

ELECTION OF NATIONAL OFFICERS

Dobbs:

Comrades, perhaps it would be useful to begin by explaining the thinking behind the arrangement of the last three points on the plenum agenda, the election of national officers, National Committee membership, and the Political Committee. Taken together, these three points embrace the steps we think it is realistic to take at this plenum to carry forward the transition in leadership. They are arranged in this sequence because we felt that it would provide a logical way for the plenum to proceed from one action to the next in making these decisions.

Under the present point, election of national officers, there are two points. First the one upon which I will submit the recommendation, that is the election of the incoming national secretary. After this, it would follow logically, the incoming national secretary should present to the plenum the proposals for the designation of comrades to any other national posts that are decided upon at this time.

After the questions of the central executive post in the party and the other national posts are decided, we come to a question touching on the process of leadership transition as it relates in another form to the role of some of the older central leaders. Under the second point, National Committee membership, Comrade Novack and myself are prepared to ask for a change in National Committee status from regular to advisory membership. That should be decided ahead of the Political Committee point because what the plenum decides there has a bearing on how to proceed with the election of the Political Committee.

One aspect of the Political Committee elections will be the normal process of selecting as regular Political Committee members comrades who are regular members of the National Committee. The other aspect has to do with regularizing the formal relationship in a consultative capacity with the Political Committee of older central leading comrades two of whom, George Novack and myself, are asking for advisory National Committee membership status at this plenum and Comrade Tom Kerry who has had that status since 1969. It is for reasons of this logical sequence in making these decisions that we have prepared the agenda points in the form that they appear.

Coming now to the matter upon which I am reporting and the recommendation I am to make, Comrade Novack reminded me just before the session convened of something I hadn't thought of. In a manner of speaking, this is my third resignation. In 1932 I resigned from a promising supervisory position in Western Electric Company because I couldn't stomach what they were trying to make out of me as a supervisory pawn of a heartless corporation. That led me into the trade-union movement, due to a given sequence of events. In 1939 I resigned from the general organization staff of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters because the party believed, and I concurred, that I could better serve our movement by leaving the Teamsters and coming to work for the party. And now I propose to withdraw from my present executive post in the party in order to facilitate the transition of leadership which is so important to us in these changing times.

You have been aware for some time of my intention in this regard. It was called to your attention at the post-convention plenum in Oberlin last summer. That was done in the course of making the recommendations I presented there concerning the election of national

officers at that time. Perhaps it would be helpful to remind you in passing who are presently the three national officers of the party. Comrade Cannon is national chairman, Comrade Barnes is national organization secretary and I am presently national secretary.

I call to your attention that this was recommended to the post-convention plenum as simply an interim step pending our deliberations at this plenum, because we didn't want to make any push-em-up decision about a change in national officers in the immediate aftermath of the convention. We wanted a little time to think about it, to make some recommendations to the members of the National Committee in advance of this plenum, and then come together in the plenum in a better position to make the necessary series of decisions.

In keeping with that understanding, I submitted a memorandum on the leadership question last November. I should call to your attention that the memorandum was distributed to the National Committee members in their entirety by a decision of the Political Committee but at my suggestion and with the concurrence of the other comrades in the Political Committee, the Political Committee did not at that time discuss the memorandum or take a position on it. It was felt by all of us that it was better to go ahead and let all the members of the National Committee, including the Political Committee, utilize my memorandum to trigger their thinking about the general problems of the transition of leadership and give everybody time to familiarize themselves with some of the specific problems as we see them at this stage and some of the specific steps we think are necessary to carry forward in the transition.

I don't think it is necessary for me to attempt here to summarize the essential content of that memorandum because you have all had a chance to study it carefully for some months now and reflect on it. I want to focus simply on what I consider one of the central aspects of the situation at this stage with regard to the action we propose to take. The proposed change in national secretary is in no respect a shotgun proposition. For quite a few years now the older central party leaders have been striving to prepare the way for changes in the central executive leadership. We began by trying to find a way to make room for younger leading comrades to play more and more of a central leadership role, to provide them opportunities to expand their services to the party in those roles and to give the cadres of the party as a whole, a chance in the work-a-day life of the party to test the relative leadership merits of the younger comrades coming forward and showing leadership promise. We felt that across a period of time within reasonable bounds this question would begin to sort itself out and logical candidates for national executive posts in the party would emerge from among the younger comrades. I believe that has been the case.

More specifically, with regard to this point on the agenda, we envisaged utilization of the post of organization secretary as one with a dual character, on the one side serving in part as a segment of the division of labor in carrying out the daily party work and at the same time as a sort of preparatory school for learning and demonstrating the capacity to function as what has traditionally been the central executive officer in our party, national secretary.

In May 1969 Jack was elected by the plenum as organization secretary, and, although it wasn't formally stated there, I think it was no secret to anybody that we already had this factor in mind. He was

showing some outstanding promise in leadership capacity and we wanted to put him through a course of basic training in functioning as the party's central executive officer and let the party watch him and see how it stacked up. It is my opinion that he has come through the test well, and I personally feel that the party need have no hesitations about proceeding now to designate him as its national secretary. And in concluding I will make that formal proposal to you.

Before doing that, I want to comment on some aspects of the question of other national posts. This will be dealt with specifically in the next report under this point but I want to communicate to you a little of the background information and some of my own thinking on the matter while I have the floor.

It will be proposed later under this agenda point that Comrade Cannon be designated National Chairman Emeritus. There are two essential reasons for this proposal. He is presently national chairman, and in the changing situation there is a growing need to have flexibility to utilize that post in the distribution of the division of labor among the younger leaders who are carrying more and more of the responsibility for the active leadership of the party. And for that reason it is best that Comrade Cannon no longer hold this post.

At the same time it is important that we designate Comrade Cannon to a special executive post in keeping with this proposal, that of National Chairman Emeritus, because Comrade Cannon personifies the distilled essence of our public demonstration of continuity of leadership in this party; and that is a very important factor. It is well to keep in mind that Comrade Cannon is not only the founding central leader of the party; Comrade Cannon is also one of the founding leaders of the Fourth International. One of the world movement's outstanding leaders, who as head of the Socialist Workers Party worked in the closest and most intimate collaboration with Comrade Leon Trotsky from 1928 up to the time of Trotsky's assassination in 1940; Jim Cannon helped in all the preparatory stages and in the actual founding of the Fourth International in 1938 and has carried a very substantial load in connection with the attempts to go forward, as the Old Man charged us, in the building of the Fourth International since Trotsky's death.

All these things are personified in Comrade Cannon and therefore he stands as a unique individual, personally embodying what is basic to the continuity of leadership in the cadres of our party. For that reason we believe it fitting and proper, advisable and necessary that he be designated national chairman emeritus.

Now I should note at the same time that this means establishing a new category. We have never before used the category of emeritus in designating comrades to any post on any basis in our party. It is a special designation to serve a special occasion. Just as Comrade Cannon in his role as a founding leader of the world Trotskyist movement is a unique individual in the movement, the utilization of the post of emeritus in his case should be interpreted as a unique utilization and not the setting of a precedent nor the occasion to begin thinking about who else we can make into an emeritus in the coming times. It's not a matter of handing out posts to anybody because it's nice to have a post. At all times and in all circumstances, the designation of any individual comrade to a post by the party must serve the interests and needs of the party and no other interests. So, this step of creating a new category with regard to designation of posts should not at all be interpreted as a

precedent. Personally, as matters stand at this time so far as I can see, I can't think of any reason why we would want to do this with respect to anyone else.

This proposal has been discussed with Comrade Cannon by the younger central leaders. Both Comrade Barnes and Comrade Sheppard have talked with him about it and he has stated to them that he concurs fully with this proposal. He thinks that it is the correct thing to do at this point and feels that we are right in stressing that by virtue of his unique role as a founding leader that there is a significance for the party in having a formal National Chairman Emeritus post.

As a matter of fact, Comrade Cannon was the first to raise this idea about ten years ago. Perhaps George and Evelyn will remember in late December of 1962 I was visiting Los Angeles. The three of us rode out into the desert to spend a couple of days with Rose and Jim, who were there, and we talked about this problem. It was there also that we first began to chew on the concept of utilizing the post of organization secretary as a post for preliminary training with respect to the development of a comrade to the point where the comrade could be designated national secretary and replace me. We also talked about the need to have more flexibility with regard to the utilization of national posts. When I replaced Comrade Cannon as national secretary, in 1953, he was then designated national chairman. We were in different times, different circumstances, and it was a logical thing to do at that point. Now we have to think about the new stage the party has reached, in terms of the need for greater flexibility with respect to these posts, and it was in that general vein that Comrade Cannon suggested even then that we consider in due course the question of whether or not he should be given an emeritus status.

In talking with Comrade Barry, just within the last month, Jim suggested that we consider whether or not it would be advisable for me to be designated national chairman in the course of replacing me in the position of national secretary. He indicated that what he had in mind was the question of giving an additional demonstration of the continuity of leadership. I have thought that matter over very carefully and it is my firm opinion that it is neither necessary nor advisable. I would like to state the reasons why.

With respect to the factor of demonstrating continuity in the leadership I don't think the criteria apply in the sense they did when I replaced Comrade Cannon as national secretary. Then his designation as national chairman was simply the form of doing precisely what we propose to do now by designating Comrade Cannon National Chairman Emeritus, that is, an official post for the founding leader of the party in order to demonstrate continuity. I don't believe that applies in my case. I think that when the younger central leaders who are now beginning to take over the active leadership responsibility from those of us among the older central leaders who are moving now into a consultative leadership position, concur in designating Comrade Cannon to an emeritus post, that is definitive in making this demonstration of the continuity of the leadership of the party. I think anything else is superfluous, not necessary -- but that's not all. I can see what I believe could be a potential disadvantage in designating me national chairman upon my withdrawal from the post of national secretary. It could give the implication that we are developing a tradition in which, if you once get elected national secretary, you're a cinch to have one or another post from then on. The implication would be, if you get

elected national secretary, then the next thing is you're national chairman, and the next thing is you're emeritus. That wouldn't do the party any good. It would make a problem for us. So on both these counts, with regards to the matter of continuity, I consider it inadvisable and unnecessary.

From another point of view, I don't see any reason why I have to have a formal national post in the party in order to do what I may be able to do in playing a consultative leadership role. I have become less and less an active central leader in the party. As a matter of fact, the present reality is that Jack is functioning as the active national secretary, and I am functioning, although still formally national secretary, as a consultative central leader. A post is not necessary for that.

Thinking further about it, something occurred to me that I can perhaps pose by paraphrasing a remark of Frank's in his trade-union report the other night: "Should you make me national chairman just for the hell of it?" Or to put it a little more precisely, should you do this on the grounds that it might help a little and in any case wouldn't do any harm? The answer is no. It would get in the way of party needs. We are in a new and what is becoming an increasingly complex stage of party building. That is abundantly illustrated by our deliberations across the last four days here at this plenum. The active central leaders of the party need all the flexibility they can possibly have to utilize the various active national posts as organizational tools in carrying out the work. And national executive posts should always be looked upon in that respect. They are simply an organizational tool, like all other mechanisms that we employ in carrying on the party work. And the younger central leaders who are now carrying the main burden of the active leadership responsibility in the party need all the latitude, all the leeway they can have to utilize the various national posts in order to carry forward in the best possible manner our party building work in the next period.

On the more precise aspects, and specific proposals with regard to these posts, the recommendations will be made by the incoming national secretary after you have made the decision as to who is going to fill the post. So with that I come to the central reason for my taking the floor at this time.

I might say first, I have consulted the candidate that I have in mind. He has informed me that if nominated, he will run. If elected, he will serve. Therefore I now nominate Comrade Jack Barnes as national secretary of the party.

Barnes:

Comrades, as you know from the Political Committee minutes and Farrell's remarks, I would like to place before you the nomination of Comrade Cannon as National Chairman Emeritus of the party and Comrade Barry Sheppard as national organization secretary of the party.

My reasons for nominating Comrade Cannon have been fundamentally given by Farrell. If I may just add one point for the comrades of the leadership of the party who became leaders in the period where they could not work directly with Jim as a fellow day-to-day leader but knew him to one degree or another as a comrade and knew him through his books and his works. What we have discovered in shouldering our responsibilities in international work makes the historical importance of Jim all the more clear. If I could repeat one of the ideas we

raised the first day of the plenum I think Jim symbolizes as a revolutionary politician operating on the basis of fundamental Marxist principles, consciously basing himself on the continuity of the world communist movement exactly those qualities which translated into Leninist organization are most needed, most useful, and a crucial contribution to the new generation of leaders in the international movement. The growing interest in, and I hope the growing translations of and growing knowledge of what Jim did, said, and stood for will be one of our major contributions to the world movement in the coming period.

As Farrell said we have discussed each stage of the transition of leadership with Jim. I discussed this question with Jim prior to taking my current assignment and then Barry discussed this with Jim just before the plenum, and he agrees with this nomination.

The nomination of Barry as organization secretary is also no surprise to the comrades. To a large degree, Barry has acted as organization secretary since he returned to the center in 1970 and began taking part in the central day-to-day executive leadership of the party. As I assumed more and more of the responsibilities of acting national secretary, in collaboration with Farrell, over this period, Barry has done the same as organization secretary. I would say that from the period just prior to our last convention, Barry has been in practice the organization secretary of the party.

I am sure most of the comrades know the fundamental facts about Barry. He joined the movement at the end of the 1950s, served as national chairman of the YSA, edited the paper, represented the party in Europe in our fraternal participation in the world movement, served on the Political Committee this entire period. Prior to the convention, Barry has had more time first to work with the comrades responsible for the development of the national departments and the expansion of the party at the center, and recently has begun to have the time, as we've tooled up the Administrative Committee, to begin getting out to talk to and know the National Committee and organizers in the field and the problems of leading the party from that angle.

I don't propose making a nomination for national chairman or woman or men or women or vice-chairman or women of the party. I completely agree with Farrell's wish not to be nominated as national chairman. Not only for the reasons he outlined, but also because I am personally confident that it means no change in his collaboration with the central leaders of the party or the character of that collaboration.

I also have another reason. One of the things we have to collectively think out is the question of how in this new period with our needs we want to use the post of chairman or chairwoman. We have had a contribution from George Breitman that all the comrades on the committee have received giving some ideas and suggestions about how we might best utilize this post in the development of the party. We'd like to share among ourselves the thinking of the other national leaders and think this out further and then as we do so, propose whatever steps are necessary. For that reason, I place no nomination for that post before you.

The two formal nominations are one, to nominate Comrade Cannon as National Chairman Emeritus of the party, and two, to nominate Comrade Sheppard national organization secretary.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Dobbs:

Comrades, between now and the convention it will be necessary for the National Committee and for the party as a whole to think very carefully about the steps to be taken at the next convention to facilitate the transitions in leadership. What we are doing at this plenum sets in motion a process I believe will put us in a much more favorable position that we were in at the last convention in this regard. As I pointed out in my memorandum last November on the leadership question, the nominating commission at the last convention was confronted with a quite difficult problem, the desire on the one hand to make room for more promising younger comrades on the National Committee and the lack of room for such change on the committee. Between now and the convention we have to give that very careful thought and be prepared to act to facilitate this process in a very conscious way.

I want to make clear that in proposing the specific actions by George Novack and myself that are definitely before you on this point today, this does not imply introducing a sense of urgency in this matter, but rather that as of this moment these are two steps that can and we think should be taken because it will suffice to serve an immediate need with regard to the composition of the Political Committee. It is in that sense that we introduce this, and not in the sense that pressure is being put on anybody to make a shotgun decision or to try to create any kind of stampede of voluntary actions on the part of comrades with respect to changes in committee status.

I should point out secondly, as I did in the memorandum, that the National Committee plenum has full authority to act on this question. That was established when we created the advisory membership category at the 1962 plenum, a provision that was then ratified by the next national convention of the party in 1963. The plenum cannot add anyone to the National Committee, but it can authorize a change in the status of a member of the committee within the committee itself from regular to advisory membership. And as was the case with the original decision, any action taken today by the plenum will of course remain subject to verification by the next convention of the party, but the action taken is effective immediately.

On that basis, speaking now for myself, I request that my status on the National Committee be changed from regular to advisory membership. I make the request on this basis: (1) I am no longer playing that kind of an active leadership role that makes it necessary or advisable for me to be a regular member of the committee; (2) I ask for advisory status because I will be playing a consultative role and in that sense will remain an integral part of the central leadership of the party.

I might say in passing that Jack will elaborate on this matter under the next point on the agenda, the Political Committee. Proposals he will make concerning consultative membership on the Political Committee are intended to facilitate this process of having a formal basis to act in a consultative role in the central leadership, doing so in a logical and consistent way that has clear definition and therefore can be carried out in the best and most efficient manner. So with that brief explanation, I formally request that the plenum honor my wish to be changed from regular to advisory membership on the National Committee subject to verification by the next convention of the party.

Novack:

I also am resigning from regular membership on the National

National Committee Membership/2

Committee primarily for the reasons given in Farrell's memorandum and his remarks here although I have the additional reason that I want to shift my work more into the literary and theoretical sphere. I have taken this decision at this time also for a more personal, somewhat sentimental reason.

When Farrell came to the center in the spring of 1940, to take the post of organization secretary, similar to that now occupied by Barry, he had a tough job on his hands. He had to organize and administer a party that was split and losing forty percent of its effective forces and 90 percent of its youth, and do it in a country heading toward war and the persecution of the revolutionary vanguard. A comrade in that situation urgently needs help he can rely upon among his coworkers. Perhaps some of you will remember a cartoon strip by Webster called "When a Fellow Needs a Friend." That was Farrell's situation.

In his quest for such assistance, Farrell invited me one sunny afternoon to take a ride on the top of an open-air Fifth Avenue bus. He explained his problem and solicited my cooperation. I remember very vividly one point he made. "I belong to the proletarian section of the party," he said. "You are one of the few qualified intellectuals left after the faction fight. The rest have gone with the Burnham-Shachtman crowd of deserters. What I propose is a teaming up of these two essential components of our movement to keep it going through the hard days ahead and rebuild its strength. What do you say?" What could I answer but yes. And on that we clasped hands and sealed a compact that has defied the laws of probability, the exception proving the rule, and endured over many political and personal vicissitudes for thirty-two years. That's a pretty good record in our line of endeavor.

There's not much symmetry in the extremely untidy course of the revolutionary struggle as some of you have already found out. So to synchronize my withdrawal from the National Committee with Farrell's gives me special satisfaction. We have served together on it for the past third of a century, a period that started, I note, before three-quarters of the current party membership was born. This action will round out that prolonged span of our collaboration as part of the national leadership team, and I stress the word team. It's been a relationship marked by friendship, trust and mutual respect, based upon a common commitment to building the kind of party that can promote and realize the goals of socialism on American soil.

I am also requesting the National Committee to accord me advisory status. I do so because the comrades at the center have said that it would be useful if along with Tom and Farrell, I could be available in a consultative capacity at Political Committee meetings. At the same time, I must tell you that I assume advisory status with a certain reluctance, for the following reasons. The advisory status was instituted in 1962 in order to expedite the process of making room in the national leadership for younger comrades who were responsible for directing party activities in diverse areas. It has helped accelerate the process of leadership renewal without a doubt. However, it was not envisaged as a standard fixture of our organizational set-up nor as an ever-lasting institution. It was a temporary expedient which we hoped could be dispensed with over time. That was ten years ago. As the French say, "Nothing is so permanent as the provisional."

National Committee Membership/3

Under the given circumstances, it doesn't seem advisable to do away altogether with this status. But the sooner that this anomaly withers away, the better in the long run. And I stand ready to participate in its abolition when that's judged desirable.

Nationally and internationally, the tasks, the problems, the accomplishments of the next elected and selected executive leaders will be of far greater magnitude than those of their predecessors. What has been done to date may be likened to a pilot operation. We've gone through preliminary experimental steps, tested our program, worked out many of our methods and procedures of organization. I think they're pretty well embedded in the habits and consciousness of our members. Now we are beginning in earnest to tool up for large-scale production in the class struggle.

Under capitalist conditions, the multinational American working class has outproduced other countries in industry and agriculture. We expect that with Marxist guidance they are going to be equally productive in the field of anticapitalist action, and that's what we are preparing for. For us, the crux of the matter is this: will the revolutionary vanguard be equal to its problems and its prospects. I think the cadres we've welded together and are training will be able to handle that titanic job. As the succession of leadership moves forward, we firmly believe, I speak here I presume for a number of the older comrades, to conclude on this Sunday with a Biblical turn of phrase, that "Our fate will be justified by your works."

ELECTION OF POLITICAL COMMITTEE

Jack:

First I should say that the action we have just taken granting Farrell and George advisory status means the first and second alternate members of the National Committee now assume regular membership in the committee. They are Comrade Charlie Bolduc of Detroit and Comrade Derrick Morrison of New York. When the national committee approves a change in status from regular membership to advisory membership, the alternate members as they are ranked move up to fill the vacancies as regular members and the openings in the alternate list remain open until the next convention. So everything else remains the same on the alternate list, and Comrades Bolduc and Morrison are now regular members of the National Committee. I would like to put three motions before you for consideration at the plenum and then go back over them and motivate them briefly.

The first motion is to elect a Political Committee of sixteen members and to nominate these sixteen comrades: Barnes, Breitman, Britton, Camejo, A. Hansen, J. Hansen, Horowitz, Jenness, Jones, Lovell, Morrison, Shaw, Sheppard, Stone, Waters, and a representative to be designated by the youth NEC.

The second motion: to establish the category of consultative membership on the Political Committee, with voice and consultative vote.

Third: to designate Dobbs, Kerry and Novack as consultative members of the Political Committee.

The proposal for the Political Committee before you is the same Political Committee that we elected at the convention, with two changes, of course. One, at that time, Farrell and George were regular members of the National Committee, and they were nominated and elected as regular members of the Political Committee. The changes which I have just proposed will, if accepted, change their status. To replace them as regular members of the Political Committee, there are two proposed additions, which keep the number at sixteen. The first one is Ed Shaw, and the second is Derrick Morrison.

Ed has agreed to come back to the center and to resume his responsibilities as part of the central executive leadership of the party. I don't have to motivate Ed's nomination to the Political Committee to you. Ed's agreement to do this is not only very important in and of itself but it is also important because Ed is a member of that thin generation of leaders of the party who have been so important and whose full collaboration remains key to continuing the transitions in the entire leadership team we have to make. I don't have to repeat Ed's qualifications. So with this proposal, Ed would be added to the committee.

The second proposed addition is Derrick. Derrick is, of course, one of the national leaders of the YSA from an earlier period, has been an alternate member of the national committee for several years now and at the last convention was placed on the national committee as second alternate, showing the confidence that convention had in his capacities. In the past period, while he has, of course, taken several responsibilities organizationally in our various interventions in the Black struggle, Derrick's primary responsibility has been as a member of the staff of the

Election of Political Committee/2

paper. For these reasons, I feel Derrick's qualified and would add something to the Political Committee.

There is, of course, an additional reason, and an important one. It would mean that one of the Black members of the National Committee, now a regular member, would be a member of the Political Committee, would contribute to the collective decision-making, would add his thoughts to the deliberations of the Political Committee and also go through the process of education that's part of the experience on the Political Committee. Both Ed and Derrick have agreed to serve on the committee.

The category of consultative membership on the Political Committee doesn't have to be motivated again. Farrell, in order to explain the steps he wanted to take motivated it. It really flows from our experience with Kerry. In 1969 when Tom proposed taking advisory status, we were all in favor of that. It was part of the transition in leadership which was in harmony with Tom's leaving the day-to-day administrative responsibilities he carried so long as part of the central leadership and moving over to other responsibilities. But it also involved a problem. The problem was that it was useful and necessary for the maximum functioning of the Political Committee to have Tom's participation, political ideas, argumentation, contributions. We resolved this informally by informing the National Committee at the time that we intended to invite Tom to Political Committee meetings. His opinion on important questions or divided questions was recorded as a consultative vote in the Political Committee minutes. Whenever we had discussions, transcripts of which were made for the information of the National Committee members, Tom's contributions were included. What the motion on consultative PC membership does is formalize this in a category.

It's, of course, a very limited category, very narrow in its potential composition. It includes those central leaders of the party who have been central executive leaders for a couple of decades on the Political Committee. But even though it's a very narrow category, we still thought, along the lines of Farrell's memorandum, that it would be better to formalize it in this way, rather than have it remain informal. The experience with Tom has convinced us that we were correct in this in moving in this direction. First, it was a help because Tom's decision to become an advisory member of the national committee opened up the possibility of making further transitions and at the same time by having this relationship with the Political Committee we lost none of Tom's contributions, in thinking out the direction of the party and its line.

The motion would be to establish the category of consultative membership on the Political Committee with voice and consultative vote and to designate the three comrades now available who would meet the criteria I outlined: Comrades Dobbs, Comrade Kerry, Comrade Novack, as consultative members of the Political Committee. This, of course, is a National Committee responsibility, not a Political Committee responsibility. This is not a post that can be filled by cooption. It is up to the National Committee to decide whether or not to alter the form of the Political Committee by adding this category.