripheral branches 5) The development of districts in the four midwest industrial branches 6) The development of a women's perspective 7) The development of a black perspective 8) The development of an anti-imperialist perspective.

A drafting committee of Ken, R Eric, Bill, Enid, Larry, Harry, Gay, Jack, and one Red Tide rep, was nominated. They will meet 1/9 to finalize a first draft of a perspective document for the majority caucus. The document will be circulated within the majority the week following 1/9.

The next discussion focussed on a resolution of the fight. The majority caucus voted to call on the E.C. to hold a special convention to resolve the debate. It was felt that the organization would be severely damaged by a long, drawn-out debate and that the differences within the organization would have to be resolved by the entire organization. It was also felt that a convention could not just deal with the questions posed by the minority, but must lead the organization forward. The document being drafted is to be the basis for the majority caucus perspective.

A continuation steering committee of Bill P., Larry S., Joel G., and Gay S. was elected. The steering committee has divided up liaison relations with the majority caucuses in the different branches as follows: N.Y. - Gay; Pittsburgh-Joel; Cleveland-Joel; Detroit-Val; Chicago-Gary-Joel; Indy-Larry; Louisville-Gay; St. Louis-Larry; Bloomington-Joel/Frank T.; Boston-Mike U.; Springfield-Mike U.; N.J. - Mike U.; L.A. - Bill; Oakland-Bill; Portland-Bill; Atlanta-Larry; Austin-Gay; Red Tide-Larry.

The steering committee meets almost daily and is charged with the development of political positions, strategy and tactics for the majority caucus. These positions will be circulated within the majority. Membership in the majority caucus includes respect for the day-to-day tactical decisions taken by the steering committee. These tactics will flow from the political agreement reached within the majority.

The meeting was considered a success by those present, although there were some fairly stormy sessions and not all differences have been resolved. Several comrades attended who represented possible third forces. These comrades attended on the basis of agreement with the fundamentals of our politics and agreement to respect the integrity of the meeting.

Although the differences with these groupings remain they have agreed to join the majority. They have done so because they understand the seriousness of the fight, the possibility of a split and agreement with the fundamentals of I.S. politics. These groupings, one around the Sam F., Peter D., Nancy H. document in N.Y. and the other around the Joel J. document in L.A. are joining the majority caucus in order to defend the I.S.

The steering committee sees their joining with the majority as an extremely positive turn in the development of the fight. The development of a solid majority representing a broad range of the membership enhances our ability to give a sense of direction to the organization and make a serious attempt to win back the ranks of the minority.

The first session on perspectives, Saturday evening, was extremely stormy. With few exceptions, most comrades addressed themselves to the questions debated at the convention. This debate got the body nowhere, proving that if the majority chose to fight out old differences it would not be able to move the organization forward.

The following morning, all sides came together, focussing remarks on a direction forward. In general it was agreed that the documents passed at the last N.C. were the right direction and were the political basis for the different sections of the majority caucus to come together and to lead the organization.

The political ideas developed at this session will be used by the drafting committee as the basis for the majority caucus perspectives document discussed above.

The meeting ended on a fairly upbeat note with discussion of making an aggressive fight to win back sections of the minority. It was felt that with developing political agreement within the majority and a direction forward that some members might be won back to the basic strategies of the majority.

Left Faction National Meeting Cincy Jan. 2

Ken B. of Chicago attended the LF meeting as a representative observer for the Majority. The following is an abridged version of the notes he made on the speakers at the meeting. It does not claim to be complete, nor is it quotes, just summations of positions. 49 people attende. 1/2 women. 4 blacks, 45 whites.

Cal: The IS as it is today can never become a working class organization. We have to turn outward to bring new people in. Can never do it on the path were on today.

Barbara: At the CWA fraction it was said that we cant take a firm position on superseniority because we'll alienate male workers.

Ellen: We cant be a force in the class, but we can build our org. We cant affect whats goin on in the IBT

Sue: IS is developing in a right wing direction due to a deep cynicism about the self-activity of the working class.

Michael: You cant choose where you think the class struggle will take place. Be where the real struggle is. See where WP sells well and then make it apriority. Make contacts through a strike, then make it a priority. When it stops being true leave it.

Todd. The PO campaign is the sort of priority the LF is for. EC has a stage theory. First bring people around, then class struggle politics, then socialist politics, but never get to the socialist politics. Those who join are never trained. To recruit to rev. politics is to "ripping off the r & f movement"(refers to last conv. opposit.)

Pat: A lot of people cant sell paper because they are not prepared to answer questions that workers might raise about Russia or Mideast.

Celia:Cynicism so deep, promise you'll be a mass leader. At CWA fraction EC said bringing people to a study group would bring them out of the class. We dont say to workers we have things to give them instead we say we need them.

Kadi: Many in majority cant see rev. s rategy independent of 5 prioritities and industrialization. People say whats wrong with Harry's work in auto is that he nees more people, not what he's doing

Clem: 4 majority supporters gave him 4 different assessments of auto work.. He came around IS because it would deal with prisoners, with political ideas. No respense from all priorites. Go in with grandoise ideas, but not enough ideas and goals.

Sharon: industrialization does not have to be conservatizing if the politics of the org. are made more important. Why is the choice of workplace thekey thing to decide if you're a successful revol.

Steve: Portugal shows rightward drift. IS refuses to criticise anything PRP does, like support to military.. Comes from a contempt for working people. Rita in steel doesnt raise any criticisms.

Doug: Rightward drift due to focus on union. In CWA cant fight AT&T Have to bloc with left bureacrats. More and more focus on union reforms. Becoming a tendency.

Pat: Have to pose systematic alternative to widespread dissatisfaction. Need propaganda for real r & f movt, not bloc with bureacrats. We have an alternative to crisis, revol soc.

Marianne: to win over people on fecne, in most branches 1/2 are passive, memoralized, 2nd class, undducated.

Ben: At Gary works RSL and OL defeated our women on indep. women's org. Contacts were won to idea that indep org divides the class. IS always look at leadership first, not the workers in struggle, as in article on Manly in Jamaica.

John:(Lvlle) Middle class indust. people are made the real workers, convince workers to think of themselves as industrialized. Industrialization cut student recruitment, bringin indus. to an end.

Cal: Drift to right. Many define our politics simply as indust.. and priorities, not self-emancipation, Stalinism, etc. Politics are going, black question is dropped; can't appeal to dissatisfied people.

Steel discussion;

Kadi: Good people are not in Fight Back.

Jenny: A teamo said we need Ed Sadlowski; WP support s him.

Pat: We are in FB because the best militants are there, also because we we are for union demo. Should have polemics over campaing, break ENA

Pat: Pitts. steel frac tion was against a mere women's group in Gary. Our perspectives says we are not to ask the embarrassing questions.

Celia: Have to build base in your own local. Only 1 WP article had anything critical of the campaign.

Ben: The focus should not be elect Eddie, but break ENA. Our focus should be to the militant minority, not the Sadlowski campaign.

Fred: Todd Joel to shove it on handing out leaflets on junior bur.

IBT discussion:

Doug: He is writing a document. IBT work is not mass work. Mass work means uncritical work. UPSurge with 4-5 people and without all org, had same impact as TDC. WP sold 40 or 50 at freight, while 400 at U PS. We wanted to keep IS out. We used civil liberties argument, Reps, DEms, Socs. TDU is 475 people pay \$5, PROD 2000 at \$20 @. WP is not sold at TDU meets, a real stage theory, 1st r&f mvt. then soc. UFW brought up at steering committee. Anne and Ken argued against union busting. Mel said it was a bad idea to bring it up now. Too controversial. West Coast people said IBT contracts were better. Our leading members wore jackets with US flags on them. TDU focuses on the ~~ix~~ union rather than the shop floor struggle. Perspective: have to concentrate on shop floor; 1st left bureaucrat will take everythin away. Wont get many recruits from white, male freight, have to look for blacks and women.

Micahel: Tendency to concetrate solely on union reform, instead of companies. Its a hype-were not going to change the union. TDU is not stable, we dont have a real local bases.

Steve(Sea.) Our fraction says PROD is simply the legal arm not to alienate people. Position on govt internation is sloppy. We accomodate to union reform. More upset at union than co.

Jenny; Never follow up on people met because we go from i campaing to another. Convernor of DEt IBT branch generates her campaing, doesnt come from the workers.

Celia: Triumphalism in IBT work, have to be honest with people wo keep it. Is for fighting in unions while not just being best r&f builders.

Todd. We should not do TDC again. Meant mass work, transtional politics, liquidation of ~~xxx~~ our work.

Ed W. Got 8 blacks interested in So Afr, found he isnt a priority.

Anne: Why UPSurge took off- organized against UPS terrible conditions WPSurge was criticized by IS leadership for not taking on union enough while many workers see it as too anti-union. The IBT steering com. doest devote enough effort to get UPSers to join IS.

Doug: TDU in LA, looking for somehing to do; officially 8members, but many think they're in it. 90 TDU in Pitts, intervenese in strikes Det, base of TDU is carhaulers. Cleve, small TDU group. By-laws campaing will probably flop. Union reform struggle automatically leads to alliances with bureaucrats. Temos uion wont be taken over



short of the revol. Pension Reform will appeal to oldest, most conservative workers. By law campaign aims at local unions. Wouldnt do TDC again in the same way.. Would have allocated more to recruiting to IS. Price wasnt worth it. Would have gone a lot slower. We'd still have a base and a newspaper.

Women's Lib disucussion.

Anne: Working on a doct. Lack of womens work and caucuses. Havent recruited from priorites. Havent built a womens periphery from 4 priorities. Increase of sexism in IS. 2nd class citizenship comes if your not a leader of mass work. Cant speak at local IS women's caucus forums. This is sexism. Have to raise women's demands. In CLUW our leader s were not in priorities but teachers. New perspective: Women in motion. Organizing dinners. Work from the outside with paper. Lear about boss, courts. Relate to events ; didnt do enough on Joanne Little, should have gone to her trial. Sue" Tokenism is causing women to quit the IS. IN Det there are several women secratries who arent in priorities. Never a headline in WP about women. We hide womens liberation politics from our industrial work. Frank Runninghorse has driven every woman out of the RT.

Clem: WP is worst paper on women's issues.

Ellen: Without this factionfight women's lib wont be brought into IS Women will leave. All because of priorities. Ridicules perspective based on wives.

Barbara: We do no work in the real world with women. Perspective is based 1st on recruiting women. The leadership of IS has to be base on the people who really lead the IS forward, not fraction heads. No wonder so much competition for women to get on the fraction comms.

Joan (ISGB) Womens Voice sells 3000/mo. R&F Teacher held up as na example. 2 Campaigns changed their work on women. IS teachersspoke to engineers branches about education for children.

Fred: Glenn gave advise to Lvle, forget about black nurse, concentrate on her Ford worker husband.

Debbie: We saw wives only as staffers in TDU offices, They are often workers, ~~na~~ and may be politically better.

Anna: Was a teachers strike in Cincy, housevies supported it.

Anne: TDU wives groups in Det and Pitts are good, should be organized around issues that concern them.

Steve Jeffreys. Thanks from ISGB for being invited. in last 5 months have recruited 800. Have never deprioritized white collar and public sector workers. Doesnt apologize for interveining here, a responsibility. Distinct drift to the right in IS. WP had r & f ist and workerist articles on next period. IS liquidated during TDC. Drift to right on role of t.u. bureaucracy. Paper was misused for last 9 mos.. EC should have sent people to listen, hear if criticisms are genuine. EC on a wish fulfillment may produce a split thry expulsions. No one is right wing, counter-revolutionary. Possible to resolve fight within one org. If us and them situation exists it will lie on the hands of the EC. We are against dividing the org at this point of time. Idea of E<sub>c</sub> is that 1st you become a workers org then you can do all kinds of things. The idea that 20 teams are better than 250 other members is workerism.

Black Discussion

Michael: Rightward drift due to iddust, priorities, mass work.

GT campaign doesnt exist, we used the issue. Busing, hear nothing.

Campaigns were opportunist, Bull of bluster. We cant ~~rebuild~~ rebuild black mvt. Can build consistent work in a few places. The IS doesnt look for special black issues on shop floor, e.g. superseniority. Problem is mass work, lowest common demoniator. Soweto uprising, because of EC based on conv of yr ago, we couldnt relate Fred: Black workers will be interested in racial issues which we ignore on shop floor more than shop issues because of their economic vulnerability. Hears EC perspective is no special demands for blacks.

Clem: IS doesnt raise black issues over medicare, welfare, housing, tells black contacts to industrialize, give up college education. Anna: Holds heresy, TDU should go after Black.Latin, Women when theyre in motion.

Maryanne: The word is out that blacks in Bost in the mvt think the IS is racist, therefore harder to recruit. Fred: IS failed to educate our early black cadre who were sent out as speakers, they were not educated in other points of our politics. We've developed all kinds of strategy for dealing with red baiting, but none with race baiting. In Lvle the white members should have tried to organize in the white areas against racism. IN Marquette Park a Maoist group went into the white area, found a youth group that wanted to join the ML King movement.

Strategy The Way Forward.

Barbara: 3 things, statement on split, how to win org, election of steering com. Against split, never goal of LF. Are loyal. We dont thin the org is right wing, soc dem etc. A democratic faction open to all. EC members said they wont stay if LF wins. Have 68 signers, a number of sympathizers- 80 if Portland is counted. People now disucssing the real issues, LF can win the majority. With present leadership it will be very difficult. With intimidation, harassment, expulsion, impossible. Have to organize a fight around present leadership. Majority is against it, has to be replaced. Should have another recruitment drive in a week-10-20 signers. Need joint work to show ideas possible. Will carry out majority line now. Will work with other groupings and individuals to get rid of present EC to carry out debate. No point in discussing Jan. 30 since dont know what will happen.

Kadi: Should add to statement, we want the leadership replaced.

Michael: Should add to statement, we dont want to end debate now.

Doug: Want representation on EC and NC proportionate to #s.

Maryanne: Want rights to tell people outside about faction.

Steve: Consti have right to recruit to our own position, except in agit situation.

Cal: Be very careful on telling people outside about faction fight, would be very dangerous.

Doug: I Believe they're going to start harrassing our people.

Sue: What if you get an unreasonable direct order?

Barbara: We wont be threatened, harrassed or intimidated.

Steve: Is EC willing to abide by democratic functioning. if it doesnt say it'll stay if LF is majority it'll prove the rightward drift. and the EC's willingness to split. A statement was made that Cal would appointed IS printer. Must demand with clarity that LF members not be harrassed or intimidated.

Kadi: They can manoever people into breaking discipline. Expect traps, be suspicious.

Celia: Rev. discipline is not obeying orders, instead after decision of elected bodies you carry it out.

Cal: Main thing is to carry out the political fight. There will be threats and intimidation.

Doug: on referendum. Wants reconstituted EC to carry out debate without interfering with the external work.

Barbara: On middle grouping. There is the possibility of trying to work with them. The majority of org would be against an expulsion of LF supporters. When they first came out as a faction people freaked out, now the scare is over, there are more openings.

Todd: Middle people are newer people, not politically educated.

Almost all ~~of~~ agree with them on the regim. Can unite with them on getting rid of EC. We stand for a responsible debate. Middle groups want more flexible industrialization and priorities. Should tell them, if LF is right on regime, isnt the EC wrong its strategy. Raise substitutionism in working class and in organization.

Michael: The leadership of middle group is unified politically, not really close to LF politically.

Ron: 3rd group says IS has misanalyzed economic crisis.

Cal: Some of 3rd group is very close to LF, others not close.

Steering Committee Nominations: Michael, Ron W, Fred, Ed W, Cal, Barbara, Deborah, Christina, Milt, Sharon, Doug, Jim (Indy).

We believe the Steering comm is Cal, Barbara, Fred, Doug, Michael, Sharon, and Kadi.

(Note: The above minutes of the "Left" Faction meeting on 1/2/77 are not word for word, but are paraphrased by Ken B. who was the E.C. representative.)

Ken was not able to accurately identify each speaker, so there is some mistakes in this. He also could not get everyone's remarks accurately. No one was checked with to see if these represent their full views. Therefore comrades are not to quote from this. It has been reproduced to give everyone a sense of the general mood and character of the discussions.