

14 Charles Lane
New York, N.Y. 10014

October 14, 1971

FOR THE INFORMATION OF POLITICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS ONLY

Dear Comrades,

Enclosed are a series of items relating to the trial recently held by the Oakland-Berkeley branch of Comrade Tom Cagle, which resulted in censure. These items include: (1) The original charges sent to Tom Cagle in a letter from Nelson Blackstock, the Oakland-Berkeley branch organizer; (2) The excerpts of the branch minutes pertaining to the trial; (3) The report by Nelson Blackstock for the trial committee; (4) Remarks by Tom Cagle in his defense; (5) The report by Ralph Levitt for the minority of the trial committee; and (6) Discussion on the charges.

Comradely,

Barry

Barry Sheppard

SWP
3536 Telegraph Avenue
Oakland, California 94609
September 12, 1971

Tom Cagle
2828 Eastman Avenue
Oakland, California 94619

Dear Comrade Cagle:

Tonight, September 12, the Oakland/Berkeley branch Executive Committee voted to proffer charges against you for violation of party discipline.

The procedures to be followed according to Article VII, Section 3 of the SWP constitution are as follows:

Section 3. Charges against any member shall be made in writing and the accused member shall be furnished with a copy in advance of the trial. Charges shall be filed and heard in the branch to which the member belongs, or in a higher body which may decide to act directly in the case. Charges filed before the branch shall be considered by the branch Executive Committee (or a subcommittee elected by it) at a meeting to which the accused member is summoned. The branch Executive Committee shall submit a recommendation to be acted upon by the membership of the branch. Charges considered by higher bodies of the Party shall, however, be acted upon by said bodies.

You are charged with violating the decision of this branch regarding its approach to the United Action Caucus. Specifically, with violation of the branch Executive Committee motion of September 13, 1970 which decided "that our UAW comrades disengage from the United Action Caucus" and the motion adopted by the branch on September 13, 1971 which stated "that the branch withdraw from working in the United Action Caucus."

This charge is based on two counts:

- 1) Distribution of materials of the United Action Caucus.
- 2) Running for office in UAW local 1364 on the program of the United Action Caucus.

The trial will be held Wednesday night, September 22, at 8 pm at the SWP Headquarters, 3536 Telegraph Avenue, Oakland. The trial body will be the branch Executive Committee with the addition of Allen Taplin.

You will have one half hour to present any defense. You may bring before the Executive Committee any evidence or any party members as witnesses on your behalf.

Comradely,
s/Nelson Blackstock
Oakland/Berkeley SWP Organizer
cc: SWP N.O.

f. Voting results: New EC: Nelson, Fred, John S., Cecily, Brenda, Brian, Dee, AnnMarie, Rich H, Bill M., Paul, Alan W., Cindy and Stu S.

- 8. Intermission
- 9. Announcements

10. Tom Cagle Trial

- a. Organization of report- Nelson be given 20 minutes to present the EC recommendation, that Tom C. be given 10 minutes to respond, and that Ralph be given 10 minutes to present a counter motion.
- b. Nelson - Recommendation of EC that Tom be found in violation of discipline as charged
M/C to extend report 10 minutes
- c. Tom C.- Answered charges presented by EC.
M/F to extend 10 minutes: 25 for- 37 against
M/C to grant a 2 minute extension
- d. Ralph- Wounter report- Motion that Tom not be found in violation of discipline and that he not be censured.
- e. M/C that there be 10 speakers total: 5 for EC rec. and 5 against. That we have 10 minutes for question and 30 minutes for discussion. For- majority-- Opposed 10.
- f. questions: Lauren, Al G., Bill M., Anthony, Debby, Ken M.
- g. discussion: Paul, Ed, Fred, Alan W., Dee, Mike T., Allen T. Bill M., John S. and Lauren.
- h. M/F by Debby that there be a roll call vote- 9 for- rest opposed
- i. VOTE: On EC recommendation:

Guilty:	50	
Not Guilty;	25	Guilty
Abstain:	3	
- j. M/ that the Oakland/Berkeley branch hereby censures comrade Cagle for his violation of discipline in carrying out the decision of the party in trade union work and issues to him a warning to avoid any further infractions of party discipline. (presented by Nelson for EC)

VOTE:

for motion:	50	
against motion:	23	Motion Carries
abstain:	4	

- k.
- 11. M/C to adjourn

REPORT BY NELSON BLACKSTOCK FOR TRIAL COMMITTEE

Last night the branch Executive Committee, with the addition of Allen Taplin, constituted itself as a trial body and heard charges against Comrade Tom Cagle. For the information of comrades, that Executive Committee consisted of the following comrades: myself, Fred, Paul, Ralph, Alan Wald, Allen Taplin was added, Cecily was excused from the meeting and Hilda was not present. In addition to that, Dee and John Studer sit in on the exec with voice and no vote, so they were present for the proceedings. The vote was as follows: two comrades voted to find Tom Cagle not guilty of the charges (those were Ralph and Alan Wald); the rest of the comrades voted to find him guilty of the charges, and that includes John and Dee, two consultative votes, which weren't counted.

This is in line with Article VII, Section 3 of the party Constitution which reads in part: "Charges filed before the branch shall be considered by the Branch Executive Committee (or a subcommittee elected by it) at a meeting to which the accused member is summoned. The Branch Executive Committee shall submit a recommendation to be acted upon by the membership of the branch."

I am submitting that recommendation. The constitution is very specific about this procedure to be followed and there is a reason for it. The branch exec is a smaller body that is able to examine the question in some detail and have some extended deliberation over the issues in question. After this, it makes a general recommendation to the branch on the basis of its proceedings. The branch does not retry the case. There were differences in the trial body, so the exec voted to give extended time to Ralph and also extended time to Tom Cagle to make some remarks.

A word is necessary here about the procedures we follow in these cases. We do not follow the norms of bourgeois legality. We do not have a whole series of laws and bylaws governing every aspect of our activity. Our decisions are arrived at not on the basis of the Perry Mason investigation of each minute empirical bit of evidence, but on the basis of the general political elements involved. On the basis of the picture that came into focus last night the Executive Committee has a proposal to the branch that Comrade Cagle be found in violation of discipline. If that proposal carries there will be another recommendation of a motion of censure.

Tom Cagle is being charged with a violation of party discipline. That means that it is felt that he has taken actions which constitute a departure from the norms of behavior expected of a member of a democratic-centralist organization. This Leninist concept of party organization embodies the right of the freest discussion and expression of varying points of view in arriving at a course of action for the party. We hold discussions in order to make decisions and we act on those decisions. The majority has the democratic right to see that its decision is implemented and once a

decision has been made it is the responsibility of each member to carry out that decision. Differences can continue to be held within the party and discussions again held on them at the proper time. But to the public, to nonmembers of the SWP, the party presents a single, united face. Each member is obligated, as a condition of membership, to carry out the democratically arrived at decision of the party. Comrade Cagle is being charged with violating these organizational norms. The charge is based on Comrade Cagle's actions in UAW local 1364 in relation to the United Action Caucus.

One year ago the branch had a dispute over what kind of intervention our party would make in the union at the General Motors plant at Fremont. At that time Comrade Cagle was involved in a small caucus called the United Action Caucus. After a rather lengthy discussion in both the Executive Committee and the branch a decision was made that the party would not intervene in that union situation through the vehicle of the United Action Caucus. Our comrades in UAW local 1364 were instructed to withdraw from the United Action Caucus. That decision was opposed by a significant minority of the branch, including Comrade Cagle. Now we are not here to rediscuss one way or another the wisdom of that decision. Comrades interested in familiarizing themselves with the questions involved are referred to the transcript of the presentation to the branch by Tom Kerry and the discussion that followed. That is reprinted in pre-convention Discussion Bulletin No. 9 that came out during the last pre-convention discussion. Comrade Kerry's presentation was made following by a few days the decision by the branch.

The decision involved a number of political and tactical questions. But the organizational implementation of the decision boiled down to one simple question: What would be the relationship of the party's representatives, our three comrades at Fremont, to the United Action Caucus?

The decision of the branch was explicitly stated in a motion of the E.C. on September 13 which stated "that our UAW comrades disengage from the United Action Caucus" and a motion passed by the branch meeting of September 21 which decided "that the branch withdraw from working in the United Action Caucus."

A motion was put forward by Ralph Levitt for a minority of the E.C. that stated "that the branch not withdraw from the United Action Caucus, but continue working within it." That motion was defeated.

Comrade Cagle is being charged with violating that decision of the branch.

On May 2 of this year, Comrade Cagle came to the Executive Committee with a proposal that he run on the slate of the United Action Caucus in the union elections which were to take place in the near future. Comrade Cagle reported that some members of the UAC had approached him with a proposal

that he be the candidate for president of the caucus. He did not propose joining the caucus, but rather he accept a draft on the part of the membership of the caucus that he be their candidate for president! After a brief discussion the exec came to the unanimous conclusion that Comrade Cagle was in effect reopening the question of the party's relationship to the UAC, something that he did not seem to understand and has some bearing on what's before us tonight. He didn't seem to understand that accepting a draft to run for president was in effect running on the slate of the caucus. It was felt by the exec that it was not in the interest of the branch to reraise that question at this time. Ralph expressed the point of view that although he disagreed with that original decision he felt that rather than going into that decision again at that time he preferred to hold off any discussion until the beginning of the upcoming party pre-convention discussion during which time more fundamental political questions would be on the agenda. The decision of the Executive Committee was reported to the branch the following night. Although Tom raised some objections to the decision from the floor, the decision stood.

In June I came into possession of some material being circulated by the UAC at Fremont. One was a printed card that was headed United Action Caucus, endorsed slate. Tom Cagle was listed as one of the eight endorsed candidates for Executive Board. The other was a copy of the UAW Hot Wire, the newsletter of the United Action Caucus, No. 5, May. It contained the same list of candidates. Above the list of candidates was printed this sentence: "All candidates endorsed by the United Action Caucus have read and approved this program and are pledged to work for the program if elected." Additionally, the Labor Temple News, the official publication of local 1364, had Tom Cagle listed as a candidate for Executive Board. No caucus designations were given for any candidates for any office.

This material raised two questions of proper functioning. One was the question of Tom's running for office in the local without consulting the branch. This is simply not the way we function. Running for office in a union without consulting the party would be a cause for concern in any situation. The fact that this was being done in a situation where the party had been engaged in a heated dispute and the Executive Committee had already considered the question of these elections only doubled the concern. But the other question, much more serious, was the question of Tom's relationship to the caucus, which had been at the very center of the controversy.

On June 23, Mary Henderson (the city secretary at that time) and I called Comrade Cagle and brought this material to his attention. There was the possibility in our minds that the information printed in this material was not accurate, that he was not running as a candidate and that he had no association with the UAC.

Comrade Cagle, however, confirmed the accuracy of the material. He was running for office in the union and the

statement printed in the Hot Wire was accurate. I will at this point quote a statement submitted by Mary Henderson. It's dated September 10, 1971:

Since I am transferring out of the Oakland-Berkeley branch at the time this issue will be brought before the branch, I am writing this letter regarding a telephone conversation that Comrade Nelson Blackstock and I had with Comrade Tom Cagle on June 23. This conversation arose over the fact that material had been circulated at Fremont indicating that Comrade Cagle was running on the slate of endorsed candidates of the United Action Caucus for Executive Board.

In the telephone conversation Comrade Blackstock pointed out a statement to Comrade Cagle that appeared in the Hot Wire issue No. 5, May 1971. This issue included a slate of candidates endorsed by the UAC in which Comrade Cagle's name appeared, along with the UAC program. At the top of the list of candidates there was a statement reading: "All candidates endorsed by the UNITED ACTION CAUCUS have read and approved this program and are pledged to work for the program if elected."

When questioned about this Comrade Cagle confirmed agreeing to run on the program of the UAC. He stated that although he was running as an "independent" candidate he had agreed to run on this program in spite of the party's position of complete disassociation from the United Action Caucus. Comrade Cagle said that no matter what the party's position was he had the right to run on the UAC program.

Comrade Cagle at no time indicated that he felt that there was anything out of order in the material circulated by the United Action Caucus listing him as an endorsed candidate. He at no time indicated that he had taken any steps to have his name eliminated from the slate. His only defense was that he was an "independent" candidate endorsed by the caucus.

I have read Comrade Cagle's letter of July 5 and am aware of the discrepancies that appear in the account of his actions given in that letter and the account given in the telephone conversation of June 23 which I recounted above.

The only thing I will add is that Comrade Cagle indicated that it was in order for him to run as a candidate because he had done so in the past. He indicated that he was not putting out any independent campaign material. His attitude on this question seemed to indicate some haziness on how the party makes its decisions. Also, he seemed to become quite angered and accused me or the party or some members of the party (it was unclear which one) of "spying," that is the word he used, on his activities at Fremont.

On June 25 I wrote a letter to Comrade Cagle bringing to his attention the problems I saw in his functioning.

On July 5 Comrade Cagle responded in a letter in which he recounts a chain of events which he never mentioned in our telephone conversation twelve days earlier. Whereas previously he had seen no problem with anything that had happened at Fremont, in this letter he seems to indicate that after the UAC material appeared he approached the leadership of the caucus and demanded a retraction be printed, but that the Stalinist Saul Wachter sabotaged the printing of the reply. He's ambiguous as to whether this happened after our conversation or during the election period. The elections were held June 8 and 9, sometime after all of this took place. He further states: "Comrade Blackstock is absolutely incorrect in his allegation that I gave him a statement as well as Mary Henderson over the phone alleging that I stated that I agreed to run on the program of the UAC as a blatant lie. I did not agree to run on the program of the UAC, being tactfully in agreement with the program of the UAC is not the same as running on their program as Nelson alleges."

Here he seems to be saying that the statement is correct. However, it is not the same as running on the program.

He also included a statement by Ted Dennis, written in Tom's handwriting but signed by Ted. In this statement Ted indicated that he authorized Comrade Cagle to enter his name as a candidate at a union meeting, but the candidacy failed to become official because Ted did not follow up by submitting an acceptance in writing. He also says that he understands this to be in line with party policy.

Also, there are two letters: one by Farrell Dobbs and one by Frank Lovell. Their relationship to this question is a mystery, unless it is only to say that comrades sometimes enter elections in unions. The letter by Farrell Dobbs is clear that these decisions must be made in collaboration with the party.

More interestingly, there is a letter from Larry Gibson, chairman of the UAC. I will read from this letter:

As chairman of the United Action Caucus of UAW local 1364 and as a long time sympathizer and subscriber to your press The Militant, I was aware of the precarious position of brother Tom Cagle as a member of your political party who was forced by your party decision to sever his relations with the United Action Caucus which he was instrumental in helping to organize.

This caucus was once closely associated with, influenced and supported by your party. I do not pretend to know or understand all of your differences that have developed or objections towards continued support.

It is with grave concern with brother Cagle's problem which I may have inadvertently aggravated in relation to his continued good standing in your party that I wish to make the following statement in his behalf; I did, during the recent election campaign, take certain liberties with

the usage of Tom Cagle's name as an "endorsed" candidate on our United Action Caucus slate without prior knowledge or approval of brother Cagle who was an independent candidate for Executive Board at large along with 49 other candidates. Brother Cagle had clearly indicated to me the necessity of totally severing all relations with his former caucus under threat of being expelled from his political party and stated that he was in hopes of clearing up these problems and changing his party's political attitude towards work in the trade unions during his pre-convention period which I concurred with at that time. I even went so far as to get our steering committee to attend and endorse SWP candidates in the election last fall in hopes of relieving the restrictions on brother Cagle.

This letter raises more questions than it answers. It indicates a kind of political relationship between Comrade Cagle and the head of this caucus, who is not a member of the Socialist Workers Party, that might at best be called unwholesome. Not only does it indicate that Comrade Cagle has been discussing internal differences with a nonmember of the party, but that he has been collaborating with him in an effort to get party decisions reversed. Comrade Cagle's responsibility, in lines with the democratic centralist norms outlined earlier, was not to go to this independent, the head of the caucus, and tell him that the SWP has made a decision he does not agree with and that he is trying to get it changed during "his pre-convention discussion period," but to defend that decision. I don't propose that we add another charge, but I think that this only backs up the charge before us as to Cagle's failure to carry out his political responsibility and obey Leninist norms.

One further point: during our discussions last night, Cagle informed us that he had also informed this Stalinist, a member of the Communist Party, Saul Wachter, of these differences within the party and that he was also trying to get it turned around and that he was trying not to get expelled from the party because of his differences.

After this material was submitted by Tom, he attended an exec at which he agreed to take immediate steps to publicly disassociate himself from the caucus, pointing out that his name was included as a candidate in error.

Since he agreed to do that, the case was put aside. No disciplinary action was proposed, since it would have a tendency to interfere with the preconvention discussion. The question of the public damage done to the party was apparently settled, or would be settled in the best possible manner, given the circumstances.

This month, after the convention, we took up the disciplinary question. Two other elements came to light.

In addition, we have the testimony of Comrade Bill Keisle that he had witnessed Comrade Cagle distributing

campaign material of the United Action Caucus during the last election. However, Comrade Keisle was under some pressure and his general remarks tended to be somewhat confused and disorganized. While the trial body did not feel that it could base its decision totally on the basis of this comrade's testimony, that it did provide an element that fit consistently into the overall picture.

In addition to that, one other thing that was part of the overall thing that was considered, was this issue of the Peoples World, November 28, 1970, after the branch decision in September of last year. It has a picture of one comrade and two people who are members of the United Action Caucus we can identify, Saul Wachter and the other guy's name escapes me (it's on some of the campaign literature along with his picture). They're holding up a sign that says "Vote No, Vote No" and it's signed United Action Caucus. Tom is standing in this group, and the caption on the picture is "United Action Caucus members urge 'No Vote' as Fremont GM workers vote."

Through the course of last night's proceedings a number of things emerged. For one thing, it was clear that despite his protestations, that Comrade Cagle had made no serious effort to disassociate himself from the United Action Caucus. Even if the new account of his actions, other than that given during the telephone conversation with Mary Henderson and myself were true, it is clear that if he had made any serious attempt to disassociate himself from this caucus they would have never made the mistake of including him as an endorsed candidate of the caucus. Tom brought before the exec a third piece of literature produced by the United Action Caucus with his name on it. The exec raised the question: why was it that there were three separate pieces of literature issued with your name on it? Wasn't it possible for you to, when this literature started appearing, insist that they stop putting your name in there? He indicated that all three pieces of literature came out on the same day: two of them were mimeographed and one was off-set. They all appeared on the same day.

Another problem is that the election at Fremont took place June 8 and 9. It was not until after the election that I called Tom about this literature, 14 days after the election, and Tom at no time had brought to the attention of the party the appearance of this material at the plant. Why did he not do this?

Another element that was considered is that although Comrade Cagle had agreed in writing last summer to take immediate steps to see that a statement of retraction was printed in some form and distributed at Fremont in order to disassociate himself from this caucus, he had taken no serious steps to do so, even to this date. This is a matter that must be taken up by the new exec. But in and of itself it tends to confirm the exec's estimate of Comrade Cagle's actions in regard to this formation, his refusal to carry out

the mandate of this branch to pull away from this formation. It also points up the necessity of taking this action of censure against Cagle in order to draw the line.

What emerged from the deliberations was that Comrade Cagle had been consciously and consistently refusing to carry out the democratically arrived at decision of this branch. He has continued to work with, collaborate with this caucus and maintain a political relationship not proper with non-members of the Socialist Workers Party.

This is not a comrade who has no history of disciplinary problems. At the public conference last fall he publicly, before a good section of the party, many independents and political opponents, attacked Black nationalism. No formal action was taken at that time, although at least one of the comrades, Ralph Levitt, who here opposes this action, proposed in the Executive Committee a motion of censure, that we do exactly what we're proposing now. But we voted to lay that aside and talk to Tom and he promised that this wouldn't happen again. This current episode is the second such clear incident involving this comrade.

The branch must find Comrade Cagle guilty of indiscipline and issue this warning. To vote against this is to say that the Socialist Workers Party will tolerate this kind of subtle circumvention of its decisions. The political picture is that Comrade Cagle's actions were clearly out of line and a refusal to take action in such cases as these, the second such incident involving Comrade Cagle, is to say that the party is unable to see that its decisions are carried out.

The party has three forms of disciplinary procedure, each of succeeding severity: censure, suspension and expulsion. Suspension or expulsion is not being called for. A motion of censure is in order so as to put Comrade Cagle on notice to cease and desist with his behavior. To not vote such a motion would be giving Comrade Cagle the green light to continue this type of behavior which can only get him into deeper trouble.

We're going to call for a vote on this report and if a vote of guilty comes forward, then we will propose a second motion, which will be as follows:

The Oakland-Berkeley branch hereby censures Comrade Cagle for his violation of discipline in carrying out the decisions of the party in trade union work and issues to him a warning to avoid any further infractions of party discipline.

REMARKS BY TOM CAGLE

Comrades, this is a very lengthy amount of charges to be able to answer in ten minutes. I would like to start off by asking for an additional ten minutes myself. [defeated]

This puts quite a cramp in my ability to answer all these charges. All I can do is on a minimal basis, very superficially, answer them.

To begin with, I had submitted this list of letters to Comrade Nelson not only for the information of the Executive Committee, but also to insert within the newsletter for the information of all the comrades here. No doubt this can only create more questions than what we can answer in this short period of time. The nature of the charges that are brought against me are designed to show a consistent and methodical discipline problem -- that I'm going against the discipline of the party. This is not true. What I want to state here is a fact that on the formation of this caucus to give you a little background information very quickly.

This caucus was formed under the guidanceship of the leadership of the SWP. When I say SWP, I'm referring to the trade union section of the leadership. This means Frank Lovell, and Kerry and Dobbs. This was a formation which was to be a part of the United National Caucus of local 160 (Pete Kelly's local) in which Frank Lovell was a member at the time. Now Frank Lovell was a leading light in this National Caucus and he was one of the...of course he played in the background, but he played a part in writing the program and pushing for a program within this formation.

I have numerous correspondence which I cannot even begin to go into here to prove the fact that the party did encourage the formation of this United Action Caucus. This caucus was an extension of our UAW comrades. This was a UAW fraction of this branch directly into the plant. The purpose of that caucus was to project our politics into that plant. On that basis, the party got to realize that it created some sort of an off-child that it disowned. It had to all of a sudden turn on it. This is one of the things that I want to get into.

One of the reasons why they turned on this caucus was the fact that it was taking up a serious oppositional fight during the strike, which was a form of embarrassment to the party. The party was not prepared to lead any kind of a rank and file struggle when it was attempting to cultivate a relationship with the leadership of the UAW. This is one of the basic objections that I raised at the time and this is where it came into disfavor. This is where, after being in the party ten years, I've had nine years of exceptional relationship in the branch where I could run for the Executive Committee and get the highest amounts of votes within the branch, at any of those nine years. But all of a sudden, in the tenth year, I've become a discipline case. All of a sudden, I've become the worst comrade in the branch.

I cannot go into all the charges, but I want to briefly state that during the strike, they offered a cease and desist.

You cannot just cease and desist with something you created. You have to go in there, and you have to explain to these comrades that you have to back out, you have to disassociate yourself with this caucus without going into detail. You can't say "My party's coming down on me." At that particular time, I just said that I had to back off from it. I had political problems and I had to back off.

Of course, this raises more questions than it answers and comrades want to say "Well, you're the organizer of the caucus. You're the leading light. Why are you having to back off from this thing?"

One thing that Comrade Nelson didn't read in his letter, he omitted from Larry Gibson's letter, was a statement that Comrade Montauk had a party for the United Action Caucus at his home, at which Frank Lovell was the main guest of honor, where he met all of the leaders of this caucus, including Larry Gibson. He encouraged the fact that we get together and run a slate of candidates for that constitutional convention. Comrades, these inconsistencies, you know you've got to become aware of the fact that our party is zig-zagging today and you don't know when it's zigging, you don't know when it's zagging, but it can lose a lot of comrades in the course of these flip-flops.

Well, I got caught up in this flip-flop myself and overnight I became sort of a problem in the branch. In this formation of the caucus, on this disciplinary problem, I want to emphatically deny that I had refused to follow party discipline whatsoever. I admitted the fact that I was subject to party discipline and I intended to follow out the party mandate: to cease and desist. It was just a matter of a period of time of actually disengaging myself from this caucus. This period of time that I disengaged from this caucus is what is in dispute here today. This is why the party has to go back one year, up to six months, in order to find something in order to build a case on.

In this trial last night (it was a five-hour trial) and it wasn't a trial to try to probe and get to the bottom of what our misunderstandings were. No. This was a trial in order to probe all of my weaknesses. This was a five-hour quiz in which they tried to contradict everything I said, like in a typical bourgeois court. The comrades attempted to find contradictions to find loopholes, in order to build their case. In other words, they did not have a case.

In five hours last night, I took point by point and I refuted those with a very concise explanation for each one of these charges. In effect, they had to admit at the end of the five hours that perhaps they didn't have absolute, concrete proof on me. But they had enough circumstantial evidence. They said there's a whole chain of circumstantial evidence here and you don't have to have a victim with bullet holes into him to prove that he'd been murdered. This was Nelson's logic. He had to back off because all of his points that he raised here were devastated. I don't have five hours. I wish I did so I could explain to the comrades a lot of these misunderstandings. But

the point I want to emphasize is that at no time have I disobeyed or refused to obey a party mandate, because I'm conscious of the fact that I want to build a disciplined party.

Now, on this Mary Henderson thing: that again is a complete distortion. It's one thing to run away and write a letter, it's another thing to stand here and face it. Mary Henderson stated that I flatly denied that I was going to follow party mandates and that I was going to run on the United Action Caucus slate, and that I was going to run on their program and everything else, which is a complete lie.

In the two minutes I've got left, I would like to just briefly sum up the fact that most of my troubles began with the preconvention discussion period in which I had published a couple of documents which were sharply critical of the leadership. These documents started out with an analysis of the trade union movement, which was never answered. These documents, of course, are a contributing factor to this trial right today. In other words, the party did not answer these rather sharp criticisms that I made of the leadership. They did not attempt to answer these because they don't attempt to answer things like that. They only move against a comrade in an organizational manner and this trial is an organizational manner.

On this basis here, we see the fact that the party is attempting to enforce discipline, I mean they're attempting to intimidate all dissidents with the branch. They want a conformity of opinion [change of tape] want to pin down some sort of a charge here that they can get a censure vote on me and I think that, in this same light, that the Political Committee plans on stepping in after a censure vote is won and then setting that aside and assessing a harsher penalty. So I would suggest to comrades who are going to vote to censure me here tonight, in effect may be voting to suspend or even more.

It's important to understand, comrades, that we have a movement within the class and at the convention, and in our documents of the Proletarian Orientation Tendency as well as the Communist Tendency, have projected a fact that we were going into an economic crisis. We projected the fact that this economic crisis was going to propel the working class into motion. And we saw one week after that convention the devastating effect of this come to be. This had quite an impact upon the leadership here, who all of a sudden...it's one thing for a group of crackpot comrades to criticize the leadership, they can be dismissed with a few laughs, but it's another thing to have the prediction to come true a week after the convention.

On this basis, this is why I say they're moving at the present time against all dissident political viewpoints within the party and they want to make an example out of them. They're moving against the Communist Tendency comrades in Boston with the mind of expelling these comrades. I've rather suspected that they would like to follow suit with this expulsion in my case.

Comrades, I want to emphasize once again that I am prepared to follow out the mandates of this party and at no time intend to disobey them, that I have severed all relationships with the United Action Caucus, and I intend to continue to work within the normal channels within the party within that basis.