

# Pre-convention Bulletin #16 / January 27, 2014

for members only

---

	Page
<a href="#">Convention information and deadlines</a>	1
<a href="#">Documents</a>	
<b>Who crossed what line? ISO Renewal Faction responds to ISO Steering Committee</b> ISO Renewal Faction	4
<b>A reply to Brian C. on community branches</b> Amy M., NYC	5
<b>We've tried this before</b> Sid P., Bay Area	9
<b>Activating the union membership</b> John G., Oakland, CA	12
<b>Theory and Practice: the centrality of anti-black racism and social reproduction</b> Lauren B., Gainesville	13
<a href="#">Documents with Resolutions</a>	
<b>Response to the ISO Renewal Faction document</b> David B., Harlem/Uptown, NYC	16

---

## Convention information and deadlines

**Convention location: Northwestern University.** *We have received final confirmation from Northwestern University, so we will be holding the convention there. We'll send out meeting room details as the convention approaches.*

Listed below are two sets of items that include information for branches and a set of deadlines that will help us streamline the convention process. These are broken up into two parts. Please read all the way to the end, with special attention to the deadlines listed here. Thanks.

I. Below is a set of deadlines that will help us make sure that all comrades who are coming are pre-registered, that comrades who need free housing are offered it, and that the pre-convention bulletins contain as many resolutions and documents as necessary.

### 1. Delegates and guests:

Please send in the names of your branch's elected delegates along with requests for any guests you would like to attend. Twigs (groups of less than five members) are entitled to request a guest.

Please send an email with the words “delegate” and/or “guest” in the subject line to [sharon@internationalsocialist.org](mailto:sharon@internationalsocialist.org). Your delegates will automatically be pre-registered. Guest requests will be answered on the Monday following the day you send in your request.

The deadline for delegate information and guest requests is Sunday, February 9.

## 2. Childcare:

We are committed to providing childcare to all delegates who require it. The childcare will take place at the home of Chicago comrades.

**If your branch is sending any delegates needing childcare during the convention, please send an email with the word “childcare” in the subject line to Cindy K. at [Ckchigo@gmail.com](mailto:Ckchigo@gmail.com).** *The deadline for submitting childcare requests is Friday, February 7. This is a firm deadline, and we can't accept any requests after this date, as we will need enough time to arrange quality childcare.*

## 3. Housing:

### Housing with comrades:

Chicago comrades are happy to offer free housing to all comrades who need it. But we are only able to guarantee floor space, so we strongly recommend that you bring a sleeping bag and a pillow.

**If you want to request housing with comrades, send an email with the word “housing” in the subject line to either Carlos E. ([xwbax777@hotmail.com](mailto:xwbax777@hotmail.com)) or Rory F. ([rory@haymarketbooks.org](mailto:rory@haymarketbooks.org)).** Please make sure to let us know in your email if the comrades requesting housing have any pet allergies, etc.

The deadline for requesting housing with Chicago comrades is Sunday, February 9.

### Local hotels:

Comrades who are able to afford it might prefer to pitch in together to stay in a hotel. Below are a couple of suggestions—but if you find a good deal somewhere, please let us know and we'll pass it on to other comrades.

Unfortunately, the Best Western Hotel and the Orrington in downtown Evanston are booked up for Presidents' Day weekend. The other Evanston Hotels are fairly pricy.

There is one option worth considering for a larger group: The Homestead Evanston (1625 Hinman Avenue, Evanston, IL 60201). This hotel is located just two blocks from Northwestern University (closer than any other hotel). It has one-bedroom apartments with kitchens (which can save money on food—there is a Whole Foods in downtown Evanston). **These apartments cost \$185 per night, but you can probably squeeze in 6-7 people to save costs. When you register, however, you should only register as four guests, which is the maximum the hotel allows.** Their website is <http://thehomestead.net/results.cfm>.

One of the cheaper options is the Super 8 hotel (7300 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, IL 60626). This hotel is close to the red line “el” and just a few stops away from Northwestern. Their website is <http://www.super8.com/>. They are listing their rate for two queen beds at \$124.99 per night, but *you can get a 15% discount on the rate if you book 7 days in advance.*

#### 4. Pre-convention documents and resolutions:

Deadline for all pre-convention submissions:

All documents and resolutions need to be submitted by Wednesday, February 12 at midnight CST if they are to be included in a pre-convention bulletin (although we strongly urge you to submit them earlier if you want comrades to have time to read them before the convention). All comrades who submit documents or resolutions after that time will be required to make their own copies to be distributed at the convention. We will include all of these in the post-convention bulletin, which reports back to the entire membership.

Please submit your documents and/or resolutions to [bulletin@internationalsocialist.org](mailto:bulletin@internationalsocialist.org) and cc Sharon at the national office ([sharon@internationalsocialist.org](mailto:sharon@internationalsocialist.org)) if you plan to submit a document and/or resolution, so we can plan bulletin production. Thanks.

II. The second set of items, listed below, is meant to ensure that all branches are able to seat their delegates, which requires branches to abide by the ISO rules and procedures.

##### 1. SW and dues:

**All branches must be paid up on dues and SW to seat their delegates.**

If your branch owes money for dues and/or SW, *please make sure to send it so that it arrives before the start of the convention*: the mailing address is ISO, P.O. Box 16085, Chicago, IL 60616.

If absolutely necessary, send outstanding payments along with your delegate. We discourage waiting until the convention to pay branch debts because it will interfere with the streamlined registration process, wasting time unnecessarily while other comrades are forced to wait.

##### 2. Double dues payments for February.

The ISO rules require all members to pay double dues for the month of February. The extra month of dues is necessary to pay for delegates' plane fares to the convention. This is the most democratic way for us to ensure that comrades who live the farthest from Chicago (and therefore have the highest travel costs) are given adequate representation at the convention. Otherwise, those with the cheapest transportation would be over-represented and those with the most expensive travel costs would be under-represented.

Here is how to handle the double dues:

If your branch delegates will be flying to the convention, use the double dues money to reimburse your delegates. If you have any money left over, turn it in to the national office to help pay for other branches' delegates. If your branch's double dues are not enough to fully pay for your delegates' plane fares, the national office will make up the difference.

If your branch's delegates do not need to fly to the convention, you should turn over all your double dues to the national office to reimburse other branch's delegates.

\*\*\*\*\*

Thanks to all comrades for attending to these issues as soon as possible. We expect this convention to be an important one, and we want to make sure that every branch is represented in the discussions and decisions that will take place.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact [sharon@internationalsocialist.org](mailto:sharon@internationalsocialist.org).

## Who crossed what line? ISO Renewal Faction responds to ISO Steering Committee

The ISO Renewal Faction rejects the Steering Committee's demand that we repudiate Shaun J. for his comment on Facebook. We see this as a diversion, yet another attempt by the SC to delegitimize the faction's existence so as to avoid having to engage directly and honestly with the political questions the faction is raising. However, we believe this incident does highlight some key political questions that are worth examination.

The ISO Notes points to a comment Shaun made in a Facebook thread ([https://www.facebook.com/snjoseph/posts/10151869416686430?stream\\_ref=10#\\_](https://www.facebook.com/snjoseph/posts/10151869416686430?stream_ref=10#_)) in which he stated that Keegan O. had talked at length to Boston police about political activities. According to the SC, this amounted to a dangerous accusation against Keegan. We agree that accusing a comrade of being a police informant would be unacceptable without strong evidence. But Shaun did nothing of the sort; he only stated that Keegan gave political information to the police in one interview—as clearly demonstrated by the document linked (<http://www.nlgmass.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/BPD-Intelligence-Reports.pdf>) in the Facebook comment.

The police report that reveals Keegan's conversation with the Boston police has been posted publicly online since October 2012 as part of a highly-publicized release of Boston Police Department "intelligence reports" on the antiwar movement following a lawsuit by the ACLU and National Lawyers Guild. When Shaun read these documents, he was shocked and disturbed to discover that Keegan had conveyed political information to the police. He spoke to the Boston district organizer about the matter on at least two occasions, asking him to address it with Keegan. This was never done. Shortly thereafter, as Shaun has documented in *External Bulletin* (<https://externalbulletin.wordpress.com/2014/01/10/the-experience-of-a-dissident-in-the-iso-i-the-trial/>), Keegan played an important role in undermining the Boston ISO's support for Shaun in his trial on criminal charges stemming from his false arrest during an antiwar protest.

No one is accusing Keegan of being a police informant. No private or sensitive information was "leaked" as a result of this Facebook exchange. And presumably, the police know who they spoke to already, so there is not a question of alerting the repressive apparatus of the state to some new situation. What is the real danger here: that Keegan gave political information to the police, or that Shaun pointed out, with reference to a public document, that this had happened? More importantly, *should the SC be more concerned with a member who is on record having spoken to the police, or with a member who points out this fact?*

Furthermore, the SC uses Shaun's comments to "illustrate" how his presence in the Boston ISO branch must have "poisoned the atmosphere". Yet the SC is silent on the numerous insults thrown at Shaun on Facebook by various members ([https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ldZWCHpHyD8FUuO19Hic82ZihzVM1VkiHR\\_m\\_10TNyk/edit?pli=1](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ldZWCHpHyD8FUuO19Hic82ZihzVM1VkiHR_m_10TNyk/edit?pli=1)) and <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1HSaBFIPmb84BttgcIQE-lSrUdd9Qmr0z-78-2i6llYE/edit?pli=1>) not only of the Boston ISO, but also of people in positions of national leadership. The SC has never addressed the allegation in the appeal for Shaun launched internally in October, that the regional organizer played a particular role in marginalizing Shaun, and in prejudicing the leadership of the Boston ISO against Shaun before he even moved there in 2011. The blame for producing a hothouse atmosphere in which political disagreements are turned into personal insults lies firmly with the formal leadership, not with the individual who was isolated by means of epithets ("ultra-left") and then ignored when he raised real concerns about the concrete operations of his branch. Now they accuse Shaun of creating a scandal. But it was the leadership that failed to address the situation properly and fairly. The failure to deal with this crisis discretely is theirs, not Shaun's.

What about internal discipline in the ISO? Does the ISO not have mechanisms for dealing with charges of damaging and uncomradely behavior on the part of members? If the SC believes that Shaun's behavior

crossed the line, the SC should bring charges against Shaun before the Disciplinary Committee. Of course, in that case, we would expect that Keegan would recuse himself from the Disciplinary Committee (of which he is an elected member). But we utterly reject the SC's skirting of the ISO's formal structures and mechanisms of due process in order to delegitimize the faction as a political formation within the ISO. Although the Renewal Faction is "disciplined" in the sense that we have a common platform that we are all obliged to promote, as explained in our Rules (<https://externalbulletin.wordpress.com/faction-rules/>), we do not attempt to monitor and control all of our members' comments on social media or elsewhere. We reject the SC's cynical attempt to reduce the faction to one person, so as to scare the rest of the faction members into silence. We agree with Shaun politically; distancing ourselves from him because of his alleged "misbehavior" would simply undermine us as an organized expression of political ideas.

What this whole incident demonstrates is that the ISO leadership faction has created a culture in which "leaders" or "stars" who support the leadership's policies uncritically are permitted to do anything, regardless of the potential or actual harm to the organization, while those who draw attention to problems are denigrated for doing so. There is an unspoken double standard within the organization, based on whether members openly challenge the leadership, or publicly agree (while perhaps hiding their actual disagreements). Ultimately the environment the SC is creating by this mode of operating is one where people are learning to keep their heads down if they have any serious criticisms, opening up the possibility that serious crises may be ignored or spiral out of control while no one dares to point out the actual danger. It is impossible to build a party that aims to take down capitalism on this basis. This attitude may work for a sect or a cult, but ISO members must reject it if we wish to contribute to building a revolutionary socialist movement.

The Steering Committee has asked us to renounce Shaun's behavior. Yet the comrade has told the truth, a truth that members and collaborators of the ISO should know, especially given the leadership's amazingly indifferent attitude. To renounce someone for telling the truth is to renounce the truth itself. We refuse to do so.

**Alden E., Seattle, Amanda HG, Cambridge, Ben S., Atlanta, Brian C., Providence, Chris Ma., Providence, Chris Mu., Providence, Ian G., Providence, Mary R., Providence, Neil P., Cambridge, Paul H., Providence, Vanessa B., Washington, DC, Yuval S., Cambridge**

---

## **A reply to Brian C. on community branches**

Brian C.'s document on "city" branches from Internal Bulletin #2 lays out an argument for recruitment and integration of more working class members. It is a welcome beginning to the much-needed debate about the role of branches off-campus, and by laying out a number of very specific proposals and approaches has concretized the discussion. My response below challenges a number of explicit arguments and what I believe to be some underlying theoretical assumptions; it is meant to be sharp, but by no means harsh, or dismissive of the seriousness with which Brian approached this subject. Ultimately however I think Brian's argument approaches the question of building the group is too one-dimensional, and the urgency felt around building at the economic core of cities overstates the possibilities of recruiting and training workplace cadre.

There are two outstanding flaws in the approach Brian uses. First, the emphasis on objective analysis of local capitalism tends toward voluntarism and an "if we are serious it will happen" tone. Secondly, Brian flattens out working class life to life on the job, and makes explicit arguments to orient almost exclusively on workplace struggles.

Brian emphasizes analyzing the economy of a city, which is useful, but suggests by understanding these facts we can find a way to recruit or relate to the workers in key sectors. He states: "We can, however, start to recruit workers and train them as trade union and workplace cadre, provided that the branch has a serious orientation on and plan for developing work around their sector or workplace. This is a different conception than previously and it requires us to think in terms of comrades' strengths and real-life connections".

This is a leap—how does even the best analysis and plan serve a branch with no connection to a given industry? And how does the analysis lend itself to thinking through comrades “strengths and real-life connections”? It is one thing to argue to put resources into a workplace where a comrade already works and there has been a thoroughgoing analysis of the potential for struggle and growth. But it is an entirely different thing to assume because an industry is *objectively* important to local capitalism, it is *subjectively* the choice to orient on. It also doesn’t acknowledge the significance of a workplace that individually doesn’t have much weight, but can carry a different kind of significance—which is what we experienced in New York around the Hot and Crusty Bakery (which beat off a closure attempt and successfully unionized, and is a touchstone for young New York leftists) or what our comrades have accomplished at a single Whole Foods.

Reading this section reminded me of Joel G’s talk on the IS’ labor work in the 1970’s, when comrades were able to study the weight of various sectors, and decide to orient and effectively participate in and sometimes lead rank and file rebellions, and try to recruit workplace members. This is a gazillion years from where we are now. The notion that we will pick a workplace, orient on it, do “systematic” contact work until we break through, then train a new recruit to be a Marxist and an effective militant who can build up a periphery and influence, *and the key element is our seriousness*, seems dramatically at odds with experience.

In this scenario the ball—all the balls—are in our court; although Brian acknowledges the slow pace and patience it requires to recruit workers, it is purely our disorientation, hesitation, or inconsistency that stands between our organization as it is and a group dominated by workplace activists. This is not to argue workplace sales *never* make sense, or that are no workplaces we should (and do) have strategic orientations on (teachers, health care, to a lesser extent retail); but to make it the cornerstone of community branch building is misled. He tacitly acknowledges the limits of our ability to meet success penetrating key workplaces in his comments about folding the Verizon sale, following a prolonged, ultimately defeated contract fight that ushered in historic concessions.

What strikes me about this approach is that Brian equates being oriented on work places as being rooted in the working class, which brings me to the second problem with his approach. Workplaces are the key link for reorganizing society, but being rooted in the class cannot be entirely *reduced* to workplace recruitment. Class struggle itself cannot be reduced down to the economic fight in the workplace. Certainly the class assault we are living through consists of not only workplace issues: neoliberalism is a universal assault on our lives, not just our livelihoods.

Brian’s logic takes him so far as to argue: “If we are to recruit working parents, our branches must be structured so that political activity fits with where working parents (like workers generally) potentially have power: at the workplace.” Our recent experience in the ISO indicates something different. Parents have asserted themselves around one of the only remaining collective, non-workplace spaces for working class people: public schools. ISO parents have begun to participate *as parents* in the arena of public education; in New York, a comrade who is the co-president of the PTA in her daughter’s school stopped a new, pointless standardized test for Kindergarten students by organizing over 90% of the parents to opt their kids out. In Chicago a comrade (who is also a parent and early childhood educator) organized a “Play-In” at the Dept of Ed to highlight the centrality of play for young learners.

Just last year in my neighborhood, one of the gems of the public school system which is responsible for sending the greatest number of non-white students to the magnet high schools was attacked to make way for a charter school. The mobilization was immediate and victorious. The campaign was led by the school’s Parent’s Association and district-wide Community Education Council; the former known for school fundraisers and the latter for its utter lack of power under mayoral control. This year within our District a new group called People for Public Education has formed.

With more comrades with children entering public school, we should consider our relationship to the various forums that exist for parents (Parents’ Associations/PTA’s, School Boards, or their mayoral-control counterparts, anti-testing groups, etc). Our overarching strategy for teacher work nationally is “social-

justice unionism” which illuminates the intrinsic connection between the working conditions of teachers with the learning conditions of their students—and lived realities of the neighborhoods and families they come from. What exists now around parent organizing is quite small and disconnected, but the potential exists in the coming years to explore and nourish this work with a political approach that situates it within the larger fight against not just the neoliberal education agenda, but capitalism itself.

If we saw the working class in one dimension, at the point of production only, we would miss this opportunity to lead in the “community” half of the “community-labor” alliance. Neoliberalism has smashed a lot of organizations and spaces that provided coherence for working class communities; some of the pushback is simply people seeking to preserve what scraps are left, or even create some buffer against the intense isolation and dispersion of communities (which was definitely the vibe of Occupy encampments). The work of organizing in communities *can* increase the political culture, self-organization, and combativity of working class people, and this work can be based in community branches.

### **The weight and composition of a new Left**

If we take Brian’s suggestion to “think in terms of comrades’ strengths and real-life connections” and apply it to the organization, the question has to be how do we leverage what we already have to move into new areas and cast greater influence on the emerging left? In this way we need both to analyze the big picture and extrapolate from our real situation as a very, very small group of revolutionaries. Reading Brian’s document, the work of the public education fraction seems to be doing just that, but the pace seems to be inconsistent and frustrating (which it is everywhere); the document is heavy on the where we want to go and less on the how are we getting there besides incremental recruitment to the ISO.

But recruitment can’t be enough. We have to help promote a larger pool, not just for us to fish in, but because “the Left” has no legitimacy and very little recognition across the working class. Without creating some networks and spaces within communities where left ideas get a hearing and are part of the culture, we will not break through to a stronger working class.

A critical issue facing localities, especially urban areas, is gentrification. Gentrification is reinventing entire neighborhoods as gated playgrounds for the upper-middle class and rich. In cities like New York and San Francisco (and its little sister Oakland) displacement, rent gouging, and the whitening of whole swaths of the city are proceeding with shocking speed. Austerity in the public sphere and aggressive restructuring of neighborhoods go hand in hand. Public space is disappearing: parks, libraries, community centers, are all being slashed, privatized, or closed. Local branches can be places to assess, generalize, and participate in resistance to a struggle that is very much about specific neighborhoods.

And different neighborhoods experience neoliberalism differently, based in no small part based on the racial and national/linguistic composition of the population. Our mandate as local branches has to be the creation of political spaces and a broader left *in specific communities*, not just across a city. The organization has related to victims of police brutality and families facing deportation, which have helped establish us as part of the fabric of certain neighborhoods.

We have been grappling with what this means in New York City, where there is a Left, left institutions, left publications, conferences, departments etc, which we are helping to grow and broaden. But we also ultimately voted to reinstate local branches in the fall because there is an audience beyond those who will self-select to participate in the existing Left or city-wide activist struggles (it is a struggle to relate to both, and campuses, but this is our goal). One of the by-products of gentrification in New York has been the spatial dispersion of working class people into further reaches of the outer boroughs and surrounding areas. While this is true generally it has hit younger working class people particularly hard (including our own members), meaning neighborhood branches can be an entrance point whereas more city-wide events miss the more far-flung audience of the boroughs.

We need local branches to both assess our work building struggle and the left, and to attract radicalizing individuals toward the ISO specifically. In my own branch, Queens, NY, our ability to relate to one specific neighborhood has gone well on the first front, but has been much weaker on the second. The

Queens branch did some (by our standards) unorthodox experiments to assess “felt needs” particularly around a massive gentrification plan (including a survey of local immigrant small business owners along Queen’s Latin American equivalent of 125<sup>th</sup> Street in Harlem) that spurred a series of discussions within the branch and between members about who could fight gentrification, the balance of forces, the economic basis of a massive build-out in Queens, and what initiatives the Immigrant Rights fraction could take.

The success of their efforts put the branch in a new position: to assess who of this work is our audience, what kind of explicitly socialist meeting we want to build, future tactics, etc. Yes, it took months and it only now feels like we are gaining some coherence as a branch, but the patience has been worth learning about the unfolding destruction of immigrant businesses and enclaves and trying some new things out. One mistake we clearly made was not holding our own public meetings to attract those individuals in the neighborhood who are more radical and form a potential audience for Marxism. So while we have had a handful of street SW tablings, we have built coalition events or Manhattan based events, but not successfully identified the ISO’s local periphery.

Having collective issues that a group, if not all, of the branch encounters on some level provides us with cohesion and room to integrate new members. What has been less successful is when the branch has felt like spokes on a wheel, given that a larger number of comrades are also workplace activists with very different jobs/unions; or relate individually to other specific movements (solidarity with Greece and Colombia). Finding the common orientation and making space for political discussions helps enormously; reading Brian’s document he seems to envision a branch more as spokes reaching into disparate industries than a collective neighborhood project.

Engaging with the most local level of politics is bringing us into contact with forces we previously avoided but who represent the leadership of communities—which raises new political questions and demands a new skill set. (My knee-jerk reaction to surveying business owners was discomfort with focusing on non-workers, but the reality is that the small business owners are part of the fabric of a working class community, and face a decidedly racialized decimation under the wheels of real estate speculation. This is a necessary, but new, road for us.)

The scale of the attack and its push into some of the more stable, urban working class communities is creating new opportunities for political struggle in arenas previously dominated entirely by local Democrats and NGO-style “community organizations”. (A strange example is the Jackson Heights’ Beautification Committee’s desire to help with a petition campaign to get 50 union supermarket employees re-hired at a local store that changed hands in December.) I am by no means predicting their immediate demise, but space is forming under the intensity of the attack. In our anti-racist/criminal injustice work contact with local politicians has been part of our vocabulary, but it is a far from generalized experience.

Add into this mix the potential reemergence of third-party candidates, and you can begin to see how local terrain can crack open for more left-wing ideas. Again, in my own neighborhood, a Green candidate ran for City Council and came in second (of five) with 15% of the vote—the highest of any local candidate citywide. Without a local branch in Queens during the highpoint of the campaign in August-October, we weren’t able to actually endorse or relate to the younger progressives and radicals around the campaign.

This is to say that our opportunities will come in many shapes and sizes, as multi-faceted as the oppressions of the working class. Workplace sales and solidarity campaigns will make sense in some places, and more at some moments than others. There will come a moment when orienting on the workplace will take a much more dramatic portion of our focus and energy across the organization. But even then we shouldn’t ignore the full field of battle raging around us as working class resist all forms of injustice—economic and social.

Workplace struggles are not the only ones that can challenge the logic of capital, even if they are ultimately the cornerstone of ending its rule. Now is not the time to pull back from engaging with social issues and oppression to dig deeper roots within the working class.

**Amy M., NYC**

---

## **We've tried this before**

This document is a follow up from my earlier one (“Why have we stagnated?”) in Pre-Convention Bulletin #4.

### **A short summary of this document:**

We know, broadly speaking, how to put on public meetings with flair, organize splashier SW tablings, hold study groups about Marxist classics, and continue to push through the movement fractions. In fact, we've done this pretty well many times over the past five years. This political practice did not make us a larger organization, in the midst of an epochal crisis of capitalism that has driven mass resistance. Emphasizing those very same practices will render us less able to adapt and evolve into an organization that can grow in this period.

### **One-sided assessments of consciousness**

What I wrote in the “Perpetual radicalization” section was too one-sided an account of political developments in terms of ideas and sentiments. It is absolutely right that, writ large, the crisis, ensuing austerity attacks, and mass resistance (Arab Spring, Occupy, etc.) have made large numbers of people much more open to socialism. That said, it is also one-sided to, in the main, insist that the key dynamic right now is the “continuing working class radicalization,” as Alan M.'s document in Bulletin #1 does. For example, the IAM at Boeing surrendered pensions (and I don't think it was just the product of a sneakily-timed vote), while the Fight for 15 is reviving class struggle. There are many factors driving but also cutting against political radicalization. Tallying up pluses and minuses won't reveal the big dynamics, but my main point is that the continual emphasis on an ongoing radicalization is more a product of hope than of analysis.

### **Have our routines served us?**

Our organizational practices – branch meetings, SW tablings, education, dues, etc. – did not fall fully formed from heaven. They came from somewhere based on some thinking; they are historically derived. I appreciate the Renewal Faction's and Lee S.'s efforts to explain the history of our practices. I believe that we need some serious rethinking now, and here's why – those practices haven't actually expanded our organization over the past five years. That's why the main recommendations from Alan M.'s perspectives document are not compelling. I understand that the suggestions in his document are not proffered as a plan for qualitatively transforming the ISO; they are more of a best attempt to re-center the ISO in a disorienting period. I just don't think this particular re-centering will fix what ails us.

When the crisis hit, we took great advantage of the ideological opening with big meetings on Marxism. We put on amazing Socialism conferences every summer; we held huge Socialism 2009 and 2010 conferences in the Bay Area and Chicago; we hosted thousand-strong events with Howard Zinn and Arundhati Roy. We've had two successful regional fall conferences in the Bay in a row. We've been tabling, holding branch meetings (many even with flair!), paying dues, holding contact meetings, study groups, the whole nine years, with solid effort and some degree of success over the past five years. We have more individual members playing more prominent roles in particular movements and unions. I can't even list the series of key and often bitter struggles that we threw our weight into. Haymarket has exploded, and SW.org is a success. We jumped into Occupy, an anti-rich movement with a kind of class politics. The masses of Greece and Tunisia and Egypt helped make our case for us.

And yet, we are smaller as an organization? In response to the argument that this disappointing and confusing outcome is just a local Bay Area thing, I say: sure, the Bay Area had a nasty faction fight, and sure, we probably didn't have the perfect balance of party building and movements and theory and all that. But we seriously kicked ass over the past five years and got enough of those things right enough; we should hope to do as well over the next five years in terms of our political profile and vibrance. And the comrades

of this district are an impressive bunch (trust me). All of the ingredients were present and properly combined, the oven was warm, and yet the dough didn't rise.

New York and Chicago have grown some meaningful amount – that is particularly important because they are two key centers of American politics and economics. But the total experience of the organization is not growth, and we still spend an inordinate amount of time trying to revive our membership and our branch life.

Numerical increase is just one aspect of growth, and perhaps I discount too much the qualitative advances we've made. But too often we affirm our qualitative growth as a consolation prize for very little quantitative growth. In addition, part of our organizational outlook is that you can have a party of the best, most rooted, most steeled revolutionaries, but if they are too small in numbers, the reformists (or even bourgeois populists) will eat their lunch (or eat them for lunch). We prize and doggedly pursue each additional person we can recruit because those small gains increase our capacity in the present, and because we believe that each of those cadres can and will lead tens and hundreds of people in bigger moments to come. So yes, numerical increase matters. And it's very disconcerting that we haven't grown numerically in the recent period.

Clearly, our political practices do not strengthen and cohere our membership, and that's because, as a whole, they are out of sync with the political needs of the day, and they do not put our membership into an ongoing, practical political relationship to the world in a way that makes our *organization* essential, beyond our individual members.

#### **Facing the unknown vs. retreating to what we know**

Exhortations to do what we know how to do, just better and with more panache, are wholly inadequate. If we go down that road, we are likely to regain some political momentum, get some new people to our meetings, recruit a few, and then head straight back to political deflation because the new recruits will ask the same questions as many of our members do – what is it exactly that we're doing, and why is being in a socialist organization relevant to all that? And so we'll enter a new drift, branch meeting attendance will dry up, we'll start the next rounds of calls to “follow up” with comrades, and then try to reorient and focus ourselves by saying “all roads lead to Socialism 2014” or perhaps “to the fall regional conference.” And we'll wait for the next revival of movement. Perhaps this is the essence of life for a revolutionary organization. If so, let's say that.

We are not at the limits of our ability to sense and adapt to the changes that are plain to see around us. We will fail to do that if we insist that the routines and practices we've relied on for two decades (maybe longer?) are going to serve us well in the midst of a crisis and assault that is reshaping people's daily lives, in the midst of real changes in how people get information and interact with each other, in the midst of movements that are pretty new to us (Indignados, Movement of the Squares, Occupy). We need to both accommodate to some of these changes (mobile communications, dominance of web over print, video information streams) and counteract others (social dispersion, retreat from project of political power, shortening of attention span and depth of information, click-tivism).

I'm reminded of our “Let it Breathe” initiative. The plan was to enable new leadership to emerge within our organization and in our branches in particular, as well as to enable more experienced members to lead in movements, writing, etc. The hope was that this new and generally younger leadership would carry and incorporate the experiences, methods, and lessons of the youth and student radicalization, thereby helping the ISO evolve with the times. In retrospect, we did a good job bringing newer people into leadership, but we didn't succeed in updating our political practice much.

#### **What to do?**

It feels as though there is an organizational evolution before us, perhaps even a leap. Let's not shy away from it and hope that reciting what we know will revive our organization. Let's face that unknown, acknowledge that we need a new approach to political practice, and let it rip. I am not in favor of

abandoning all of our political routines. I am in favor of inviting discussion on what aspects of our political activity are dead weight; what ways have people done something rather out of line with our political practice that has worked; what ways do other grassroots organizations we're a part of conduct themselves that seem to work; what else do people want to try?

I admit that this is hopelessly vague at this point, but as one comrade related to me: "I'm not sure I would even know what we could do differently." I certainly cannot come up with a new organizational practice myself, and it won't happen all at once anyways. All I can say is that putting all the focus on what we know – branch meetings, SW tablings, study groups, etc. – will stifle the possibility of collectively producing a new practice. Therefore, my *main recommendation* is to openly acknowledge that we're facing an impasse in becoming the organization we want to be, and to invite a wide-ranging inquiry and debate about our organizational practices with an eye towards responding to changes in the world around us.

Comrades here are frustrated that I have very few specifics to offer at this time. I can't come up with this by myself. But I'll offer some meager brainstorming at this point. We face the pull of atomization in our work, our housing, our social interactions. We see a retreat from the general political project of taking power, a retreat from grand narratives, into silo-d struggles, single-issue activism, and even more isolating click-tivism and outrage/call-out politics on Facebook. Petitions, which used to be some form of face-to-face political interaction, are increasingly online and individual efforts.

Our project is distinctly collective and social – the construction of a political organization (and party) based in the working class, with a regular and vibrant collective political life. So we must counteract atomization and reassert the social. Where possible, no more tiny fractions, no more tiny branchlets. Branch meetings, our collective political space, should happen more often (and be shorter to enable that). Perhaps one meeting per week would have the regular form with a structured agenda; the other weekly branch meeting should be an informal and unstructured discussion space.

We should engage in more activity as a branch whole and not as tiny fractions or individual representatives. We should have larger presences at external meetings (given that we won't overwhelm them); our contact work should be as collective as possible (phone banking together, meeting in larger groups). We should do publicity collectively – don't ask people to flyer on their own in their neighborhood, but get several people together to hit that neighborhood as a joint project. No tiny SW tablings. Perhaps we need more collaborative writing and intellectual production as well. We should tend towards larger branches, and tend towards more regularized activity at the district level.

These half-baked suggestions just scratch the surface. There are other more important dynamics – tectonic shifts in the global economy, changes in the structure and composition of the working class, changes in international power relations, changes in mainstream political organizations here in the U.S., etc. - what we should conclude about our political practice on these bases is a harder and even more valuable question.

### **Conclusion**

It seems that most of my comrades in the Bay Area are responding positively to the proposals to re-emphasize branch meetings, SW tablings, education, our core routines. (We've had numerous branch discussions and votes about doing exactly this over the last year or two, but perhaps it'll be different this time.) I do not doubt at all that we can come up with a solid series of events and priorities, and maybe even revive some of our core organizational practices, and that we can do all that with gusto for a certain period of time. I'm just no longer confident that this course will make us a bigger and more influential organization. I hope I'm wrong; the last five years tell me I might be right.

**Sid P., Bay Area**

---

## Activating the union membership

This document is to agree and extend some of the arguments that Dana B. made in her Leading the Labor movement document. Specifically, I appreciated the Key point #2 and the "one size fits all" explanation. The questions laid out helped me better understand the next steps for my union organizing in a suburban district that does not have an established left or (an acknowledged) history of social justice union activism.

The starting points that Dana laid out for unions in general are the same (the need to rethink rank and file strategy and the role of elected leadership positions), but there is a serious concern about how best to orient ourselves towards a relatively nervous/hostile/complacent leadership that is afraid to "rock the boat". Part of this has to do with the older generation of union leaders training the newer leaders on how to act as the sitting president/ executive board. This older generation of leadership sees the importance of the union, but is seeped in their commitment to the service model and working themselves up the ladder of statewide branches of the union (CTA: California Teachers' Association). While the newer generation of leaders were positive about the Chicago Teachers' strike and the Seattle test boycott, there was no training from the older generation of union activists on how best to move forward to support these actions or apply any of these ideas to our own union activities.

The best way forward in this case, I would argue, would be organizing at the site level, then finding other activists in the union outside of that site that are willing to push the union towards a rank and file strategy. From there, we need to think about the way to work with union leadership that activates the membership-learning from the Chicago teachers. For example, over the last 2 years in Fremont, we have a core group of 7 folks from 4 different sites in our union that basically agree that there needs to be a change of direction that is more focused on activating our members (the rank and file). During bargaining last year, this group played a key role within the Organizing committee of our union in activating sites out to different events as well as having break out sessions during rep council to talk with one another so that we can hear what works at different sites and figure out which sites need help activating their members. When the President was termed out in June, the group was dissolved because the in-coming President would choose the chairs of committees. Unfortunately, all of the members have been asked to play different roles in the union because of our effectiveness in organizing. This has meant that there is no organizing team actively engaging the rank and file. While this core group of 7 still meets and corresponds on a monthly basis, we are not able to help organize events our union endorses because of our new role. There is a sense within the group that either the new leadership does not know how best to use the strength of our group (because of timidity and inexperience) or they did not want us to continue the strategy of activating the membership.

Our union leadership is not really planning to activate folks to the Karen Lewis event in March Organized by the Berkeley Federation of Teachers and the Oakland Education Association which our representative council voted to endorse overwhelmingly. While the endorsement is important for solidarity with other unions in the area, Fremont has no plan to organize our own teachers to the event. We (the 7 teacher activists) plan to meet with each other to help the union develop a plan to sell tickets to this event and get people out to Berkeley. From there, Karen Lewis' talk will certainly raise questions about the next way forward for unions to take on corporate ed reform as well as how to organize contract campaigns- 2 things that we are thoroughly unprepared for in our union.

Some questions that have been raised from the group of union activists are:

1. Is it useful for our group to figure out our place in the union or should we continue to encourage the union to activate the membership without having any real say in the matter?
2. What would "encouraging the union to activate the membership without having any real say in the matter" look like?

**John G., Oakland, CA**

---

## Theory and Practice: the centrality of anti-black racism and social reproduction

"a basic fundamental understanding, a clear understanding (within the limitations of the party and the objective situation), a clear historical and theoretical grasp of perspectives is the only cure for those difficulties that are bound to arise, and if they don't turn up today, they are bound to turn up tomorrow. Because we are not creating them. It is the tremendous power of bourgeois society which tries to stop and tries to prevent a complete coordination and pushes itself into the party at all times. That is what is taking place. It is an aspect of the struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletarian movement. And we have to learn to meet it in a proletarian way." - C.L.R. James, *The Revolutionary Answer to the Negro Problem in the U.S.*, July 1948

### Objectives

1. Encourage further debate and discussion on the theory *and* practice of social reproduction.
2. Provide some insights about the historical relationship between party-building organization, labor movement and social struggles.

### \*Questions for SC (and ISO members) at end of document\*

### Suggested links (cited in document)

1. C.L.R. James: *The Revolutionary Answer to the Negro Problem in the U.S.*, July 1948  
<http://www.marxists.org/archive/james-clr/works/1948/07/meyer.htm>
2. David McNally, *Labour-Power and Social Reproduction: From Capital to the Current Crisis*.  
<http://wearemany.org/v/labour-power-and-social-reproduction>

---

**The significance of our comrades' work, Sharon Smith and Tithi Bhattacharya, should *not* be underestimated -- it is *central* to the ISO's development, both in theory and practice.**

### I. CTU Strike: Social Reproduction Theory in Practice

At the 2012 Historical Materialism conference David McNally gave a talk on *Labour-Power and Social Reproduction: From Capital to the Current Crisis*. (I highly recommend watching the full video (<http://wearemany.org/v/labour-power-and-social-reproduction>)).

McNally argued:

“Every crisis in the reproduction of capital is simultaneously a crisis in the reproduction of labor power [both paid and unpaid, not limited to domestic labor] ... struggles over the reproduction of labor power that are at heart of the current crisis... [is] about wage struggles and struggles over the social wage, struggles over the human practices that are involved in social reproduction.

...on the radical left we need to be using the CTU strike as an example.

- Workforce: 87% female, 50% African American and Latino/a
- Waged an effective strike, because a group of left oriented rank and file activist teachers for years have done work in the communities beyond the workplace fighting school closures in poor working class African American and Latino communities. When they won electoral leadership of their union -- they had a social base so when they struck back against austerity they could mobilize communities.

The CTU Strike shows us something about what it means to link the struggles over social reproduction, in terms of both wage struggles and workplace struggles and the wider community struggles.

We need to begin to develop both our theoretical apparatus for understanding the struggles over social reproduction in this era crisis and austerity AND to begin to develop richer accounts of what successful resistance to austerity can look like, in which the struggles over social reproduction become central to our understanding of what we mean by class struggle today.”

**Suggestion for SC:**

1. Edit ISO study guide; add recent readings/videos to *Women Oppression and Women's Liberation reading list*:
  - 1) Black Feminism and Intersectionality (wearemany)
  - 2) Labor power and Social Reproduction: From Capital to the Current Crisis, David
  - 3) McNally (wearemany)
  - 4) Theorizing Women's Oppression Part 1&2 (ISR)
  - 5) Explaining Gender Violence in the Neoliberal Era (ISR)

**II. Lessons & Connections: C.L.R. James**

Excerpt from *The Revolutionary Answer to the Negro Problem in the U.S.*, July 1948.

[*The report published below was delivered by Comrade Meyers in presenting the draft resolution on the Negro Question to the Thirteenth Convention of the Socialist Workers Party, July 1-5, 1948.* – Ed.]

***The Case of Negro Women:***

**Now there we have a movement, essentially proletarian, proletarianized Negroes, Negroes who are part of the organized labor movement and who dominate the Negro community.**

Here it would *seem* is a place where the independent Negro movement should play a strictly subordinate role. But history takes its own course.

Let us look at what happened in Detroit in 1943.

**The struggle began over the Sojourner Truth housing development for Negroes.** Isn't that so? It continued by the activity and hostility of the Negro people to being pushed around, and finally the general dissatisfaction burst out in the rioting.

At this stage the organized labor movement had to intervene; absolutely had to intervene. In other words, owing to the activity and conflict of the Negro people, the proletariat begins to get some education in its responsibilities not only for the demands and needs of labor, but for other sections of the population. But it didn't stay there, it didn't stay there.

***Beginnings of a Great Alliance:***

The movement has fallen off since, but we have seen enough to know this: *That the struggle which began by Negro militants in the Negro community fighting purely for Negro rights – a simple matter of housing, and resisting people who pushed them around, resulted ultimately in – let us put it mildly – the beginnings of an alliance, a political alliance between the Negro community and the organized labor movement in Detroit.*

If we can reflect on that, if we can constantly be on the alert to see these possibilities, the leadership, the fundamental leadership that organized labor can give to the Negro movement, the basic dependence of the Negro movement upon organized labor; but we can at the same time see the kind of leadership, the kind of stimulus, the kind of impetus, the kind of anticipation that *the Negro Movement can give* to organized labor, then we shall be able to deal with all problems, not

only the general problems outside, but the specific problems that the party will have to face.

the task, consciously and deliberately to transform itself from a propaganda group (that is to say, a group that more or less puts over the whole program), into a mass party, in other words, a party which would draw workers not on the basis of general socialist conceptions, but on the basis of concrete activity and readiness to help them on basic problems that were immediately troubling them and which, as far as they could see, required, if not an immediate solution, at least immediate activity.

***Recent Party Experiences:***

Now the fact remains that a great number of Negroes who came into the party left. First of all, the most fundamental reason which has been given to me and which I see no reason to disagree with, is that the party was not quite ready to handle these tremendous problems. It could handle a specific case like the Fontana case. It could handle a case like the Hickman case and carry it through to a brilliant conclusion. But the actual day-today struggles against the bourgeoisie, and the Negro organizations, and the inertia of the labor movement, we simply were not powerful enough to handle.

**If the vitality of the independent Negro movement depends in the last analysis upon the power and response of the proletariat, then life and activity, the strength of the party's Negro work must depend also – American society being what it is – upon the strength the party has in the organized labor movement and as a Marxist organization.**

It is impossible to be able to do Negro work in the sense that the party at this stage wants to do it, in mass activity, meeting the demands of the Negroes, transformation from a propaganda organization to a mass party, without great strength and power in the organized labor movement. I have been told that the best work has been done and the best Negro cadres have remained where our party *was strongest in the labor movement*. That must guide us in the coming period.

And, not at all to be forgotten, I am informed that the party didn't have trained, experienced personnel to be able to lead this work in the way that it should be done. So that we have been more successful with the Negro comrades in the unions, who could work in one of our fractions in the labor movement. That is good, but it is not sufficient.

...we go into those movements, into that movement, as we go into all others, as revolutionists.

**I have been talking to one or two Negro comrades, not as many as possible but I have been talking to some and one of them says that he gets an impression that this insistence upon the significance of the Negro struggle for democratic rights gives him the feeling that when we go into the Negro movement, we may go there concerned only with a democratic program, when in reality, he says, there are many Negro militants who want Marxism.** We can assure you that in saying many Negro militants want Marxism he is absolutely correct. We go there as revolutionists seeking to make those organizations into class organizations, seeking to inculcate proletarian methods of struggle, seeking to clear out the petty-bourgeois reformist leadership and substitute the leadership of organized labor or of revolutionary militants. But we do more than that.

**...it is absolutely imperative that we carry into those Negro organizations the fundamental doctrines of Marxism not only on the Negro question but on all the political questions of the day.**

**III. Questions/Suggestions:**

1. Should new/small ISO branches commit to leadership in long term campaigns/org? Or, prioritize political development of branch and initiate/participate in solidarity actions?

*Note on solidarity actions:* we need to think of new creative ways to do solidarity work, beyond one-off

events/protests -- *social reproduction theory can be a useful tool to brainstorm*

2. Should large branches/districts consolidate movement work efforts by committing to a couple campaigns/org.? This could allow ISO to play a more influential role in movements, rather than dividing up resources and participating in multiple movements.

3. How can ISO national/regional provide political direction and guidance for new branches involved in movement work *without* regional coord. and cadre? (*this is especially an recurring issue for comrades in the South -- political education has been our compass*).

Ex. "Movement study guides" may be useful for new branches -- branch/fraction can use study guide to assist comrades in organizing and assessing their movement work.

(*Although there's not one specific set of readings for movement work, a general study guide can serve as a resource for new comrades, especially for branch assessments and discussions about movement work*).

4. Assessments (in relation to Eric. R document): New branches without cadre aren't experienced on how to politically motivate and guide assessments -- this often results in lack of or inaccurate analysis of branch work and the same mistakes happen over and over again, which ends up translating into a general frustration and demoralization amongst membership. An "assessment guideline" (to be added to toolkit) could be useful for small branches. This could simply be a list of questions.

**Lauren B., Gainesville**

---

Documents with Resolutions

---

## Response to the ISO Renewal Faction document

I read ISO Renewal Committee's document ("Proposed Amendments to ISO Rules Proposal from Rules Commission," Preconvention Bulletin #15). First, as one who does not spend 10 hours a day on Facebook or related media, I don't feel I'm in any position of judging whether Shaun J, Vanessa B, or any other member subjected to disciplinary measures, were actually worthy of those measures.

Second, I have found Shaun J's past Pre-Convention documents to be expressing a bizarre, conspiratorial-bent towards our leadership. That said, I supported - and would continue to support if he was a member - his right to say what he wants (so long as it's done in a respectful manner). But rather than sticking around in the organization, he's apparently joined the "rebels without a cause" who are resigned to, I suppose, be socialists organizing their house pets into a union. I submit those comrades who resign and then start a blog (or the like) to trash the ISO and/or its leadership are making it clear they know little about the concept of Democratic Centralism. All the more shameful for those who were in the ISO for 5-7+ years - one wonders whether they were actually drinking-in the ISO's politics, or rather whether they were swishing it around their mouth just to get a taste only to spit it out.

Third, while comrades in the "Renewal Faction" propose reading more about Trotsky's "Transitional Program" (which I don't necessarily have a problem with), I think they - and we - could benefit from reading more about the concept of Democratic Centralism. A good starting point would be the Steering Committee's '08 Pre-Convention document (#1), "Leninism and Democratic Centralism." (For those who want the back copy e-mailed to them, let me know: [ivanblivsky@hotmail.com](mailto:ivanblivsky@hotmail.com)).

This is not tongue-in-cheek here. I actually believe the comrades in the "Renewal Faction," following Shaun J's line, are really just "criticizing for the sake of criticism" and have no real agenda - thus the disconnect between their criticisms and their supposed solutions. They are putting forth lines which are profoundly distrustful of leadership in general (not just the current Steering Committee) and are setting forth fundamentally anti-Leninist sentiments. My argument is not that such comrades should be expelled from the organization for such thinking - my argument instead is that we, as an organization, must do a

better job educating our membership on what "Leninism & Democratic Centralism" means.

Fourth, in reading through the ISO Renewal document, I kept finding myself waiting for the punch line. In a nutshell, it seems their major critique - and their basis for separating themselves off in a separate "faction" - is: "The Steering Committee has been overly optimistic, while we choose to be relatively pessimistic." I submit these comrades would do themselves better by sitting down with the book "Lenin Rediscovered: What is to be Done in Context." Lenin was, if nothing else, a continual optimist when it came to the working class. While arguably the ISO's Perspectives over the last few years have been overly-optimistic, I don't share the implicit conclusion of the "Renewal Faction" that it's because our Steering Committee is actually out to sabotage the organization (to what end, I have no idea - perhaps our entire Steering Committee are secretly NSA agents - hey, it's possible - how many of us REALLY know any one of them?).

Fifth, I actually don't have much of a problem with their suggestions - though I don't actually see how they solve the problems they subjectively see with the organization. That said, I find it profoundly ironic that they accuse our organization of having anti-democratic structures, yet in the rules of their faction, propose even more anti-democratic measures: (a) to join the faction, I'd have to agree with everything they said so far - and can't write anything disagreeing with them in the future, (b) the Faction is governed by an (apparently) unelected & unaccountable National leadership, who is empowered with both admitting & removing people from the faction with no apparent due process measures, (c) even if everyone else in the Faction believes in its worthiness, the National leadership can dissolve the entire faction without any (apparent) vote or even input of its membership. Wow.

Sixth, I do have constructive suggestions for moving forward. One theme I've noticed amongst the dissenters is that the complaint process needs an "airing out." In other words, we need to take further steps to ensure our members, whether they be the Shaun J's of the world, or whoever, are accorded the utmost due process when facing discipline. I reiterate that we should not give our own members less due process than the criminal system of injustice gives to the working class. I submit we need to invoke solid structures now while our group is relatively small, rather than wait to think about such things when our group contains 5,000, 10,000 or more. Thus, while I agree with the proposed changes to the ISO Rules, I submit we need to think more along the lines of formalizing the process. We need to institute a formal complaint form as well as a "charges" form, both of which would be posted on an internal website accessible to members via password. This way no complaints will be made against other members "in secret" nor will disciplinary charges be made against members without any ISO members being able to see for themselves what the charges are. Additionally, any disciplinary proceedings must be tape-recorded, and the recordings likewise accessible to the membership. Finally, decisions of discipline after such hearings need to be typed on a "Decision" form, with the details as to the reasons discipline was warranted - or not. Again this should be accessible to the membership - but any of these forms or recording may be "sealed" (or made private) if the charges involve such issues as sexual misconduct. This is not an exhaustive list - and should not be counterposed to suggestions I made last year.

Seventh, my formal proposal is to have a specific, formal rule barring members from posting internal documents online. There are obvious security risks with our information being released - not only law enforcement but also rival organizations. One can certainly argue that the NSA can access our e-mails anyway, and that's probably true. That said, entities such as the NYPD do not have the same resources as the NSA - and we shouldn't be making their job easy for them. Moreover, rival organizations seemingly exist just to make the ISO look bad - they'll leave no stone unturned in twisting any statement out of context just to bury us. Let's not make their job easier either.

There are also some members - myself included - which do not necessarily want their name "out there." Whether members' names are released to the public as socialists or members of the ISO should be their choice.

Finally, even if names aren't used, some arguments and debates need to be held internally - especially when assessing other groups or movements. This is not a matter of "we want freedom to talk about people behind their backs" - but instead a recognition that merely because one (or some) members think negatively about a particular group or movement doesn't mean that's the assessment of the ISO as a whole. But if the

statement(s) are released to the public, it can be taken that way.

I'm quite sure there are many others reasons for keeping "internal" discussions non-public. This is not an attempt to stifle debate - there remains way too many avenues for people to debate things in public (SW Readers' Views, Blogs, Facebook, etc.). But one or a few members should not have the authority to decide for themselves - as well as everyone else in the group - which communications labeled "internal" are really meant to remain internal - and which of those can be aired out in public. This is a group decision.

**PROPOSAL:**

ISO Communications (including but not limited to Convention Documents & ISO Notes) labeled "internal" or "members only" (or some substantially similar label) should not be re-published, in whole or in part, in any non-ISO forum, including but not limited to social media or blogs, without permission of the particular document's author.

**David B., Harlem/Uptown, NYC**

---