

## **Response to the Melbourne Branches Expulsion Report.**

**By James Crafti [james\\_crafti@yahoo.com.au](mailto:james_crafti@yahoo.com.au)**

- 1. Introduction page 1**
- 2. Trial process page 2**
- 3. On the process of charging me page 3**
- 4. On the charges against me page 5**
- 5. Conclusion page 16**
- 6. Appendices page 17**

### **Introduction**

On May 10, I received formal charges against myself from the Melbourne Branch Executive of Resistance. These charges are being presented to the Resistance National Committee on May 18. Below is my written defense statement in relation to the charges along with several appendices. While I give a rather thorough defense of my actions I regret in many respects the level of minute detail I need to go into in order defend myself against these charges.

The charges are on the most part administrative and petty, and despite best efforts to politically engage with the root issues, I fear that I need to respond to some of their ‘legalese’ to an extent. The charges are on the whole attempts to bureaucratically rather than politically deal with the fact that I have political differences with the Democratic Socialist Perspective (DSP). I resigned from the DSP in 2007 after having been in the Leninist Party Faction (LPF). My expulsion from Resistance comes shortly after the expulsion of LPF comrades (for details see [www.lpf.org.au](http://www.lpf.org.au)). However this is the end of a long road in which the DSP has sought to marginalize those with dissenting views rather than building political consensus and unity. Having marginalised the ISO and the smaller affiliates in Socialist Alliance, the DSP alienated the Non-Aligned Caucus which represented what was left of the independent leaders in Socialist Alliance. Having stuck the boot into any broader Socialist Alliance layers, the DSP turned its focus on the significant minority of DSP members who raised political differences over the DSP’s

orientation to the Socialist Alliance. Now having expelled the LPF, the DSP turns on young Resistance members like myself who have raised disagreements publicly.

Resistance has historically served a different function to the DSP. While the DSP is a cadre party consisting of members who agree with the program and constitution of the DSP, Resistance is supposed to be a much looser organisation of people not necessarily convinced of the positions of the DSP. However, having failed to keep me quiet, the DSP youth cadre have sought to enforce administratively norms out of keeping with and unconstitutional in the youth organisation Resistance. Further I have recently been informed that I don't even have the right to attend my own trial. According to Trent Hawkings "as outlined in the constitution you can request an oral submission of your report to the NC. This does not mean you can listen to the investigating commission's report and the discussion. You will be logged on [to paltalk a online meeting program] when it is time to make your submission, and logged off after you have given it." Sure there is no formal right for me to hear the report in the constitution, however this is just one more sign of the degeneration of the DSP spilling over into Resistance, in that they are no longer confident enough in their political positions to have me be able to directly respond to my accusers (something even allowed in bourgeois democracy). All that being said, here is my report. I apologise for any spelling or grammatical errors as I have only had 3 days to write this report in order that the Resistance NC has time to read and think it over before voting on the charges:

### **Trial Process.**

I ask that I be able to give an oral submission to the Resistance National Council. I request the right to give a 1 hour refutation of the charges with 10 minutes devoted to the problems regarding the process in which the charges took place and 50 minutes devoted to the charges themselves.

I ask that I be able to give an oral submission on the process by which the charges have been handled first and that be voted on before proceeding to the charges themselves, as

obviously the NC finding the investigation improperly conducted would nullify the charges themselves and a new investigation would have to take place.

While I realize that comrades may feel an hour is a long time, I respectfully remind the NC that the recommendation of an expulsion is a serious one that cannot be taken lightly. In my 9 years as a Resistance member, I have not seen a single member of Resistance expelled and I am not aware of another example prior to that. Certainly given the fact that I have given Resistance 9 years of dedication, the NC can indulge me an hour. Further, I have been informed by Trent that I am not able to neither witness nor respond to the charges against me. This seems like an incredibly bureaucratic maneuver which will inhibit the NC from receiving the other side of the equation. Given that the only people from Melbourne at the NC will be those who have presented the charges, my word wont even be presented against theirs, inhibiting the Resistance NC from making an informed position. Therefore I ask that such a maneuver be overruled.

### **On the process of charging me:**

On April 22 I received a "Notice of Formal Charges" from the Melbourne Resistance Branch Executive. The Melbourne Executive informed me that as of April 9 they had "ratified these charges" i.e. voted that they agreed with them although no specific charges were given in this letter. Instead I was informed that whatever these charges were, the exec "are now further investigating the charges and what specific aspects of the constitution you have violated." The letter went on to blame me for several things (which I will go into when discussing the content of the charges).

I sent a query to the Branch Executive asking how they could have ratified (these unspecified charges):

- “1. without an investigation
2. without you knowing "what specific aspects of the constitution [I] have violated."

I pointed out that the “The investigation team needs to be elected by a national body and I would suggest given your already declared bias that such an investigation team does not include any Melbourne executive members. I also ask given the position of guilt already adopted pre trial by the Melbourne Executive that the NE secretariat deems the investigation by the Melbourne executive as improper as can be done under Section 6: Rule 9 of the constitution.”

However Trent felt it totally kosher to have the Branch Executive respond to my pointing out of the Branch Executive’s bias saying “There is no presumption of guilt; rather the executive will go through a process of accumulating all the necessary information and make a recommendation to the NC meeting.”

Of course, as I pointed out in my previous letter and in my follow up letter to Trent, there is a contradiction between ratifying the charges on one hand and claiming there was no presumption of guilt on the other. After quoting the branch executive’s original letter, I went on to write:

“One could possibly accept this as a typo or an indication that the exec didn't know what the word ratified means. This would be possible if the letter didn't continue to outline the execs belief in my guilt. The exec's position is indicated several times i.e. *"It is the opinion of the Melbourne Branch executive* [my emphasis] that you have continued, in defiance of the requests by the National Secretariat, to publicly attack the DSP" and *"we believe* [my emphasis] it is not your desire to engage in a comradely internal political discussion" and "Based on the evidence we have received [and I still don't have] *we believe* [my emphasis] you are unwilling to act in the interests of building Resistance" and *"We do not believe* you are willing to act as a loyal Resistance member." I am sorry but based on all these statements from the executive signed by the executive *I do not believe* that "There is no presumption of guilt." How could I possibly believe otherwise?”

The investigating committee was clearly biased (and acknowledged its bias). This bias can be further seen in the investigation document which refers only to sections of correspondence which (taken out of context) point to my guilt, and ignores all further explanations by me. As such, it is now incumbent upon me to provide the correspondence in full to give comrades a fairer overview of the situation (see appendix). While the investigating committee “considers it inappropriate for James C to send an email to, and seek a meeting with, member of the investigating commission, Atsuko N, to garner her support.” There is no comment made regarding the fact that the person who placed the charges, Trent Hawkings, is able to persuade the investigating committee by the fact that he is actually on the committee and the person presenting the charges to the NC. Trent had convinced all of them on April 9 (weeks before I received notification that the charges even existed) that I was guilty. Further, he managed to convince them without a single one of them speaking to me to hear my side. So if we want to talk about interference I think that the Branch Executive and Trent in particular has perverted this whole process.

As requested in two previous e-mails to the NE secretariat and the NE, I now ask the NC to dismiss the investigation team under Section 6: Rule 9 of the constitution and if the NC wishes go through a proper investigation to assess the validity of any charges.

**On the charges against me:**

The investigating body has accused me of breaching the constitution. The charges cite part of the introduction to the constitution which states “We aim to mobilise and organise young people fighting against the system and to train young radical activists who want to participate in the revolutionary movement.” I could go one step further and put the actual aim as stated in the constitution (rather than the preamble) "the aims of Resistance are to help bring into being a socially equal, democratic and ecologically sustainable socialist

world, and to organise, educate, and mobilise young people to this end." But how does that relate to my actions?

According to the charges "It appears that James C's statements to these people [Kate and Laura] and the manner in which he raised his concerns has impacted on our ability to recruit new members and train them." Really??? I have been the comrade working closest with both Laura and Kate, helping train them in movement work (more than any other Resistance member). I therefore find it ridiculous to allege that I have been undermining their training. I worked with Laura to set up Students for Palestine (SFP), a example of non-sectarian united front work. Further I was the person who actually introduced Laura to Resistance after meeting her at an Australian Friends of Palestine (AFP) film screening. Likewise I have been assisting Kate in trying to organise a Palestine film screening at Deakin. My actions seem a strange way of trying to undermine the training of these "young radical activists"

Trent blames me because he "spoke to Laura again recently about writing a GLW article. She stated concern that the article might be censored. She said her concern was based on "what is happening with James." Sure Laura is concerned and she has the right to be, but her concern is not with me but with Trent and the Branch Executive. It wasn't my actions that Laura objects to, it was this sham trial. After receiving my charges I notified Laura because she was referred to in them. My e-mail was straight to the point and did not seek to persuade her. All I wrote was "I thought you may be interested in seeing Trent's report. It mentions you." Without prompting Laura's position, she responded (English not being her native tongue) by writing:

"James it seems to live in a post-soviet autocratic society... You should write a short tragi-comedy on it (I don't know if it's a word in English, but I guess you understand the idea of it)

Does Resistance (ot Trent) live in a psychic mental status of the Maoist cultural revolution kind??

that's funny, isn't it? How can people waste time and resources for such an investigation?? Anyway, I didn't imagine that everytime I met Trent I was under interrogation..... it was less expected than when the investigatory police came to search my flat in Italy...my friend bewared me on their possible arrival....so we took some (unfortunately not all) precautions....but Trent case is really ridiculous.....”

It should be further pointed out that unlike Trent who used everything Laura said (including casual conversation) as part of his interrogation against me without her permission, any citing of Laura here I do with her express permission.

I am not the one putting Laura off Resistance. Trent and his witch hunt are doing that. Blaming me for revealing the actions of Trent and the Melbourne Branch leadership is like blaming Mordechai Vanunu for Israel losing support after exposing their nuclear weapons program or like blaming Andrew Wilki for revealing that Australia knew there were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. Frankly, the Resistance NC should condemn this witch-hunt against me as a way of trying to remove the taint on this organisation made by the Branch Executive. It isn't my actions that will push these comrades away, it is those of the Melbourne leadership. If the actions of the Melbourne Branch executive weren't so disgusting, then it should be easy for the 5 of them to convince Laura otherwise. They aren't.

But apart from communicating with Laura about this witch hunt, all of my criticisms were not of Resistance but the DSP. Trent tries to fudge this by saying “At the time Laura did not understand the differences and relationship between Resistance and the DSP,” but really what does that mean? Maybe I should hide my criticisms of the US government because someone might confuse them with US people? Maybe we should make sure that comrades don't attack Zionism because people may see it as an attack on Judaism? Resistance is an independent youth organisation, it is NOT the same thing as the DSP (despite attempts by people like Trent to enforce DSP style norms).

Why am I not allowed to criticise the DSP? Trent quotes Brianna's letter to me on behalf of the NE secretariat which states "[a]s outlined in the Resistance Constitution, Resistance is in political solidarity with the Democratic Socialist Perspective (DSP), particularly it states: 'we [Resistance] work with and aim to build the DSP'.... [a]ny further public attacks on the DSP will be seen as a breach of the Resistance constitution." But he fails to mention my query of this at the time. I wrote:

As for the charge of my breaching the Resistance constitution I reject this outright and ask the NE secretariat quote which sections of my posts they feel are in breach and *explain how*. I would request a copy of the Resistance constitution (as I have an older copy), but my understanding is that the preamble of the Resistance constitution was changed to remove reference to the Democratic Socialist Party and replace it with Socialist Alliance. Even if it is still in there (which I doubt) having something in the preamble of a constitution is not the same as having it in the constitution. A preamble isn't a rule and the NE secretariat can't turn it into one.

Briana in her follow up letter doesn't clarify what is actually in the Resistance constitution her only mention of it to say, "The Resistance secretariat is currently in the process of updating the printed version of the Resistance constitution." Briana does not actually clarify whose memory of this unprinted constitution is correct. I seriously doubt the Branch Executive investigating me even bothered to read the old Conference minutes to find out how the amended constitution actually reads (the latest printed copy I found was from 2001). It was more convenient for them to quote Briana's misquoting of the constitution than to actually bother to read the minutes of previous conferences to see how the current constitution reads.

The false constitutional evidence including the bit at the end of Briana's letter saying "Any further public attacks on the DSP will be seen as a breach of the Resistance constitution" is being used exactly as I expected it to be used back then. Back then I



stated that it was a charge of the lowest order as stated in the constitution “warning against repetition of violation.” I pointed out that I should be investigated back then, precisely because a failure to investigate the invalidity of the NE secretariats charge could be compounded by my later and equally legitimate actions. Because they didn’t prove through the proper democratic channels that I was in breach of the constitution last time, they can hardly expect me to take that previous warning seriously.

Further in responding to Briana, I cited the DSP’s own youth work pamphlet in particular a quote from Trotsky:

“The Spartacist League while claiming to support "organisation independence for their Spartacist Youth League (in the United States ), nevertheless insist that it be constitutionally and politically subordinate to the party, which denies the youth its own independent role. According to the Spartacists this was the Bolsheviks view.

But Trotsky himself disagreed with these attitudes towards the youth (as did Lenin and the Bolsheviks) and he said:

*It is clear that the youth cannot replace the party but that does not mean that we have the technical possibility of prohibiting the youth from trying to replace the party in every case where the youth think they find the party following a bad line. We cannot establish with one blow or with one resolution [or one threatening letter -ed.] the authority of the party."*

I went on to conclude from that “This is not a Bolshevik method but as the DSP pamphlet points out a Spartacist method.”

Trotsky warned against resolution (and I am sure he would be even more weary of expulsion), which sees the youth being punished for their criticisms of the party line. Trent claims it is one of Resistance’s aims to build the DSP.

We should be clear that an introduction is not the same as the constitution. Anyone doing constitutional law will tell you that a preamble lacks any weight. The only organisational “aims” which can and should be enforced are those which are actually *in* the constitution under the very clear heading “Aims,” This section reads in its entirety “the aims of Resistance are to help bring into being a socially equal, democratic and ecologically sustainable socialist world, and to organise, educate, and mobilise young people to this end.” That is it! If the Branch Executive think Resistance should change its constitution to add building the DSP as a constitutional aim, they can argue that at Congress. However I would argue against this, as making it a constitutional aim turns it into a requirement of being a member of Resistance. As I quoted from an unchanged part of the constitution “Membership of Resistance is open to *anyone* [my emphasis] of the age of 26 and under who supports the aims of Resistance and who pays the joining fee.” There is actually a political reason why building the DSP is not a requirement for being a member of Resistance. If new people who joined Resistance had to agree with building the DSP you can kiss goodbye to any perception of Resistance as broad Socialist Youth Organisation. Resistance members aren’t bound to support the positions of the DSP. This is made even more clearer in the DSP constitution which I pointed out in a response to Trent “in the final paragraph of the DSP constitution which states that DSP members in Resistance will seek to "win them [non-DSP Resistance members] to the party on the basis of the party's Program and Constitution.” This statement would be pointless if Resistance members were already convinced by the DSP (so much so that they actually want to build it).

Resistance is (or at least should be) a much looser organisation than the DSP. To prove my disloyalty Trent quotes my letter to him where I state:

““it seems odd that you tell me I need to "bring all proposals for *our* work to branch meetings where we can democratically decide on what course of action to take given our available resources" which would be true except for the fact that I haven't asked for a single resource from Resistance, the only resources I have committed are my own which are not dictated by

Resistance but rather by me as I am not required to place all of my political work under Resistance's direction” (emphasis added).

However he fails to quote my rationale earlier in the letter which justifies this. I said:

“Resistance is not a democratic centralist organisation in the same way as the DSP is. Resistance is a much looser association than the DSP as they play two very different roles. The constitution of Resistance is much looser than that of the DSP for that very reason. There are things in the DSP constitution which AREN'T in the Resistance one i.e. in the obligations of a party member as listed in Article 4, Paragraph 2. One of these obligations is for members "to place *all* [my emphasis] of their political activity under the direction of the party..." This obligation isn't in the Resistance constitution and quite deliberately so because the DSP seeks to win Resistance members *politically* to accepting the democratic centralism of the DSP and recruiting them to the DSP, this is spelt out in the final paragraph of the DSP constitution which states that DSP members in Resistance will seek to "win them [non-DSP Resistance members] to the party on the basis of the party's Program and Constitution. If Resistance already had clauses like those in Article 4, paragraph 2 of the DSP constitution in its own constitution there would be no point in trying to win people to the DSP constitution as we would already be bound by an identical document.”

i.e. it is possible to be loyal to Resistance without putting *all* of my political work under the direction of Resistance bodies. So when the Branch Executive tries to catch me out by quoting my words, which say “*that I am going to do it anyway,*” I fail to see how it is a crime to do useful work undirected by Resistance bodies.

Given that I was doing this political work which Trent describes as “a good initiative.” The political question for Resistance *should be* not how can we control the actions of

James, but to what extent can Resistance assist and be associated with James' actions. As well as this, rather than forcing my hand on any particular action the Resistance leadership can seek to *politically* convince me of any tactical recommendations in terms of interventions into SFP. However, it should be noted that there has not been a single e-mail or phone call in which Resistance has put proposals to me in terms of my intervention towards the rally. The only recommendation I received in terms of SFP was for after the rally "If there continues to be a level of interests from broader forces (i.e. not just us and Socialist Alternative) then we should consider suggesting that we hold a film screening on campus." That is the only suggestion and I agree with it. The charges say "James C reported back to members of the Melbourne Branch Executive some of the proposals he took the meeting and decisions that were made, but this was only after the fact," however this works both ways, despite SFP meeting weekly (which they knew because I made sure Trent was in the loop to receive minutes) the executive never called me up before a meeting to ask what I thought or to give me political direction. I called Trent up before the first meeting of SFP and talked to him about it at the Venezuela Toast prior to the event. At neither time did he tell me not to go or any particular position to raise. Trent Hawkings attended two of the meetings (not one as stated in the charges), missed most of the meetings and didn't bother to notify me when he could and couldn't make a SFP meeting, let alone asking me to caucus with him over the intervention.

But while Trent failed to notify me of his moves in regard to this intervention, he e-mailed Laura, a non-Resistance member, on two occasions (April 23 and May 8) stating whether he was able to show up to meetings.

Sure I admit (not that it is a crime) not going to a branch meeting where the Palestine work was being discussed, nor submitting anything in writing to be discussed at said branch meeting. However, the exec knew I had problems attending things on Wednesday, this includes the weekly LaTrobe stalls, for study reasons. Sure it would have been good if I could have committed something to writing but given the large number of university assignments I had around that time it wasn't feasible. You would think given the exec knew I couldn't make the meeting and given the extent of my work in the area, that they

would actually take the initiative to call me up and discuss our perspectives, rather than blaming me for doing political work and not attending branch meetings. Why am I, the comrade not on a leadership body, the scapegoat for a breakdown in communication?

The Branch Executive report claims that my actions were in the name of Resistance. To prove this Trent cites the minutes (which I sent him) of the SFP meeting which states I have “been in Palestine in 2006, involved in Melbourne Palestine Solidarity Network and [a] Resistance member.” Trent didn’t tell me not to go in there as a Resistance member. On the contrary, Trent provided me with Resistance leaflets and *Green Left Weekly* (a newspaper produced by Resistance and the DSP) to distribute at the meeting, which I did. I figured given that Socialist Alternative and the Islamic society were prepared to endorse the event on the spot (before I produced the leaflet), that my own comrades would also like to share my political credibility in SFP by attaching their name and likewise trusting that I would produce a leaflet that did not go against Resistance’s predetermined positions. For Resistance to endorse a Palestine rally should be a no brainer, I have never come across a Palestine rally in Australia that Resistance wouldn’t be eager to be associated with. Sure I asked for comrades to put the leaflets on our stall, just as a lot of other people ask Resistance to put progressive fliers on our stall. Where is the problem?

There is no problem and I find it odd that while Trent expected me *not to* put myself forward as a Resistance member (unless the intervention is taken through a central body) and *not to* get Resistance to endorse a rally until the exec has seen the leaflet, yet he automatically expects me *to* identify as a Resistance member at the rally itself. When this investigation began and I heard that the exec was concerned about the way I got Resistance’s endorsement I offered to remove it. I further offered to not speak on behalf of Resistance at the rally. Yet Trent replied telling me “as a Resistance member it is expected that you should be identified as such when speaking at the rally on May 15.” So am I to identify as a Resistance member or not? Trent hasn’t asked for the content of my speech prior to approving my identification as a Resistance member, but unlike the flier content he is actually trusting that I will put forward a position that Resistance agrees

with. How does Trent expect to have it both ways? The reality is the charges surrounding my intervention in SFP are apolitical, bureaucratic and inconsistent attempts to charge me for trying to be a loyal Resistance member and to promote Resistance through my “good initiative.”

Lastly I would like to respond in terms of my criticisms of Ema Corro, the DSP and MPSN. I find it ironic that my bringing the DSP into disrepute is in regards to Ema who as a DSP member actively undermined the DSP only a few years ago by being part of a split from the DSP in Darwin branch which argued that a legalise marijuana campaign was a greater priority than a refugee rights campaign. Ema and the DSP members who split ended up organising “smoke-ins” in the Centre of Darwin and Ema was charged with assault (and went to prison) after an ultra-left stunt where she attacked a security guard in Darwin’s legislative assembly. Despite Ema’s previous actions which are one of the key reasons why the DSP no longer has a Darwin branch, my actions (and those of LPF comrades) past and present are being treated as worse.

Late last year I re-applied to join the DSP, still with differences but with the aim of dealing with those differences in the DSP’s internal democratic framework. I had left the DSP after discovering several e-mails between the branch organizers and other leading comrades around the country calling for amongst other things to “crush the Crafti vibe” in Resistance. I forwarded these e-mails to DSP members and four close collaborators because I felt, like today, I was being marginalised in an a-political manner because I had political differences. I was angry at the degeneration of the DSP and wanted some time on the outside, however when I asked to be readmitted my application for membership was declined (even provisional membership) whereas Ema was returned as a full member of the DSP. Ema’s actions were far more severe than my own but the DSP leadership ignored the disrepute Ema brought to the party because she was in agreement with the majority line in the DSP on Socialist Alliance.

I make no secret of my criticisms of the DSP. I think the DSP has totally degenerated and a clear sign of this is these charges against me by youth cadre of the DSP assigned to

Resistance. I had previously hoped to be able to raise my criticisms within the DSP's framework, however as I was rejected for readmission I raise my criticisms publicly. I am not required to take those criticisms through any body of Resistance because Resistance is not the DSP (my hypothesis may be disproved if these charges are accepted by the NC) and its members are not obligated to raise all of their political positions through resistance's framework.

The main reason why Trent, Ema the DSP and co are so worried about my criticisms of MPSN is because they are true. MPSN has not had an open democratic meeting for about a year now. For the record I don't believe I am excluded from MPSN because of my views in the DSP, rather I believe the majority of Palestine activists including ex-DSP member Kim Bullimore, Laura and the comrades in Australians For Palestine have been excluded from being able to participate democratically in the Melbourne Palestine Solidarity Network.

To prove the democracy of MPSN, Trent states:

“It also came to the investigating commission's attention that James C was included in an informal email network by the MPSN about organising two Palestine solidarity rallies in Melbourne. Furthermore it is our understanding that a meeting was convened by members of MPSN to specifically address concerns James C had raised with Palestine solidarity activists about being excluded from the MPSN. James C attended this meeting.”

Yes I received a few e-mails in a loop for a brief period of time (after I caused a fuss) however there was no democratic functioning on that list and the concerns that I and others had were overruled. E-mail never was and never can be a substitute for democratic decision making. I also continue deny that in my time in Melbourne there was an MPSN organising meeting, let alone one “to specifically address concerns James C had raised with Palestine solidarity activists about being excluded from the MPSN.” I can get Melbourne Palestine activists to verify this. My criticisms of MPSN aren't new. While

Trent includes Ema C's claims "that a member of Australians for Palestine (AFP) was approached by James C about setting up a new committee in competition with the MPSN. This discussion occurred just after James moved to Melbourne and before he had sought involvement in the MPSN." The reality is that the AFP member Michael Shaik had approached me with concerns over MPSN's dysfunction and was considering such action before I moved to Melbourne. This assessment of MPSN is also shared by Laura and Kim who have also tried to argue that MPSN needs to meet and function more democratically but have been blocked by Ema. I was fully convinced by Michael and Kim of the lack of democracy in MPSN through my involvement in Palestine solidarity work here.

## **Conclusion**

Comrades the charges against me are highly bureaucratic and seriously lacking in politics. The degeneration of the DSP is impacting on Resistance and how the NC votes will be an indication of its trajectory. Politically thinking people are not going to buy the administrative show report presented to me 7 days ago by Trent. Laura's reaction is the normal, political, healthy response that actions like expelling me generate. When I exposed the DSP's hostile treatment of minority members through my resignation, those people around us knew who to blame. As former DSP member Leyal wrote in her response to my resignation from the DSP "I believe that your resignation is a major blow to the DSP as a whole. I also place the blame squarely on the Branch and DSP leadership." Likewise Michael Shaik wrote:

"As someone who is an outsider but nevertheless has an active interest in DSP Canberra, my opinion is that they will be very foolish if they don't beg you to return. In my opinion the Canberra branch has been in free-fall since Nick left. If they get rid of their most active and intelligent resistance activist over some petty factional intrigues well more the fool them."

While comrades may criticise my discussing the dirty linen of this origination and the DSP, it is clear that anyone who puts their loyalty in socialism rather than functionaries will see it rather differently. While comrades may criticise my tactics, the content is more



important than the forms. In my using of internal e-mails to expose the DSP's treatment of myself and others, Jude Morton, who has resigned from Socialist Alliance commented "I think it is unfortunate that James discovered those emails. I think it is even more unfortunate that those emails were sent in the first place."

Maybe the leadership of Resistance has degenerated to the point where the charges by the Melbourne Executive are acceptable. I hope not. If I get charged here I will consider appealing to the National Conference as I am allowed to do according to the constitution. I suspect any newly radicalizing delegates who are truly interested in socialist democracy will side with me.

If Resistance expels me like the DSP expelled the LPF, Resistance will show itself as being nothing more than a youth fraction of a degenerating party rather than as an independent youth organisation

Yours in solidarity,

James

---

**Appendix 1. Letter from the Resistance National Executive Secretariat – Tues  
March 11.**

Dear James

I am writing to you to express our concern regarding your posts to the Marxmail list relating to the Democratic Socialist Perspective and the PRD split. As outlined in the Resistance Constitution, Resistance is in political solidarity with the Democratic Socialist Perspective (DSP), particularly it states: "we [Resistance] work with and aim to build the DSP".

Your posts on the Marxism list publicly attacked the DSP, which undermines the work of Resistance members and is detrimental to our organisation. It is in this context that the Resistance National Executive Secretariat instructs you to cease all public attacks on the DSP.

Any further public attacks on the DSP will be seen as a breach of the Resistance constitution.

In solidarity,

Brianna Pike

On behalf of the Resistance National Executive Secretariat.

---

## **Appendix 2. Response to the National Executive Secretariat - Thurs March 27**

To the Resistance NC,

I am writing to complain about a communication I have received from the Resistance NE secretariat accusing myself of breaching the Resistance constitution (see below) by supposedly violating a part of the Resistance constitution which states, "we [Resistance] work with and aim to build the DSP."

The letter refers to a discussion between myself and Stuart Munckton from the DSP, over the DSP's position on the expulsion of a minority current from PRD Papernas who have set a another PRD organisation known as the KPRM PRD. This letter of "concern" is a threat saying "Any further public attacks on the DSP will be seen as a breach of the Resistance constitution. " Such a warning is a disciplinary act under Rule 7 of Section 6 of the Disciplinary procedures outlined in the Resistance constitution which state:

"in the event of a member being *found guilty* [my emphasis] of violating the Resistance constitution, the following disciplinary action may be applied:

(a) warning against repetition of violation"

But proper procedure was not followed in terms of charging me. In order to be found guilty of violating the Resistance constitution, which clearly this letter is indicating I have been, I would first have to be charged under the rules of procedure outlined in the constitution. These include "the body dealing with the charges shall furnish a copy of the charges to the accused member at least seven days in advance of the date when that body will consider the charge" and "where charges are dealt with by a national body the accused member may submit a written statement, or request permission to present an oral statement, on the charges to the meeting of the national governing body that will act on the charges."

As I was not given notice of the charges before the NE secretariats findings nor was I given a chance to present my side through oral or written presentation this letter is unconstitutional. As such I ask the the NE Secretariat apologise for their disregard of the constitution and retract their letter. Further I would like the Res NC as the body above the Res NC to investigate the NE's breach of constitution and to present their findings.

As for the charge of my breaching the Resistance constitution I reject this outright and ask the NE secretariat quote which sections of my posts they feel are in breach and *explain how*. I would request a copy of the Resistance constitution (as I have an older copy), but my understanding is that the preamble of the Resistance constitution was changed to remove reference to the Democratic Socialist Party and replace it with Socialist Alliance. Even if it is still in there (which I doubt) having something in the preamble of a constitution is not the same as having it in the constitution. A preamble isn't a rule and the NE secretariat can't turn it into one.

The ONLY politically mandated position according to the constitution is "the aims of Resistance are to help bring into being a socially equal, democratic and ecologically sustainable socialist world, and to organise, educate, and mobilise young people to this end." The constitution goes on to say "Membership of Resistance is open to *anyone* [my emphasis] of the age of 26 and under who supports the aims of Resistance and who pays the joining fee." There is no exception clause in there which says "unless they undermine building the DSP."

But despite this game of funny buggers being played against me by the NE secretariat there are more serious political questions flowing from these bureaucratic unconstitutional charges. What is my "attack" on the DSP? I sent a series of e-mails questioning the DSP's censoring (internally) of comrades Max Lane and Sam King in regard to the expulsion of KPRM PRD, through denying them the ability to contribute to Pre Congress Discussion on the issue. Resistance and the DSP have a long history of critically analysing political developments in the PRD and Indonesia more generally. We have always followed developments in the international left with interest. Even with groups we are in political solidarity with, we have never refused to discuss amongst ourselves, political developments occurring elsewhere. Such actions taken by the DSP are a break with DSP and Resistance tradition and a departure from collective internal democracy, debate and education.

Also surely one can be in solidarity with an organisation while being critical. Certainly the fact that Briana signs off her email to me saying "In solidarity" while the content is a criticism (as well as threat) is an indication that you can be in solidarity with someone or a group while still being able to criticise. If the NE secretariat is now redefining solidarity as to uncritically support then the rest of Resistance has the right to know.

What the Resistance NE secretariat (made up entirely of DSP members) letter to me indicates is a disturbing change in the DSP's orientation to Resistance as an *independent* youth organisation. The DSP's document *Building the Revolutionary Youth Organisation*

is critical of the Spartacist position of building a youth organisation politically subordinate to the party. As the DSP document says

"The Spartacist League while claiming to support "organisation independence for their Spartacist Youth League (in the United States ), nevertheless insist that it be constitutionally and politically subordinate to the party, which denies the youth its own independent role. According to the Spartacists this was the Bolsheviks view.

But Trotsky himself disagreed with these attitudes towards the youth (as did Lenin and the Bolsheviks) and he said:

It is clear that the youth cannot replace the party but that does not mean that we have the technical possibility of prohibiting the youth from trying to replace the party in every case where the youth think they find the party following a bad line. We cannot establish with one blow or with one resolution [or one threatening letter -ed.] the authority of the party."

Yet despite this historical position this appears to be what the Resistance NE secretariat wants to do in instructing me to silence my criticisms of the erosion of democracy in the DSP. Like their attempts to silence Max and Sam as DSP members the DSP is now seeking to silence criticisms from Resistance members not in the DSP. This is not a Bolshevik method but as the DSP pamphlet points out a Spartacist method.

Further my discussion with Stuart on the PRD split was contradictory and further posts exposed the DSP simultaneously declaring that "When we said we don't intend to interfere, we mean \*we don't intend to interfere\*." yet at the same time Stuarts posts appeared to side with PRD Papernas over KPRM PRD saying:

"Given that we are not jumping to say this, it follows logically that we will continue our relationship with the PRD. As for the new group, we are not refusing relations, we are testing things out. We are encouraging them to continue sending us their material. We

certainly aren't declaring them not revolutionary or anything else James is attempting to imply or push us towards.?"

On one hand Stuart says we aren't picking sides on the other he says we are continuing relations with one side but only receiving information from the other. This inconsistent position of the DSP is confusing and certainly I think Resistance should be clear about its relationship with the 2 PRD's are.

I believe that Stuarts formulation is not only confusing but wrong. Firstly if we are not going to interfere then that means that we should support both PRD Papernas and KPRM PRD rather than support info from one and only receive information from the other. Secondly while I am open to the possibility that PRD Papernas are the side we should be supporting at this stage I am *more* convinced by what I have read of the KPRM PRD position. It appears to me that PRD Papernas have sort electoral fusion with not only bourgeois political forces but anti-communist bourgeois forces. It also appears to me that the expulsion of what appear to have been loyal minority members of the PRD in the process of pushing such a "tactic" is wrong.

I seek clarification from the NC as to what Resistance's position is on the PRD split is. It appears that leading comrades on the NE secretariat have moved away from our understanding of an "independent youth organisation" in their use of Spart like repression of dissent in Resistance and the spreading of bureaucratic and unconstitutional methods from a degenerating DSP in order to silence critics. This is especially odd when it appears like Resistance hasn't even had a discussion on the PRD split. If the Resistance leadership has the same political line on the PRD split as the DSP, I as a loyal resistance member disagree with that assessment, but from what I can see it hasn't been discussed (or at least not off leadership bodies).

I ask in investigating the NE secretariat that the Res NC reaffirm Resistance as an independent socialist youth organisation as understood in the Democratic Socialist Party document *the Revolutionary Youth Organisation*. I ask that the Res NC reaffirms that

unity in Resistance is primarily a political question that must be sorted through political methods and cannot be sorted through Stalinist decrees.

I also ask given that there appears to be political differences, that Stuart and my posts to Marxmail be reprinted in the Resistance bulletin along with all available information from *both* sides of the PRD split so we are able better flesh out Resistance's understanding of events in Indonesia and develop appropriate relation to the *two* PRD's

If any comrades want further information from me they should contact me via e-mail james\_crafti@yahoo.com. au .

Yours in solidarity,

James Crafti

---

### **Appendix 3. re: Response to the National Executive Secretariat – Fri March 28**

28.3.08

Dear James,

There were a number of inaccuracies in your letter, one of which we would like to correct.

The letter sent to you by the Resistance NE Secretariat was a letter of concern over your actions: it did not charge you with anything.

The letter simply asked you to stop your public attacks on the DSP. As you know, Resistance works in political solidarity with the DSP, and your public attacks on the DSP

do not help build that political solidarity. If you reject this then you are rejecting an important aspect of Resistance's mode of operation.

This is a reasonable request of any Resistance member, but particularly in your case given that you resigned from the DSP in 2007 over political differences.

On the issue of the DSP's relations with PRD – that is a matter for the DSP, and it has taken a decision on that (which you would no doubt be aware of).

Resistance has not taken a position on the PRD split. We have not yet had the time to study the documents and have the discussion and we intend to do that.

The Resistance secretariat is currently in the process of updating the printed version of the Resistance constitution.

Again, we would ask that you to respect the democracy of Resistance, regardless of your political differences with the DSP (and Resistance, it appears).

Comradely

Brianna Pike

Resistance National Co-coordinator

---

#### **Appendix 4. Reply to Brianna Pike – Sun March 30**

Dear NC Comrades,

According to the constitution the NE secretariat did charge me. The letter includes the claim "Any further public attacks on the DSP will be seen as a breach of the Resistance constitution." This means I have already broken the resistance constitution and am given



a warning not to repeat said action. This is the lowest form of disciplinary action available as outlined in my letter citing the constitution:

"in the event of a member being *found guilty* [my emphasis] of violating the Resistance constitution, the following disciplinary action may be applied:

(a) warning against repetition of violation"

Briana says "The letter simply asked you to stop your public attacks on the DSP," no it didn't the letter didn't ask anything it says "instructs" and then threatens me with disciplinary action "Any further public attacks on the DSP will be seen as a breach of the Resistance constitution." Does this really sound like asking? Even if the letter said "if you proceed with what we perceive to be a breach of the constitution we will investigate it" this would be at least better but the fact that it automatically "will be seen as a breach" is a finding on my current actions without me having been charged.

No, it was an attempt to unconstitutionally use the constitution against me. At least Brianna could be big enough to acknowledge what happened so we can work out how to move on in a comradely manner. I specifically cited the constitution to indicate that this was what the NE Secretariat was doing. If Brianna does *not* think this was charge then maybe she could explain how the above cited section of the constitution does not apply to her letter.

Secondly I did not resign from the DSP over "political difference." I left the DSP after having been a loyal member for 8 years sometimes having political differences but happy to operate in a democratic framework (part of the point of democracy in any organisation is that exists because we all have differences and aren't all robots). I resigned from the DSP because when I had political differences I was bullied by leaders who sought to marginalise me from the branch. I remained in Resistance because I hoped (and unfortunately appear to be mistaken if the NE secretariat position is reflective of the organisation), that the same sort of bureaucratic bullying that I experienced in the DSP

would not be repeated in Res. Brianna has read my resignation letter and yet has decided to lie to the NC about my reasons for resigning. I would appreciate it if she did not put words in my mouth and forward them to the national leadership. Because she has done so I feel that I need to put on record what I actually said at the time (see attached resignation letter). If comrades want more information on the context of my resignation they only have to ask.

If there are political differences let's debate them honestly in a comradely manner but let's not resort to apolitical bastardry in order to deal with them. On Resistance's "mode" which Briana is talking about this goes against our historical understanding which includes the right to criticise organisations we are in political solidarity with as I pointed out quoting the youth work document of the DSP supported by Res comrades which quotes Trotsky saying "but that does not mean that we have the technical possibility of prohibiting the youth from trying to replace the party in every case where the youth think they find the party following a bad line. We cannot establish with one blow or with one resolution the authority of the party." I believe the DSP is following a bad line, it should be incumbent on DSP members like Briana Pike to defend the line politically rather than doing what Trotsky warned against that is "establish with one blow or with one resolution the authority of the party." Your "mode of operation," runs against the historical political norms of our tendency.

Now in terms of Resistance's position on the expulsion of the KPMR PRD by PRD Papermas I am glad that Resistance will be studying the issue. So does that mean that the position papers of both organisations will be reprinted in the Resistance bulletin? Will this mean that we are opening up the bulletin for contributions on the expulsion?

Lastly I look forward to reading the new printed version of the constitution in the mean time can Brianna confirm for us where it states in the constitution that we are in political solidarity with the DSP, and if it even still says it in the preamble of the constitution? I would like to know if Briana was quoting a redundant document. I would also like to

know where have we ever said questioning a political line is tantamount to not being in solidarity?

Finally I ask Briana to respect the democracy of Resistance and not invent some new norms or reinterpret the constitution in funny ways to justify your threats.

Yours in solidarity,

James

---

### **Appendix 5. Notice of Formal Charges - Tuesday April 22**

Dear James,

This is to notify you that Melbourne Resistance organiser Trent Hawkins presented to the Melbourne Branch Executive on April 9 formal charges against you for violating the Resistance Constitution. The executive ratified these charges and are now further investigating the charges and what specific aspects of the constitution you have violated.

The decision was based on your actions in the Palestine Solidarity work in Melbourne. It has come to our attention that you have had discussions with non-resistance members and collaborators in our Palestine solidarity work in which you have publicly attacked DSP member Ema Corro and other leading DSP comrades. It is our understanding that you described these comrades actions as undemocratic and that they were deliberately excluding you from working in the Melbourne Palestine Solidarity Network, as you have political differences with the DSP. This has undermined Resistance's ability to collaborate with Palestine solidarity activists in joint activity and to recruit to Resistance.

Furthermore your actions in organising a new Palestine Solidarity committee at LaTrobe, without the consent of the branch, and your failure to appropriately inform the exec of

proposals you were taking to its meetings is considered by the Melbourne Executive an indication of your unwillingness to act as loyal Resistance member and work towards building Resistance.

It is the opinion of the Melbourne Branch executive that you have continued, in defiance of the requests by the National Secretariat, to publicly attack the DSP. Furthermore we believe it is not your desire to engage in a comradely internal political discussion about the DSP, and rather you are openly hostile to the DSP and this continues to undermine our work with the DSP.

Based on the evidence we have recieved we believe you are unwilling to act in the interests of building Resistance, and rather are acting independently of the decisions and structures of Resistance. We do not believe you are willing to act as a loyal Resistance member, working collaboratively to build Resistance.

Last Thursday the National Executive Secretariat voted to have the charges heard at the next National Council Meeting, currently planned for May 11. In fairness to you this decision was based on the fact you have only recently moved to Melbourne and also the material that may be considered in making a decision is of a national character.

As outlined in the constitution you will be given the chance to present your case to the NC. The full details of the charges will be sent to you at least seven days in advance of this NC, as required by the constitution, including all relevant material.

Regards,

The Melbourne Branch Executive

Amanda Z, Atsuko N, Ben P, Sean SJ, Katherine B, Trent H

**To the Resistance Executive (sorry I don't have everyone's e-mail), and the NE secretariat.**

Can I ask what charges have been ratified and how this can have occurred:

1. without an investigation
2. without you knowing "what specific aspects of the constitution [I] have violated."

Also under Section 6 rule 5 of the constitution it is clear that a commission needs to be set up to investigate the charges and make a recommendation to the national governing body. You note in your letter that the Melbourne executive is investigating the charges, however given that the Melbourne Resistance Executive seems to have already found me guilty (of what I still don't know) of said charges they can hardly be expected to conduct a fair investigation. The investigation team needs to be elected by a national body and I would suggest given your already declared bias that such an investigation team does not include any Melbourne executive members. I also ask given the position of guilt already adopted pre trial by the Melbourne Executive that the NE secretariat deems the investigation by the Melbourne executive as improper as can be done under Section 6: Rule 9 of the constitution.

Secondly, I would suggest given that the NE secretariat has already found in breach of the constitution (in what I believe to be an unconstitutional manner), that the commission be made up of comrades not already on the NE secretariat. Of course comrades on the NE secretariat can elect who they like but I may raise any perceived bias in the commission as a reason to dismiss the findings.

Lastly I ask that I be allowed to attend the NC meeting to present an oral statement on the charges to the national meeting (Section 6: Rule 6.) As I am guessing the meeting will be held in Sydney I ask that I be able to hook in via PalTalk. Please inform me of the time that the meeting will be taking place so I can organise my computer for said event.

I am sorry that it has come to this,

James

---

Appendix 7. Disassociating Melbourne Resistance with LaTrobe Palestine Solidarity –  
Mon 28 April

To the Melbourne Exec

"Furthermore your actions in organising a new Palestine Solidarity committee at LaTrobe, without the consent of the branch, and your failure to appropriately inform the exec of proposals you were taking to its meetings is considered by the Melbourne Executive an indication of your unwillingness to act as loyal Resistance member and work towards building Resistance."

Given that my actions in the LaTrobe Students for Palestine do not have the "consent of the branch" I can ask Chris from Socialist Alternative to remove Resistance from the list of endorsees. They of course will think it is extremely weird and given that everything I have done is in line with Resistances' politics and general perspectives, I would tend to agree. Of course I have done Palestine work for years with the approval of Canberra branch and built resistance in the process with the occasional maybe 6 monthly report-back on the specifics of that intervention. But if you aren't wanting to be associated with my good work in the committee that is fine I am more than happy to remove your endorsement of the rally seeing as you clearly don't support me setting up the committee. Also I was thinking of identifying myself as a Resistance member when I speak at the rally but seeing as you don't approve of my attempts to build resistance I am happy to let that drop as well.

Anyway let me know by Wednesday otherwise I will just presume that the flow on from your lack of support from the committee is your disendorment of its actions. I am sure Socialist Alternative will be most pleased.

Yours in solidarity,

James

---

### **Appendix 8. Responding to your concerns – Tues April 29**

Dear James,

I am writing to respond to some of your questions regarding the procedure adopted for investigating the charges brought against you and the Resistance endorsement of the LaTrobe Palestine rally.

I'm sorry if the process wasn't clear in my previous email.

Essentially the charges were brought by me to the Resistance Melbourne Branch Executive, which accepted that the charges warranted further investigation. The initial thinking was that the Melbourne Branch Executive would investigate the charges.

At the NE secretariat, which met a week later, I proposed that these charges be acted on by the National Council, rather than a Melbourne branch meeting. This was in fairness to you, given you have only recently transferred to Melbourne Branch.

As a consequence the NE secretariat appointed the Melbourne Branch Executive as the commission to investigate the charges. There is nothing in the constitution stating that the appointed commission

can't be the branch executives. In fact for charges dealt with by a branch it states that the body to investigate the charges be either the "branch executive or a commission". Given that there was already initial discussion about the executive being the body to investigate the charges, the NE Secretariat saw no reason to set up an alternate body.

There is no presumption of guilt; rather the executive will go through a process of accumulating all the necessary information and make a recommendation to the NC meeting. At this you will have an opportunity to present your case in response and it will be the NC which will make a decision on how to act on the charges.

Furthermore the NE Secretariat has not been found in breach of the constitution. It has already been explained to you by National Coordinator Brianna Pike that it is absurd to claim that you have to be formally charged before any leadership body warns you against acting in a certain way, if they feel it may be a breach of the constitution. If however you insist that the NE secretariat has breached the constitution then I suggest you do raise this at the National Council.

I am not able to make the decision as to whether or not you be given the chance to submit an oral presentation to the NC. The general procedure would be to move a motion at the NC and if the majority agree then we will accept an oral submission. Irrespective of this you should still write a written submission.

In regards to our Palestine solidarity work, firstly I am not opposed to the Al Nakba rally at LaTrobe, in fact I think it was a good initiative. However this is not the issue of concern here. The point



is that any proposals you take in the name of Resistance need to be taken to a branch meeting or exec, it's the same with any other member of Resistance. That is, it is insufficient to merely report back on your activity after the fact.

As I raised in my email to you on April 15 "[i]n taking the actions you have, you have not acted as a Resistance member, instead have operated in an independent framework. As a long term Resistance member i should not have to tell you the democratic procedure for raising proposals for branch activity. However, I reiterate the call i have made to you verbally on three occasions to keep me informed about any political work you are undertaking in the name of Resistance, and bring all proposals for our work to branch meetings where we can democratically decide on what course of action to take given our available resources."

I spoke to Melbourne executive comrades, before the leaflets had to be printed, who agreed that we should endorse the rally so there are no problems there about putting our name to the rally. At the branch meeting last week everyone agreed that we should endorse the event, when we had our discussion on Palestine solidarity work.

It was unfortunate that you didn't come to this meeting, despite my requests that you do so and outline your proposals for our work at LaTrobe. The meeting decided that we should help build this action, but that we would need to make a judgment after this about the basis for an ongoing committee on LaTrobe. If there continues to be a level of interests from broader forces (i.e. not just us and Socialist Alternative) then we should consider suggesting that we hold a film screening on campus.

We also agreed to help build any actions planned for Al Naksa (MPSN has been discussing this as a possibility for a united action around Palestine). The meeting agreed that we should continue to see the MPSN as the key activist group in Melbourne doing Palestine solidarity work and that we would send a couple of members to their planned AGM.

Finally as a Resistance member it is expected that you should be identified as such when speaking at the rally on May 15.

If you have any further questions please give me a call 0407 070 841. Perhaps if you want you can drop by the stall tomorrow (from 12-2).

Regards,  
Trent

p.s. Hobart is having a Teach In on May 11, so we are leaning towards moving the NC to the following Sunday.

---

#### **Appendix 9. Re: Responding to your concerns – Sun May 4**

Dear Trent,

Thank you for your letter however it raises more questions. In the letter sent by you last week, you state that the exec only accepted that the charges warranted further investigation. Yet in the letter which the exec comrades put their name to it says "The executive ratified these charges." In the English language ratified means "to confirm by expressing consent, approval, or formal sanction" ie. the exec agrees with your charges.

One could possibly accept this as a typo or an indication that the exec didn't know what the word ratified means. This would be possible if the letter didn't continue to outline the

execs belief in my guilt. The exec's position is indicated several times i.e. "*It is the opinion of the Melbourne Branch executive* [my emphasis] that you have continued, in defiance of the requests by the National Secretariat, to publicly attack the DSP" and "*we believe* [my emphasis] it is not your desire to engage in a comradely internal political discussion" and "Based on the evidence we have received [and I still don't have] *we believe* [my emphasis] you are unwilling to act in the interests of building Resistance" and "*We do not believe* you are willing to act as a loyal Resistance member." I am sorry but based on all these statements from the executive signed by the executive *I do not believe* that "There is no presumption of guilt." How could I possibly believe otherwise?

Given this, I again ask the NE secretariat or the NE for that matter to rule against the Melbourne Executive investigating this matter as they are entitled to do under Section 6: Rule 9 of the constitution. Can you forward this e-mail to all members of both bodies?

Secondly you still haven't answered exactly what I am being charged with ie. what breach of the constitution. As far as I can work out you haven't outlined a single violation. Rather you have said that you are still working out "what specific aspects of the constitution you have violated" meaning that so far you haven't found a single line in the constitution from which to charge me with.

What you have presented me with is a series of allegations to things which are either false or not violations of the Resistance constitution but are violations of the DSP constitution which I am not a member of. In your latest e-mail you tell me "The point is that any proposals you take in the name of Resistance need to be taken to a branch meeting or exec, it's the same with any other member of Resistance. That is, it is insufficient to merely report back on your activity after the fact."

What proposals did I put forward in the name of Resistance? I put forward proposals to LaTrobe Students for Palestine as an activist who is also a member of Resistance not "in the name of Resistance," the only way anything becomes in the name of Resistance is either if I say "Resistance is putting forward..." or I confirm Resistance's endorsement of

particular actions ie. a rally which as you know I didn't because I talked to you prior to printing the leaflet (and got your approval).

Resistance is not a democratic centralist organisation in the same way as the DSP is. Resistance is a much looser association than the DSP as they play two very different roles. The constitution of Resistance is much looser than that of the DSP for that very reason. There are things in the DSP constitution which AREN'T in the Resistance one i.e. in the obligations of a party member as listed in Article 4, Paragraph 2. One of these obligations is for members "to place *all* [my emphasis] of their political activity under the direction of the party..." This obligation isn't in the Resistance constitution and quite deliberately so because the DSP seeks to win Resistance members *politically* to accepting the democratic centralism of the DSP and recruiting them to the DSP, this is spelt out in the final paragraph of the DSP constitution which states that DSP members in Resistance will seek to "win them [non-DSP Resistance members] to the party on the basis of the party's Program and Constitution. If Resistance already had clauses like those in Article 4, paragraph 2 of the DSP constitution in its own constitution there would be no point in trying to win people to the DSP constitution as we would already be bound by an identical document.

As you know Resistance often recruits people who cannot put all their political activity under the direction of Resistance, i.e. Socialist Alternative, Greens or Amnesty International which have radically different politics but through the course of involving them in Resistance, DSP members can try and politically convince these individuals to change their positions. Resistance can't direct them to do so however.

So it seems odd that you tell me I need to "bring all proposals for our work to branch meetings where we can democratically decide on what course of action to take given our available resources" which would be true except for the fact that I haven't asked for a single resource from Resistance, the only resources I have committed are my own which are not dictated by Resistance but rather by *me* as I am not required to place all of my political work under Resistance's direction. Likewise you say "Finally as a Resistance

member it is expected that you should be identified as such when speaking at the rally on May 15." Why is it expected given I have received almost no backup from Resistance in the Palestine solidarity work? Presuming Resistance approves of me speaking in the name of Resistance then I can elect to do so but this is a *voluntary* thing based on my *voluntary* political support for Resistance.

If Resistance doesn't trust me to *voluntarily* organise a Palestine rally in line with the general line adopted by Resistance conferences since I became a member 9 years ago then me optionally deciding to mention Resistance in a speech at LaTrobe is less likely to happen. Given that you acknowledge that the rally is a good initiative and that I am going to do it anyway maybe you should be supportive and see what extent Resistance can work with me rather than trying to charge me for it.

Further the substantive accusation that I "have publicly attacked DSP member Ema Corro and other leading DSP comrades" is bizarre given that one of the other obligations that is only in the DSP constitution but not the Resistance one is stating that members are to "conduct themselves in a manner which does not bring the party into public disrepute." There is nothing in the Resistance constitution that says I can't publicly criticise Resistance let alone the DSP (an organisation I am not even in).

But while we are on topic my criticism that MPSN is undemocratic is correct and confirmed by your latest e-mail. You state that "MPSN has been discussing this as a possibility for a united action around Palestine " how can MPSN be discussing anything given that MPSN has not had a meeting for at least 10 months? This lack of any meetings is despite repeated calls by myself and other Palestine solidarity activists (the majority of whom are not members of Resistance or the DSP) for open, democratic organising meeting. Despite repeatedly putting my name on MPSN contact lists and having helped out MPSN on stalls including at the UIA picket and the March 16 anti-war rally I have never been contacted regarding Al Naksa. So obviously I have been locked out of discussions making the discussions selective and hence "undemocratic." I also know of

several other activists who despite similar involvement have also not been involved in MPSN discussions, if this is not "undemocratic" what would you call it?

It is great that MPSN is having an AGM but despite having heard about this idea several months ago I am yet to hear of a set date, time and location. If you have those I would appreciate you forwarding them onto me. If MPSN starts to become democratic I will be one of the first people to be cheering the process on but I will believe it when I see it.

Lastly you state "I am not able to make the decision as to whether or not you be given the chance to submit an oral presentation to the NC. The general procedure would be to move a motion at the NC and if the majority agree then we will accept an oral submission. Irrespective of this you should still write a written submission." Does this mean I am invited to the Resistance NC meeting so I can move said motion? I would like to be able to organise my calendar. Sure the NC can ultimately reject my invite but seeing as the NE secretariat is recommending my charges be put can they also move a motion recommending that I be invited and allowed to present my oral response to the charges?

Yours in solidarity,

James

---

## **Appendix 10. Fwd: Investigating Commission Report – Sat Mat 10**

Hey Laura,

I thought you may be interested in seeing Trent's report. It mentions you.

Cheers,

James

See you on Monday

---

### **Appendix 11. Re: Fwd: Investigating Commission Report – Sat May 10**

James

it seems to live in a post-soviet autocratic society...

You should write a short tragi-comedy on it (I don't know if it's a word in English, but I guess you understand the idea of it)

Does Resistance (ot Trent) live in a psychic mental status of the Maoist cultural revolution kind??

that's funny, isn't it? How can people waist time and resources for such an investigation??

Anyway, I didn't imagine that everytime I met Trent I was under interrogation..... it was less expected than when the investigatory police came to search my flat in Italy...my friend bewared me on their possible arrival....so we took some (unfortunately not all) precautions....but Trent case is really ridiculous.....

anyway, I tried to call you, but you didn't answer...are you sleeping in?

laura

I' d better go back to my global financial macroeconomic imbalances.....

---

### **Appendix 12 Re: Thesis– Wed April 23**

Hey Laura,

I won't be able to come to the meeting on Thursday as i will be at Melbourne Uni doing a Resistance Stall.

If you are still in Melbourne tomorrow night, im having drinks (im hoping they have non-alcoholic) for my 25th birthday, 7pm at the Prudence Bar - just passed Vic Markets on Victoria St, in North Melbourne.

No problems if you can't make it, i hope you enjoy your weekend in Perth.

Cheers,

Trent

---

**Appendix 13. Re: article – Sat May 7**

Hey Laura just one point is perhaps you could finish the article on a slightly sharper note.

Maybe instead of "thats why donar aid and Palestinian reforms will not lead to economic growth unless accompanied by Israeli policy changes."

What do you think about stating "... unless accompanied by an end to the Israeli occupation"?

That was more or less the conclusion of your presentation at the forum, no?

Ill catch you at tomorrows meeting.

Cheers,

Trent

---

**Appendix 14. Re: My Resignation from the DSP. Tues April 22 (2007)**



Dear comrades,

Although I have left the SA I feel it is appropriate to respond as I have been mentioned and I received another email that troubled me.

This email has angered me somewhat.

I think James is a huge loss to any organisation - he is not only a personal friend but a great activist.

As most people know, I have resigned from the SA. After I did I received an email from a DSP friend who thought that my resignation was merely a (petty - my words, not theirs ) response to the fact that I disagreed with the SA deciding to put the request for a speaker up at the last Hick's event that I was involved in.

I think who ever suggested that was the case, was actually out of line and it was a rather nasty bit of disinformation that put the emphasis on my resignation back on me, rather than any other reasons I might have and any wider problems out there in the branch.

I'm quite willing to talk about my reasons with anyone who might want to ask me. I don't expect people will agree with me as I am no Socialist scholar or tactician but they were above a hissy fit.

I haven't met a SA or DSP comrade who I didn't like and I regard Socialists a better class of people who have helped me a lot and given me support, friendship and training in grassroots activism. I expect those friendships to continue and I look forward to working with people in the future.

I think it is unfortunate that James discovered those emails. I think it is even more unfortunate that those emails were sent in the first place.

I hope things heal themselves quickly.

Jude.

**Appendix 15. Re: My Resignation from the DSP. Tues April 23 (2007)**

Hey James.

I am very sorry to hear this.

I believe that your resignation is a major blow to the DSP as a whole.

I also place the blame squarely on the Branch and DSP leadership.

Take care (and have a break).

Leyal

---

**Appendix 16. Re: My Resignation from the DSP. Tues April 24 (2007)**

Thanks for the info James.

As someone who is an outsider but nevertheless has an active interest in DSP Canberra, my opinion is that they will be very foolish if they don't beg you to return. In my opinion the Canberra branch has been in free-fall since Nick left. If they get rid of their most active and intelligent resistance activist over some petty factional intrigues well more the fool them.

Anyhow, if you ever need a reference from a non-DSPer who has worked with you for 2 years, I'd be happy to help.

Real sorry about this. I know how much the party meant to you and how hard this must be.

Michael.

---

**Appendix 17. Circulation of report and your oral submission to NC. Wed May 14.**

Dear James,

I spoke to Laura last night and this afternoon. She informed me that you had:

- a) given her a copy of the investigating report,
- b) you had invited her to participate in the NC hook-up

I should not have to point out to you that the report from the investigating commission is an internal document and will remain so until a national leadership body decides to make it public.

Secondly as outlined in the constitution you can request an oral submission of your report to the NC. This does not mean you can listen to the investigating commission's report and the discussion. You will be logged on when it is time to make your submission, and logged off after you have given it.

Thirdly these actions will be taken into consideration at the hearing on Sunday.

Regards,

Trent