

August 28, 1970

Dear Comrades:

"Only when subjectivism is overthrown can the truth of Marxism-Leninism prevail, can party spirit be strengthened, can the revolution be victorious. We must assert that the absence of a scientific attitude, that is, the absence of the Marxist-Leninist approach of uniting theory and practice, means that party spirit is either absent or deficient." (Mao Tse-Tung; Reform Our Study)

In my analysis, I believe that subjectivism not only permeates the entire structure of the CCL, but remains firmly rooted in its foundation. This is the basis for the contradictions in the League, and also the key link in their inter-relationship. Truth is the enemy of subjectivism, and sectarianism its closest ally. Mao said, "To combat subjectivism we must propagate materialism and dialectics."

Incorrect practice stems from an incorrect method of thinking. In terms of philosophy, the principal contradiction within the League, the one least discussed by comrades, is metaphysics versus dialectics. All communist organizations contain the contradiction between metaphysics and dialectics, but within the CCL the principal aspect is metaphysics. It is only when this contradiction is firmly grasped that others be solved.

A metaphysical approach is incapable of linking theory and practice. As Mao Tse-Tung has said, "There is a muddled idea among many comrades about 'linking' theory and practice, a phrase they have on their lips every day. They talk constantly about 'linking' but actually they mean 'separating,' because they make no effort at 'linking'." A concrete example of such practice is that concerning united front and communist work within the League. Very early in my practice with the League I initiated a discussion in my collective around why there was almost total emphasis placed on united front work while communist work was either neglected or seemingly avoided. This practice, because it places united work strategically, does not correspond with the League's immediate task: to draw out the advanced elements for Marxist-Leninist classes toward the building of a party. Therefore, in theory united front is tactical but in practice it is strategic.

The united front line represents the least common denominator in our work. It appeals basically to the intermediate worker. Such work has its place in a communist organization but generally must come after considerable inroads have been made amongst the most advanced. Even then such work must remain tactical rather than strategic and in all genuine united fronts, that is, united fronts entered into with other groups, there must be both "unity and struggle." We must never confuse the struggle around the workers' immediate needs, which is necessary and legitimate, with the notion of a "united front line." To treat the question otherwise, as does the League, is right opportunism pure and simple. In effect, it means the League carries out a two-stage theory of the American revolution and elevated the "united front" to a strategy in the present stage of work.

The question remained unsettled until a few weeks later when our collective received a directive from the central committee to re-organize our sections so that communist work is primary. Many of the same arguments I had given (though my criticisms have deepened since then) were the reasons for the organizational re-evaluation, but in this case the comrades were in full agreement and thought it was correct. Or did they?

Time now has elapsed since the directive was implemented throughout the League. The results have clearly shown in the newspaper, and recently distributed leaflets, that the problem in the League does not lie in the need to make "communist work" primary, but actually the leadership does not even appear to understand these concepts. Why else can so-called communist leaflets be written and distributed that differ from anti-imperialist propaganda only in that "CCL" is added at the bottom. A good example is the most recent leaflet on the Chicano Moratorium. In no way does it attempt to explain how socialism is in the interests of the working class. And with regard to the united front, it is an example of "all unity and no struggle." It simply endorses wholesale the Chicano Moratorium.

It was Comrade Nelson that said, "I've never before seen an organization with such spirit, that comrades carry out tasks without fully understanding them." From this statement alone we can see that the lack of communist training of cadre at all levels in the League is no accident. This statement, plus the different attitude displayed when the subject of united front work was initiated by a higher body brings us to another contradiction: slavishness versus self-reliance. Comrade Stalin has said, "The strong point of the new cadres is that they are acutely sensitive to what is new and are therefore enthusiastic and active to a high degree-- The very qualities which some of the old cadres lack." Chairman Mao sums it up this way, "Cadres, new and old, should respect each other, learn from each other and overcome their shortcomings by learning from each other's strong points, so as to unite as one in the common cause and guard against sectarian tendencies." I have seen in my experience with the League strong sectarian tendencies in dealing with comrades who struggle at lower levels; and Comrade Nelson's statement, describing how comrades blindly follow instructions, is encouraging nothing more than pure and simple slavishness. Chairman Mao puts forth that, "Communists must always go into the whys and wherefores of anything, use their own heads (self-reliance) and carefully think over whether it corresponds to reality and is really well founded (analyze); on no account should they follow blindly and encourage slavishness."

Approximately three to four weeks prior to the announcement of an ideological rectification campaign to be initiated, I had waged a struggle in my collective around the question of ideological weakness that I felt was the basis for allowing the uneven development of cadre in the League to go unchecked. From the outset of the discussion it was evident that the comrades had engaged in very little discussion before around the significance of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution of China. The urgency to grasp the teachings of Mao, on deepening our ideological understanding, was clearly demonstrated in the results of this one discussion.

The comrades could not see the importance of ideology; that it is the key linking theory and practice. The argument put forth by the collective was, "Marx formulated theory; Lenin formulated politics; and Mao developed ideology." These historical periods were discussed as separate entities with different degrees of importance, instead of seeing their necessary interrelationship. The comrades, in separating these three essential ingredients for revolution, argued that we must focus our attention on theory and politics, placing ideology second. At its worst ideology was narrowly identified with "inspirational literature," politics with crude organizational maneuvers and theory with a finished set of ideas which begins with Marx, ends with Lenin and is applied with Stalin. This caricature of scientific concepts obscures and denies that Marxism-Leninism has been brought to an entirely new level with Mao Tse-Tung Thought. Ideology is our fundamental scientific world outlook developed first and foremost by Marx. Theory is the body of propositions tested and verified in practice which is ever-growing and which has been added to by Marx, Lenin and Mao; to a greater degree, by these three men, than anyone else. And "politics," if it means anything is the science of the class struggle of the proletariat which all Marxists have engaged in. Ideology should never be seen as "pep pills" to substitute for unsatisfactory practice. It is essential to recognize the scientific character of Mao's writings as the source of their inspirational quality.

To understand why the League makes the error of not fully grasping the essence of the Cultural Revolution of China, it is necessary to give a short analysis of the historical development of Marxism.

Marx and Engels lived during the stage of the development of capitalism. Through studying the laws of capitalism they formulated a means for which the working class could overthrow the oppressive system. These views marked the era of Marxism.

Lenin lived in the era of imperialist wars and social revolutions. He developed Marxism to a higher stage by applying it to the changed conditions of his time. Despite the handicap of revisionism, that introduced itself in this era, Lenin successfully led the people in a revolution that established the first socialist state. Lenin, in transforming theory into practice, raised Marxism to the era of Marxism-Leninism.

After only a few years into the revolution Lenin died and now it was up to Stalin to carry on this scientific experiment without historical experience to prevent repeating past mistakes. Stalin was not only the first to apply the concept of socialism in one country, but he was a pioneer, responsible for the development of the first workers' society. His ideas, derived from the theory of Marxism-Leninism, had not yet been tested through social practice; therefore, opportunists such as Khrushchev were able to worm their way into the party. And not only did they deceive the CPSU as to which class they really represented, but successfully initiated and achieved counter-revolution.

The Chinese were not fooled by the attempts of the bourgeoisie to undermine the significance of Stalin's contribution to Marxism. Their interests lay in summing up the experience of the Soviet Union, thus advancing the struggle for socialism.

It was precisely due to the experience of the Soviet Union, to the errors as well as the achievements, that was responsible to a great degree, for developing Marxism-Leninism to a higher stage; Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-Tung Thought.

In their study of this era, the Chinese discovered that the main internal weakness was due to over emphasis placed on the development of the economic base while not recognizing in theory that classes and class struggle continue under the dictatorship of the proletariat and under socialism for a long historical period. While the entire country of Russia was preoccupied with socialist production, the superstructure was not transformed and not transformed correctly, enabling opportunism to consolidate itself and eventually take over.

Chairman Mao says, "It (materialist dialectics) holds that external causes are the condition of change and internal causes are the basis for change." In applying this knowledge to the actual circumstances at the time in the Soviet Union, we will objectively want to look to Stalin, not to characterize him as some immortal human, incapable of error; but instead to open our minds and investigate just where it was that these errors of Stalin were made that allowed the internal conditions to weaken. Mao has said on the subject, "You can't solve a problem? Well, get down and investigate the present facts and its past history! When you have investigated the problem thoroughly, you will know how to solve it. Conclusions invariably come after investigation, and not before. Only a blockhead cudgels his brains on his own, or together with a group, to "find a solution" or "evolve an idea" without making any investigation. It must be stressed that this cannot possibly lead to any effective solution or any good idea." (Oppose Book Worship) But the League repudiates this analysis in theory and practice. Outside the collective to critically analyze Stalin would be to violate centralism; inside the collective to critically analyze Stalin would be to take an anti-Marxist position. Therefore, the League's line on the errors of Stalin is: Comrades cannot discuss the errors of Stalin internally (defined as an "antiMarxist position"), comrades cannot discuss the errors of Stalin externally (defined as "attacking" Stalin and a violation of democratic centralism); therefore, one might conclude that it is forbidden to critically analyze!

The most important place to discuss the errors of Stalin is among the workers. The proletariat won't be fooled by simply evading the question. "The wealth of society is created by the workers, peasants and working intellectuals. If they take their destiny into their own hands, follow a Marxist-Leninist line and take an active attitude in solving problems instead of evading them, there will be no difficulty in the world which they cannot overcome." (Mao; Quotations from Mao Tse-Tung p. 198) Communists must be prepared for such questions from among the people; but an organization that refuses to discuss a particular question organizationally, will certainly not be able to honestly deal with these contradictions among the people. To attack Stalin is to attack the working class; but critically analyze him is a service to the working class--and the duty of communists.

It is also argued that the reason we don't criticize Stalin is because the bourgeoisie does. (Is that reason enough to not criticize ourselves

as communists--because the bourgeoisie does?) We as Marxists-Leninists understand and use criticism in a positive way; contrary to the negative definition of the ruling class. Communists welcome it--for without it an organization will stagnate and die. "The Communist Party does not fear criticism because we are Marxists, the truth is on our side, and the basic masses, the workers and peasants, are on our side." (Mao; Quotations from Mao Tse-Tung p. 258)

"We should help the masses to realize that we represent their interests, that our lives are intimately bound up with theirs. We should help them to proceed from these things to an understanding of the higher tasks which we have put forward, the tasks of the revolutionary war, so that they will support the revolution, and spread it throughout the country, respond to our political appeals and fight to the end for victory in the revolution." (Mao Tse-Tung; Some Questions Concerning Methods of Leadership)

The Chinese learned this lesson well; for after seventeen years into the new democratic and the socialist revolutions it was found out that in order to promote production it was necessary to grasp revolution in the course of initiation the cultural revolution. Mao said, "Although in the general development of things the material determines the mental, the social being determines social consciousness, yet we also, and indeed we must, recognize the reaction of mental on material things, of the social consciousness on social being, of the superstructure on the economic base."

Eventually the cultural revolution led to an unprecedented upsurge in production due to the heightening of socialist enthusiasm. As Lin Biao says, "This wide dissemination of Mao Tse-Tung Thought in a big country with a population of 700 million is the most significant achievement of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution." (Report to the Ninth Party Congress) This is directly the opposite to the League's resolution on the dictatorship of the proletariat which, upholding mechanical materialism states: "Most important; they have made a century of technological and industrial progress in two decades." (Draft Proposal for Merger of MLWA and CCL, Feb. 1970)

It is here that we see that the League continues to make the same error that Stalin did; that is, the error of the productive forces. Stalin led the Soviet Union in socialist production, at its time to a degree unprecedented in history, but he failed to sufficiently grasp the need to recognize the reaction of the superstructure on the economic base.

The lessons that have been drawn from the tragedy of the restoration of capital in the Soviet Union have greatly contributed to the development of the world socialist movement as a negative example. The experience, summarized, has led to the formulation by the Chinese of the necessary key to victorious revolution; understanding, ridding our ranks, and eventually destroying all remnants of the enemy who attacks from within, revisionism. This key, finding the method to mobilize the masses, highly developed by Mao Tse-Tung, is what brings us to the era of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-Tung Thought.

The success of the Chinese, in repudiating revisionism and the erroneous economist theory of the productive forces, was due to their Marxist-Leninist approach in analyzing the revolutionary period in Russia. The CCL has not made a scientific analysis of this period; and any attempts to do so (seek the truth) is characterized as being; "anti-Stalin", "anti-working class", or the most popular, "Trotskyism". For the League, or anyone, to characterize his errors--is to discredit the real greatness of his leadership and to distort the scientific principles of Marxism-Leninism. The League tries to copy Stalin's strengths and his weaknesses; to mechanically copy his strengths is to reduce them to a caricature; to copy uncritically his errors reminds me of Marx's remark that history often repeats itself, "The first time is tragedy, the second is farce." (Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte)

"To oppose the subjectivist, one-sided approach to problems, we must demolish dogmatist subjectiveness and one-sidedness." (Mao Tse-Tung; Rectify the Party's Style of Work) Dogmatism exists to a serious extent within the CCL. This is not a characteristic of the League that the comrades are unaware of. Quite the contrary, for when on occasion I have criticized this tendency, the comrades were quick to remind me that dogmatism is a positive quality; one that Marxists should strive for! It was Stalin, at the 5th Congress of the Bolshevik Party held in Petrograd, July 26 to Aug. 3, 1917, that said, "There is dogmatic Marxism and creative Marxism. I stand by the latter." An example:

(This example will attempt to illustrate how all the manifestations of subjectivism, that exist in the League, can be found in the analysis of just one discussion.)

Recently, after the YCL* conference, a group of five comrades and four contacts got together. In discussing the events of the evening there was mention of a person who had "split" from the YCL. This person was referred to by one of the comrades as a "blond bastard".

(1. dogmatism versus Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-Tung Thought)

(a. characterization versus scientific analysis)

My response to such chauvinism, was that this was not a communist attitude. I explained that we must concern ourselves and not see our views as fixed and final for all time. With the only necessary tool, Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-Tung Thought, we don't have to resort to "name calling". "We are Marxists, and Marxism teaches that in our approach to a problem we should start from objective facts, not from abstract definitions, and that we should derive our guiding principles, policies and measures from analysis of these facts." (Mao Tse-Tung; Talks at the Yen-an Forum on Literature and Art)

(b. slavishness versus self-reliance)

I questioned the comrades if they had each investigated exactly what these differences are; they explained that on the basis that these people had "split" from the YCL, was sufficient proof that they are traitors to the working class. They did not agree that their conclusion was based on heresy, which is a mere substitute for the truth.

* (Editor's note: YCL is the abbreviation for Young Communist League. Also, CCL - California Communist League - was formerly the name for the CL, or Communist League)

"To behave like 'a blindfolded man catching sparrows', to be crude and careless, to indulge in verbiage, to rest content with a smattering of knowledge--such is the extremely bad style of work that still exists among many comrades in our Party, a style utterly opposed to the fundamental spirit of Marxism-Leninism. Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin have taught us that it is necessary to study conditions conscientiously and to proceed from objective reality and not from subjective wishes; but many of our comrades act in direct violation of this truth. (Mao; Quotations from Mao Tse-Tung p232) Chairman Mao has instructed us! "Unified discipline is a necessary condition for victory of the revolution." Sharp class struggle enables the proletariat to understand that only with strict organizational discipline is it possible to form a resolute and powerful contingent which will advance in step and which has a unified will. Only with strict organizational discipline is it possible to ensure the carrying out of the political line, to concentrate the force of the proletariat on a common target of attack and to defeat a mighty enemy. When we oppose slavishness, we do not oppose at all subordination to Party organizational discipline. On the contrary, our intention is to strengthen the revolutionary organizational discipline of the proletariat. (Passage from: "Down with Slavishness; Strictly Observe Proletarian Revolutionary Discipline"; Peking Review Vol 10 No 27 June 30, 1967)

(c. attack versus criticism)

The comrades expressed that even though they had not investigated all sides, that it was definitely "an attack on the CCL which is an attack on the working class". The comrades preferred this slavish approach rather than, "If we have shortcomings, we are not afraid to have them pointed out and criticized, because we serve the people. Anyone, no matter who, may point out our shortcomings. If he is right, we will correct them. If what he proposes will benefit the people, we will act upon it. (Mao Tse-Tung; Serve the People Selected Works Vol. III p 227) Secondly this tendency to confuse the terms 'attack' and 'criticism' stems from not being able to distinguish between contradictions among the people and contradictions among the enemy. "Now, there are two different attitudes towards learning from others. One is the dogmatic attitude of transplanting everything, whether or not it is suited to our conditions. This is no good. The other attitude is to use our heads and learn those things which suit our conditions, that is, to absorb whatever experience is useful to us. That is the attitude we should adopt." (Mao Tse-Tung; On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People)

(d. routine; tolling the bell versus revolutionary spirit; dare to struggle)

If revolutionary spirit existed in the League, to the degree of daring to struggle, then the comrades would not accept blindly that all criticisms of the line are attacks. They would not settle for abstract definitions, would not be satisfied with opinions of others, but struggle arduously to be all-sided. The roots of this ideological weakness can be seen in a statement made by Comrade Nelson: "It must be understood by all that while we welcome criticism no one will be allowed to put their paws on the line of the CCL." In essence, this means that the League will be friends with anyone as long as we agree; but at such time that you should disagree with us we will assume that

you were merely pretending all along to be our friend, while actually you are an enemy.'

Therefore it is a 'slave-owner's mentality' that produces lazy dogmatists. Mao says that "dogmatists are lazybones." For those who solemnly adhere to the "unprincipled peace policy", they are guaranteed a life that is "stabilized". "Some comrades do not like to think much about difficulties. But difficulties are facts; we must recognize as many difficulties as there are and should not adopt a 'policy of non-recognition'. We must recognize difficulties, analyze them and combat them. There are no straight roads in the world; we must be prepared to follow a road which twists and turns and not try to get things on the cheap." (Mao Tse-Tung; On the Chungking Negotiations Selected Works Vol IV p. 59)

What is perhaps most disturbing about this incident is the racial slur against the person in question. And since I opposed such a slur as "blond bastard" (would we attack a Negro with whom we disagreed as a "black bastard"?) from a position generally critical, it was not necessary for the comrades to compound their initial error and all chime in that he was a blond bastard and we'll stick to it." It is a little difficult to tell here whether it is racism or slavishness ("My CCL right or wrong") that is principal in causing this approach.

The League talks about ideological struggle and encourages the comrades to struggle, but from what I've seen they waste no time in implementing an "isolation campaign" on those comrades who dare to struggle! The results cannot be seen as yet, but such a style of work will contribute nothing but harm to the revolution. "The masses have a potentially inexhaustible enthusiasm for socialism. Those who can only follow the old routine in a revolutionary period are utterly incapable of seeing this enthusiasm. They are blind and all is dark ahead of them. At times they go so far as to confound right and wrong and turn things upside down. Haven't we come across enough persons of this type? Those who simply follow the old routine invariably under-estimate the people's enthusiasm. Let something new appear and they always disapprove and rush to oppose it. Afterwards, they have to admit defeat and do a little self-criticism. But the next time something new appears, they go through the same process all over again. This is their pattern of behavior in regard to anything and everything new. Such people are always passive, always fail to move forward at the critical moment, and always have to be given a shove in the back before they move a step." (Mao Tse-Tung; The Socialist Upsurge in China's Countryside Chinese edition Vol. II) The League's tendency to "stand pat" and isolate dissidents is directly related to its tendency to place its own unity above the class.

(2. metaphysics versus dialectics)

(a. unity, struggle, unity)

"Idealism and metaphysics are the easiest things in the world, because people can talk as much nonsense as they like without basing it on objective reality or having it tested against reality. Materialism and dialectics, on the other hand, need effort. They must be based on

and tested by objective reality. Unless one makes the effort, one is liable to slip into idealism and metaphysics." (Mao; Quotations from Mao Tse-Tung p. 212) Again we see that the principal contradiction serves to link up all the problems... I based my discussion that evening on the principle of 'unity, struggle, unity', and related this principle to those comrades who decide to leave CCL at this time over political differences. To apply this concept correctly we must understand the varied forces (different organizations) of this period and how they correspond historically. Our understanding is that though there are many groups that are presently in opposition, that as time goes on in the struggle many of those now in opposition will resolve their differences and come together. Development comes only through struggle; therefore we must have a correct attitude toward 'struggle', as a positive moving force. That is, to begin always with a desire for unity (The bourgeois definition would have one believe that struggle was a tool to divide.); then to understand that through struggling a new unity will be attained. Just because the CCL self-proclaims itself the "most highly advanced Marxist-Leninist organization in the country" does not make it true. It is true that the "theory of many centers" is a revisionist theory and that eventually we must have only a single proletarian center. But to assert that we are the "center" at a time when numerous communist groupings are striving for the creation of a party, and the theoretical level is admittedly low, is nothing but "small group mentality" and will not lead to the consolidation of a proletarian center particularly when there are so many and basic errors in the political line! Some proletarian modesty is in order here.

The result of this metaphysical "center" theory when combined with the "greatness" of the leadership leads to a theoretical justification for keeping the rank and file backward. After the conference J. and H. X.* were voted to leave, I brought up the fact in my collective that on the basis of democracy and self-reliance each collective should receive a copy of the paper the X's had written, so that we can analyze, criticize the situation for ourselves. The answer I received was; "There are some things that leadership decides is best that we don't see." I replied that suppose the central committee was wiped out tomorrow, does that mean the organization would fold up? The leadership finally issued a letter throughout the organization though all it contained was "the League's side of the story."** Example after example such as this can be related to the experiences of every comrade.

Time and time again, I have tried to figure out how to reconcile the particular irreconcilable contradiction in the League. To explain-- the very way in which these contradictions, that I've dealt with

*Two League contacts who were expelled from a League conference - not for criticizing the League line, but for publishing their criticism publicly before discussing it with the leadership. - Editor's note.

**This statement (we cannot let it go by) is an untruth. The X's statement was first read at the conference, and then passed around to all League members along with the League's 'side of the story'. - Editor's note.

operate, in turn allow the comrades to dismiss a letter like this. Chairman Mao teaches us, "Throughout history, new and correct things have often failed at the outset to win recognition from the majority of the people and have had to develop by twists and turns in the struggle."

Comrades will perhaps say that "if she was any good she would have fought it through." Well, I would generally agree, and on the basis of struggle being the essence of revolutionary practice, my decision had been to 'stay in' and struggle. Time went on and my understanding developed to a higher level on these fundamental differences. These contradictions on which I was basing my criticisms on were merely manifestations of the real problem. The real problem, subjectivism, is in the very foundation that the League was built on. Therefore if the manifestations are found at the lower levels, then the basis for the problem and principal contradiction is deeply entrenched in leadership. My struggle would therefore be with leadership, because to resolve these manifestations we must first deal with the basis for them.

Whatever or wherever we are struggling must be based on an analysis of the needs of the over-all struggle of the proletariat for socialism. Chairman Mao says, "They (communists) must grasp the principle of subordinating the needs of the part to the needs of the whole. If a proposal appears feasible for a partial situation but not for the situation as a whole, then the part must give way to the whole. Conversely, if the proposal is not feasible for part but is feasible in the light of the situation as a whole, again the part must give way to the whole." In my analysis, for me to prepare to spend as much time as necessary to struggle over the initial principles around which an organization is formed is not to subordinate the part to the whole. Therefore, for me to remain in the CCL while I am conscious that my time could be more beneficial to the working class elsewhere is in essence doing harm to the revolution. "To govern one's own conduct by this style is to harm oneself, to teach it to others is to harm others, and to use it to direct the revolution is to harm the revolution. To sum up, this subjectivist method which is contrary to science and Marxism-Leninism is a formidable enemy of the Communist Party, the working class, the people and the nation; it is a manifestation of impurity in Party spirit." (Mao Tse-Tung; Reform our Study)

Lack of experience and the fact that I've been a Marxist for only one year has been chiefly the cause of a number of tactical errors on my part. It is also attributed to why I achieved only little success in convincing other comrades of my ideas.

It was comrade Nelson that has said on many occasions that comrades are either "moving toward or away from the League." If conforming to that analysis, then I am moving away from the League. But, before I leave, I hereby present this letter of resignation and my criticisms to the CCL. My real hope in writing this letter is that I will be proven wrong --that the comrades will seek the truth! "Blame not the speaker, but be warned by his words."

Comradely, Susan -

Appendix: I gave my resignation to Comrade A.D. with the request to give it to my section leader. The letter was written on the date of August 28, 1970, but due to the hasty circumstances and my inexperience I failed to make a copy to include in this letter. Apparently ignoring my statement of resignation the League has tendered charges against me. These charges are printed in full below.

September 6, 1970

Susan,

Your activities since you've been in the League have shown that it is your opinion that the moods, needs, and desires of one individual are more important than the democracy and centralist discipline of a militant proletarian organization- at least when the individual is you. Especially significant are your constant failures to fulfill responsibilities, your inability to keep criticisms within the collective and your hypocritical charges of lack of democratic discussion in the League. We know that what you mean is that comrades didn't support you when you made abstract criticisms of Stalin. We also know you never tried to take your position to a higher body which is the right of every League member. Because of these facts we have brought the following charges for expulsion against you. These charges will be heard September 13, 1970. You are instructed to be at --'s/3⁰ o'clock to defend yourself against these charges and show why you shouldn't be expelled from the League if you wish.

List of charges:

Four violations of democratic centralism:

1. Making criticism of club and club leader outside of established channels, for which you were criticized and made a self-criticism.
2. Opposing the League line outside of the collective and in front of contacts, for which you received criticism and a warning and made a self-criticism.
3. Opposing the League line and criticizing the League to a contact of the League.
4. Telling League members you have differences with the League outside of the collective and in front of a contact.
5. Frequent and habitual missing of League meetings including: (Editor's note: There follow a list of over seven meetings missed)
6. Failure to function as.... (Editor's note: A committee is mentioned)
7. Failure to meet responsibilities in community work.
8. Being out of communication with club chairman and others you were assigned to work with and failing to get in touch when you were given messages to do so.

J.

It is true that I did not attend two meetings and (one class) mentioned. These meetings occurred just one week prior to August 28, and I was both contemplating resigning and preparing this letter. Due to the fact that at the time I was still a member, this part of the criticism is correct. The other meetings include some that I've missed over the

entire period in which I was a member and before my last week; but the rest have been added following my statement of resignation.

The charges are not of a political nature but stress organizational errors only. Other than the innuendo about Stalin it is evident that the League is not interested in even discussing the political issues. This is a prime example of how the League operates. In filing these charges over a week after having received my statement of resignation, the League is clearly justifying their political position by an organizational maneuver.