

January 13, 2017

\_\_\_\_,

This is our response to your letter of January 12, 2017.

You can pretend to be shocked that we regard you as hostile to Marxist-Humanist Initiative (MHI), but the facts are clear:

1. You submitted an article to our publication. The whole Executive Committee (EC) took time out to read and discuss it, and then one member of the EC had a very lengthy discussion of it with you, at the end of which you agreed to revise the article and resubmit it to us. However, you went back on your word. You instead published the article on the website of a known critic of Marxist-Humanism and MHI, without even informing us. Given the immense value you place on your own time (see below), it is striking how little concern you have for wasting ours.

2. On December 6, 2016, you refused to “keep my obligation, as per the newly approved motion, to voice any disagreements [with MHI’s views and positions] and provide an alternate viewpoint.” Your refusal to engage in a comradely discussion within the organization is, itself, a hostile act that reveals your disrespect for and hostility to us. But it gets worse.

3. The excuse you gave, at that time, for refusing to engage in a comradely discussion within the organization was that “my time will be under further constraint during the coming year, and next semester especially. ... my degree of involvement must unfortunately diminish in both frequency and intensity during the coming year.” This was an extremely disingenuous statement, another hostile act, because—in the *same* message—you wrote that “I would like to stay in touch, and to be invited [to participate in MHI’s ‘educational’ discussions] as a guest.”

You don’t have time to voice disagreements and provide alternate viewpoints within the organization, but you do have time to participate in MHI’s “educational” discussions as a guest?! We recognized immediately that you were lying to us with your lack-of-time excuse. As \_\_\_\_\_ noted in her December 7 reply to you, “we cannot accept your request to be invited to meetings while we forego knowing about your disagreements.” Your attempt to leave MHI but still participate on your own terms was an attempt to “reap the benefits of membership without having to make any contribution to the organization or to working out its ideas.”

4. But it gets even worse. *We subsequently learned that, while you supposedly don’t have time to voice disagreements and provide alternate viewpoints within the organization, you do have time to co-host a regular podcast show! The time devoted to the podcast project could instead be used to participate in MHI—including by voicing disagreements and providing alternate viewpoints within the organization—so this is further evidence that you were lying to us with your lack-of-time excuse.*

5. You lied to us again, in a message of December 9, when you stated that “the coming year will demand even more time of me, and this means that I need to cut down on obligations and respo[n]sibilities outside friends, family, study, and livelihood.” The new podcast series, which

is an additional “responsibility” that you have since chosen to take on—while eschewing all responsibility to Marxist-Humanism and MHI—does not qualify as “friends, family, study, [or] livelihood.”

6. While you supposedly don’t have time to voice disagreements and provide alternate viewpoints within the organization, you do have time to
  - a. write a 900-word letter denouncing us—even comparing us to “a McCarthyite government” and “the Gestapo”;
  - b. initiate an extended, public, social-media discussion in which you falsely accuse us of unlawful behavior; and
  - c. listen to your co-host’s version of his discussions with a member of the EC—but, of course, no time to elicit the latter’s version of these discussions before going half-cocked, making vile and false allegations of unlawful behavior.

Is this evidence of hostility to MHI? Obviously so.

7. You could have excused your co-host from podcast work so that he could participate in MHI’s “educational” discussions meetings, study Marxist-Humanism, and continue a relationship with us, but you did not.

In your letter of January 12, 2017, you falsely state, “When I left the organization, I made it clear that ... the reason for my withdrawal of supporter status was due to health reasons.” In your message of December 6 (attached), in which you announced your resignation, you made no mention of health issues. The *only* reason you provided (apart from financial concerns) was your bogus lack-of-time excuse.

We first learned about alleged health issues only three days after you resigned, at which time you stated that “I need to cut down on obligations and respo[n]sibilities outside friends, family, study, and livelihood due to health reasons.” Since your new podcast series does not qualify as “friends, family, study, [or] livelihood” (see point 5, above), this was another disingenuous excuse.

You further state that “It was my belief, and I had no reason to suspect otherwise, that I left the organization in good standing.” As we have already documented (see point 3 above), we made clear at the time that you were attempting to “reap the benefits of membership without having to make any contribution to the organization or to working out its ideas.”

You also falsely charge that our discussions with your co-host were “in the middle of the night and without previous notification.” \_\_\_\_\_ informed your co-host that he wanted to speak with him, and asked and received permission before doing so. In addition, your co-host initiated contact with \_\_\_\_\_ after speaking with \_\_\_\_\_. He stated, “dear \_\_\_\_\_ i know you are probably talking to \_\_\_\_\_ right now, and i would just like to say i reely like and admier the work that the MIH and

you are doing. and if you have any questions to me whatsoever about anything feel free to call me on skype. i am awakeable all day.” “[A]wakeable [awakeable] all day” means that he was willing to be called at any time.

You further charge falsely that the purpose of the discussions was “to interrogate him about me, my beliefs, why I left the organization (ALL of which has been explained to you **in writing**) and to proclaim me **‘hostile to the organization.’**” No, the purpose was to inform him that we’d be happy for him to remain a friend of the organization and participate in MHI’s “educational” discussions if he discontinues his work on the podcast series.

It was never stated that he should break off his friendship with you. In his second discussion with your co-host, \_\_\_\_\_ clarified that the issue was the podcast series, which has excluded discussion of Marxist-Humanist views while publicizing opposing tendencies, and which is co-hosted by an individual (you) who is hostile to MHI. Contrary to what you suggest, \_\_\_\_\_ did not ask your co-host anything personal about you or your family.

Your letter of January 12 demands that we provide “justification” for our request that he discontinue his work on the podcast series if he wishes to remain a friend of the organization and participate in MHI’s “educational” discussions. The justification is your hostility, ample evidence of which has been provided above.

You were not a party to these discussions, so you have *no evidence* that \_\_\_\_\_ engaged in “harass[ment]” and “draconian, authoritarian behavior that I might have expected from a McCarthyite government, or from the Gestapo.” \_\_\_\_\_ spoke with him, and discussed the political orientation of the podcast series and his co-host, but we completely reject your absurd, harmful, and unsubstantiated characterization of these discussions.

Unless your co-host lied to \_\_\_\_\_, he also rejects your characterization, since he volunteered that he really likes and admires the work MHI is doing and that \_\_\_\_\_ should feel free to call him, with any questions whatsoever, at any time. He also wrote a friendly message to \_\_\_\_\_— after the Skype discussions—in which he stated that he has “tremendous respect for” “the organization and what it stands for, the people and the idea that it represents,” and that he “truly believe[s]” that it is a way forward.

You recklessly insinuate that the Skype conversations, and our desire to make sure that participants in MHI’s “educational” discussions are friendly to us, are in violation of Swedish law and that you intend to sic the authorities on us. This is an extremely serious threat.

We are giving you 48 hours, during which time you must:

- a. withdraw all insinuations that you intend to sic the authorities on us;
- b. withdraw the allegation that \_\_\_\_\_’s communications with your co-host were “harass[ment]” and “draconian, authoritarian behavior that I might have expected from a McCarthyite government, or from the Gestapo”;
- c. publish both withdrawals in all places, including social media, where the insinuation and allegation were made;

- d. provide us with documentation that you have done so;
- e. affirm that you have no evidence that we ever stated that your co-host should break off his friendship with you;
- f. affirm that you did not cite health issues as a reason when you resigned;
- g. admit that the “health” excuse is phony, since your health is good enough to initiate a new podcast series that doesn’t qualify as an obligation to “friends, family, study, [or] livelihood”;
- h. admit that the lack-of-time excuse for leaving MHI is phony, since you have time to involve yourself in a new podcast series; and
- i. admit that you are indeed hostile to MHI; specifically, that the charges made in points 1 through 7 above are all correct.

**If you fail to comply, fully, within 48 hours, we will take further action. We do not intend to allow Marxist-Humanism and MHI to suffer harm by sitting idly by while you publicly slander us and our members.**

Sincerely yours,

The EC

Note: relevant communications follow as documentation.

[December 6, 2016]

Dear \_\_\_\_\_ and everyone in the EC,

I regret to inform you that my time will be under further constraint during the coming year, and next semester especially. I will therefore not be able to keep my obligation, as per the newly approved motion, to voice any disagreements and provide an alternate viewpoint. I’m also not certain that I will be able to make financial commitments on a regular basis and – if I can – what I’ll be able to give. I’m therefore uncertain whether my supportership will fit with the spirit of the (much needed and reasonable) changes that were made during the Annual Conference. I therefore ask to withdraw my supportership, unless the EC sees it fit that my status stay as is.

Please note that I am still in general agreement with the aims and positions of MHI, and I have every intention to maintain a relationship to the organization, but my degree of involvement must unfortunately diminish in both frequency and intensity during the coming year. I would like to stay in touch, and to be invited as a guest for coming discussions, should the EC and OS share that wish.

In solidarity,

\_\_\_\_\_

Dec. 7[, 2016]

Dear \_\_\_\_\_,

We regret your resignation, but we cannot “fit” your requirements into the requirements of supportership. We are sorry you have unspecified disagreements or potential disagreements with MHI positions but you don’t feel they are important to express and thereby possibly to improve MHI. We think people should state disagreements; that’s why we just voted it in as a rule for supporters (as it is already in the By-Laws for members).

We are glad you’ll keep in touch, and hope you’ll also send contributions when you can. But we cannot accept your request to be invited to meetings while we forego knowing about your disagreements and forego the modest dues we set. To do that would reinforce the very relationship we just attempted to change: supporters who reap the benefits of membership without having to make any contribution to the organization or to working out its ideas. Clearly, the “guest” designation should continue to be for new friends who have shown interest in MHI, not for old friends who joined and then left it.

Unless we hear from you in the next 3 days, we will treat your resignation as final. If you wish to re-apply at a future date, you may do so.

We wish you the best,

\_\_\_\_\_, for the EC

[December 9, 2016]

Dear \_\_\_\_\_,

It is not that I do not feel like contributing to the development of the MHI. Believe me, if I could I'd do nothing but read and write all day. But the coming year will demand even more time of me, and this means that I need to cut down on obligations and responsibilities outside friends, family, study, and livelihood due to health reasons since I do not respond well to stress. I'd also like to point out that this is likely temporary, and that I intend to reapply for supportership or even membership once my life calms down a bit.

I could of course continue donating the modest fee proposed by \_\_\_\_\_ (presuming that motion passed, I had left the meeting by this point). My concern was that - in \_\_\_\_\_'s amendment to the motion that supporters as well as members need to voice their disagreements - he expressed himself like one would have to give more in order to be excused from the obligation by the EC. \$7 or whatever \_\_\_\_\_'s motion proposed is not an issue.

In solidarity,

\_\_\_\_\_

[January 11, 2017, from podcast co-host]

dear \_\_\_\_ i know you are probably talking to \_\_\_\_ right now, and i would just like to say i reely like and admier the work that the MIH and you are doing. and if you hawe enby questions to me whatsoever about anything fel free to call me on skype. i am awakibule all day .

[January 12, 2017, from podcast co-host]

dear \_\_\_\_\_,  
after long thinking and reflection i have come to a conclusion regarding the issue that we have been discussing the last couple of days. when i first find this organization and was able to associate with it my first reaction when that for relief and joy. but after long and hard thinking i have come to the conclusion that my services for the cause and the idea that organization serves and my contribution to that idea is best served thru the podcast. this is because of the fact that so many leftist in sweden have contacted os peronly to tel oss that it fills av woide. the organization and what it stands for, the people and the idea that it represents is still something that i have tremendous respect for and i truly believe that it is a what forward, but i also have to consider when i as a single individual well make the greatest difference and ser the same ide of that you are doing. and for the time being i have come to the conclusion that i as a person can make a bigger contribution in the podcast than in your organisation. as i said, this is something that truly saddens me. as i said, this is somting that truly sadens me, and i still consider the MIH as remarcebul oragistion and whiche you all de best of luch in bildig it. and i still consider the MIH remarquable organisation and which you all the best of luck in building it.