

## Wulp Summary

I'll try not to take as much time as I have allocated. I wouldn't speak very long, except I take very seriously those comrades who spoke during the preceding and said that they still hadn't made their minds up. So I want to go over some of the questions that have been raised tonight again and elaborate on a few things that I said before, in the hopes that this would clarify some questions.

We've heard the summary of Comrade Dick. He told us that it wasn't indisciplined, the act that he committed, that it was within the traditions of the party. I spent my first presentation trying to indicate what the traditions of the party were. I don't have the time to go over that entire presentation, but I don't believe that anyone, after having listened to that presentation and then listened to Comrade Dick, has any ~~any~~ question about what the real norms of the party are on these questions. Remember Dick told us that the document, which he intended to have an educational value, was being used in a factional way. It's true comrades. It's being used in a factional way, by the Merrills, in the YSA to organize a grouping in the YSA which is anti-party. They made it very clear exactly the kinds of reasons that it took us so long to sift out the chaff from the wheat to be restrained about it, when Dick made such statements as, "We support the political line of the document, but we'll withdraw our names." That's a contradiction, comrades. You've got to spend some time studying testimony, which is all like that. I think that comrades, in listening to Dick just now, got an inkling of what we went through in trying to present to you tonight the report that we did. It takes a good deal of time and thought, relistening to the tapes, to come up with exactly what's being said.

I think without a doubt the Socialist Workers Party is the most democratic organization in the world. Where else would a democratic vote be made, where we would be put in a position as a result of that vote, to listen to out of 37 minutes of summary by Comrade Dick, at least 29 or 30 minutes of which was beside the point, had nothing to do with the trial whatsoever. We don't care what their politics are, comrades. The norms of the party is what we are discussing here and whether or not the party's going to uphold them. If the party passed a resolution at the convention a statement to the effect that profootball is barbaric and has no place in a socialist society and is clearly a result of the capitalist world and the Merrills had come to us and said, "September 15, the start of the National Football League shows that you're wrong because the workin class goes to those football gaems," and they put it in a document in the YSA and that was counter to the line of the party, we would have had exactly the saem trial that we're having tonight and my original presentation would not have had a word changed in it. Not a word. However about 30 minutes of the 37 minutes of the summary might have been different.

The Merrills have committed acts. Those acts are irreversible. The trial body says they're disloyal and indisciplined acts and the Merrills say they are not. But it's not their decision to make. Right there ~~X~~ you have the crux of the matter. These comrades are abrogating to themselves the right to decide upon party norms. That is not their right in our party. It's the right of the official bodies of the party.

What Comrade McCann said is also beside the point. We don't care whether he agrees with the norms of our party or not. But it's the responsibility of all loyal comrades to uphold the norms of the party and abide by them, whether you agree with them or not.

Some questions were asked and I'll try to answer them. How did Barry

Sheppard get the document~~X~~ that the Merrills wrote. I want to read you letters which are kind of short. The first is dated November 16 and is from Barry Sheppard [letters already ~~XX~~ given to PC]

All in order. Exactly what should have been done. That's how Barry Sheppard got the document. Frank Boehm, who's an SWP member, called his attention to it, because it was a violation of SWP norms. But he proceeded to have the thing printed because it wasn't a violation of YSA norms.

The next question was why do we only get around to discussing disloyalty on December 11. I think I've already answered that one, really. It takes a while to blow the smoke out of ~~XX~~ your eyes, to try to figure out what the terrain is. What Comrade McCann was in agreement with the trial body on was that they were evasive. He agreed. As I recall, his statement was, "I'm not naive. I know they're being evasive."

Why didn't we put them under discipline and tell them not to speak at the YSA pre-convention discussion? Two points should be made there. Yes, we could have. Yes, it was within the power of the Executive Committee to do that, or failing the Executive Committee having taken that step, in my power as organizer between Executive Committee meetings. But that would have been intervening in a discussion of an outside organization. And if we had done that, and then proceeded to say these comrades were guilty of indiscipline and disloyalty, and recommended something and it comes to the attention of the party here tonight, then our democratic friends would accuse us of suppressing discussion in the YSA, an outside organization, which is, in fact, what we would have been doing. They didn't do anything wrong as YSAers. It's only what they have done as SWPers which is up for discussion here, because we don't control the YSA.

Why didn't I approach the Merrills? The Merrills asked me that question when they came to me and said that they were going to take party discipline from now on. So I went to read a couple of more questions and answers. This is myself

Q: What I'm saying now is partly what I've said before, which I won't repeat, and [?] that it was within your power some time ago, that is to stop these proceedings by not having written this document and not having organized the group, but you've committed acts which make it now the province of the party to make that decision.

A: It was within the power of the party, too, through the EC, or the organizer, to prevent those things from happening.

Q: Why? We wouldn't assume that comrades are going to break discipline. That's not an assumption that one makes and proceeds from that assumption to run around telling people how not to break discipline. Just think of what the party would be like if that was the case.

A: What I was saying was that the Executive Committee felt it was going to be indisciplined, it could have restrained us from doing it.

Q: How? We didn't know you were in the process of doing it. We didn't know you were writing a document. How could we tell you it would be indisciplined to write it?

A: After the first hearing, I don't want to pursue that.

The charges don't have anything to do with whether they discussed in the YSA. The charges come from the fact that they organized a grouping

inside the YSA and presented a counterline resolution to the YSA for its pre-convention discussion. I simply reported the time sequence of events going from November 23 to the meeting on the first to the YSA meeting on the 2nd, to the YSA discussion and summary on the 8th, to indicate to you why the trial body felt that when they came to me on December 11 and said we'll take our name off the document, that was to indicate to you why we didn't place much credence in that. Why we didn't think it was too heavy an act.

One of the comrades who spoke said that they submitted their views to official channels for airing in the YSA, not in the party, before they submitted their views in the YSA, they had to get permission to submit their views from the Political Committee. They didn't do that. Why didn't they do that? Because, to quote them fairly roughly, but I think accurately, "We know the traditions of the SWP. We're loyal. We're disciplined. We know the traditions of the SWP." In other words, they decided what the norms of the party were. They took it upon themselves to make that decision. That's not correct. We don't allow that. Larry and Phyllis nailed it right on the head. Loyalty comes from within. We don't allow people to play around inside our party, evading discipline, performing disloyal acts.

Is the YSA an outside organization? Peter Gordy says it's not. But he's wrong. It is. Let me quote to you one paragraph besides the ~~XXXXX~~ stuff that I've already read ~~XXXXXX~~ from the "Where We Stand" document, one little section entitled "National Executive Committee Statement on the Expulsions of Ken Simpson and Nancy Adolphi, adopted Nov. 23, 1971. which is pertinent:

"We are neither shocked nor surprised to hear from Adolphi and Simpson that SWP members in the YSA function under the discipline of the SWP. The SWP, like the YSA, has organized according to the principles of democratic centralism. If the SWP were not a disciplined organization, it would not be a revolutionary party. However, precisely because of the close collaborative relationship between the two organizations, SWP members within the YSA do not presently function as a fraction in the YSA."

But party comrades functioning in the youth still function under the discipline of the SWP. There's a non-fractional intervention in an outside organization and comrades cannot go into that organization and try to organize against the party, no matter how much success or lack of success they have.

A lot of people have spoken on the politics involved and I'm glad to know that they feel the decision of the convention has been proven incorrect. What you're supposed to do now is clear, comrades. Ask the Political Committee to reopen the discussion. Don't try to raise it on the Boston branch floor though. That's out of order. And don't base your defense of the Merrills on calling the norm governing party-youth relations incorrect. That's no defense. I want to reemphasize that again. A loyal comrade abides by all the norms of the party, not the ones they happen to agree with.

There were some other arguments that were raised near the beginning. One was is this a new norm? John raised this in his original presentation. This is new, something out of the sky, that suddenly appeared for the first time, full blown, at the 1971 convention when the SWP leadership took a turn in its relationships with the youth. No, it's not new. I wasn't quoting Comrade John, I wasn't quoting Comrade Kerry from 1967. I was quoting him from 1961. A party convention where he gave a report. Not a party pre-

convention discussion where he made a contribution. I'll quote it again. 1961, only a year and a few months after the YSA was founded:

"Despite possible variations in party-youth relations... and subordinate bodies of the party."

Another question John raised. There's been a lot of factional activity in the SWP and it's always taken place in the youth as well and nobody's ever been expelled for it. Wrong. 1967. I gave you the precedent in my report. James Eyman suspended without any investigation whatsoever on the bare face of having received a document. That's all, Finished. Suspended. The Control Commission, that is, pending further investigation by the National Control Commission. Why was the National Control Commission called in? Because this was happening in the Milwaukee branch of the SWP, a branch which in its entirety, including its top leadership, agreed with the action that Eyman had done. Let me quote you a few little good sections from the response to the motion of the PC that James Boulton, ~~XXXX~~ the organizer of the Milwaukee branch, sent back to New York. It sounds strangely familiar.

"In the history of revolutionary parties, unprincipled leadership formations have invariably tried to conceal their opportunist politics and fear of debate over fundamental problems of development for Marxist by resorting to administrative priorities, formal argument and organizational demagoguery. The institutional majority in the SWP invested its political bankruptcy in a Bolshevik ultra book, entitled "Organizational Character of the SWP," at the 1965 convention and its caricature of Bolshevism would lead logically to the inseparability of the Political Committee and the Control Commission. They are indeed one body, whose police powers are designed to protect their abandonment of Marxist method: Trotskyist heritage on the touchstone questions of our epoch, on the counterrevolutionary role of the Soviet regime, on the role of the Marxist party in modern socialist revolutions, on the proletarian party and the class orientation, on the proletarian Marxist character of the Chinese leadership and regime, on the internationalist content of the Chinese struggle against the Soviet bureaucracy and on the profound socialist cultural revolution in China. The institutional majority in the SWP has renewed its administrative attack on the Chinese Marxist minority in the SWP and has subordinated the function of serious political debate to the calendar on the wall, and has ordered the Milwaukee Trotskyists to halt all efforts at presenting their views to the socialist youth."

Now in the motion that was made in the Political Committee, it said that Tom Kerry was going to go out for the Control Commission to Milwaukee and investigate this act. In some sections of that which I did not read to you, Comrade Boulton told the PC to save the air fare because they weren't going to cooperate with the Control Commission so forget it. That spring, the entire Milwaukee branch was expelled from the Socialist Workers Party.

I do want to make one more quote. This time from Tom Kerry. This time from the 1967 preconvention discussion, in an article called "Some Comments on Party Policy and Tactics in the Antiwar Movement]" This is a polemic against Dave Funder:

) "Which brings us to the specific question..."

In the trial body's mind, there's absolutely no question in our mind but that the comrades involved, Dick and Carol Merrill, are not loyal to

the party and they do intend to raise these questions inside the YSA to try to turn the YSA into a factional instrument against the party to have their line passed by the party. And they admit it. They told us that. It's clear out. The acts themselves, in the context of the fact that the pre-convention discussion is over. I don't know how to use my voice to try to get that across to comrades. It's over. It's finished. What was in order in the Boston branch during the summer is not in order in the Boston branch this fall. The convention happened. That marks the differentiation.

Do these comrades know they were indisCIPLINED? Yes, they knew they were indisCIPLINED. I read you a quote from Dick Merrill during the Communist Tendency trial proceedings where he indicated that he knew the correct procedure in order to get discussion on a question that had been decided by the convention or on a new question of catalytic world; import. He knew that.

Did they follow the norms of reopening the discussion? No. They arrogated the right to themselves to decide whether or not they should open that discussion.

This is something that I didn't put into the quotes from the trial body. The most common phrase that was heard from members of the trial body throughout the evening during the questioning of these comrades was, "That's not what I asked. Please answer my question." They evaded us. They tried to play lawyer games to get around the question of loyalty to the party, but there is no getting around that question. Absolute loyalty is demanded of all comrades. It's the bedrock upon which our movement is founded and Phyllis is right again comrades. It comes from within.

The issue here is whether individual party members have the right to take into their own hands matters which the party elected a leadership to represent it to take care of. Carol Merrill and Dick Merrill demand the right to decide themselves, and for the party to accept, whatever they think is important. But they're only a part of the party. The only body that represents the whole party between conventions is the National Committee, and in between National Committee plenums, the Political Committee. That is why the Political Committee, and not individuals, are the only ones who have the right to decide party policy on the question of reopening discussion. That is real democracy and we will maintain it. We won't tolerate anybody telling the party what it should do. That is the norm of the party. We aim to see that it is upheld. We don't ask people to give up their ideas. I know two comrades in Chicago that are state capitalists. They're still in the party. They've been in for years. We don't ask comrades to give up their ideas, we don't practice thought control. But if anyone has the idea that they can get around the norms of the party, and that's an idea that has no place in the Socialist Workers Party. We trust that this branch will agree with and vote for the recommendations of the trial body that these comrades be found guilty of indiscipline and disloyalty and for that, be expelled from the Socialist Workers Party