

I.S. National Report

Vol. III, No. 4

Oct. 10 - Oct. 24, 1974

CONTENTS

National Secretary's Report, October 24, 1974  
EC Minutes, 10/16 & 10/23  
Membership Referendum on adding two comrades to the National Committee  
\*For A New Industrialization Campaign KM  
Minutes of the 1974 National Convention

\* Denotes NC Documents

FOR MEMBERS ONLY

FOR MEMBERS ONLY

FOR MEMBERS ONLY

FOR MEMBERS

1. Executive Committee

Boston Busing Crisis: On 10/16 the EC had a long discussion on the Boston Busing Crisis and our attitude toward federal troops coming in. The position passed is in the accompanying statement on the crisis. We have sent Li'l Joe, CR (Detroit) & BH (Chicago) (all formally of LA) to Boston for approximately 2 weeks to develop and begin implementing our strategy for the crisis. That strategy developed by Joe and the comrades in Boston, and passed by the EC on 10/23, is to build for the second stage of the busing program into East Boston (which incidentally will reportedly be more difficult than in South Boston) in January. The assessment is that the situation in South Boston will remain static or subside, hence the concentration ~~is~~ on what will be going down in East Boston. Specifically the comrades are attempting to build groups of workers/parents in Roxbury (black community) and East Boston which would come together around a common program of carrying out the busing plan, protection for the students, and opposition to racist mobs, etc. We have contacts in the East Boston area, and have begun to make them in Roxbury. There is a vacuum of leadership in the black community, with little or no support for the NAACP and/or black politicians. The assessment is that the situation is quite open, and that we have the potential to develop a real periphery and branch out of the struggle. With the exception of the OL, who is our biggest competitor in Boston, all of the other groups are relatively bankrupt. The SWP is calling for federal troops as the answer, the SL is concentrating on exposing the NAACP & AFL-CIO for not being serious in their support for busing because they don't call for armed self defense, and the RU has called for smashing the racist busing plan. There will be a more complete report later by the comrades in Boston.

NC meeting: Preparations for the NC continue. We passed the industrialization perspectives document for the NC, and it is included in this mailing. We held a discussion on KM's document on the current conjunctural economic crisis in the US, and that document and the CLUW document will go out in the next bi-weekly mailing.

Report on the Maoist Groups: The following is a brief report on the latest developments that we know of in the Maoist groups. Comrades should continue to send in any information on the Maoist groups and we'll send it out in the Report.

RU: We have begun to recruit from the RU periphery, and should continue to do so. They leafleted our forum recently in Seattle, and Avakian recently attacked our analysis of RUSSis (not by name), all of which point to the fact that they are being forced to take us more seriously. There is currently a crisis in the RU around the black question. Many of their rank and file can't or won't defend their line (see report on Boston, and the latest issue of Revolution). They seem to be going in a PL-moralistic direction on this question.

OL: The OL is growing rapidly, and from the same milieu that we are (collectives, etc. We now share a number of contacts with them. We've heard, but it is yet to be confirmed, that there is an opposition developing to their Washington DC network of study groups, and that they think that we will pick up a chunk of it. We will be confirming this soon, as a comrade is now in Washington. Recently, however, they have gotten into trouble around their all out support for the Shah of Iran. They are currently having a fight with the Guardina on this.

BWC: The BWC is becoming a major competitor in the fight among the Maoist organizations for hegemony. They have been picking up some of the ex-RUers, and are now open to whites to joining. They are allied with the August 29th Movement (Chicano group, formally the Labor Committee of the La Raza Unida Party in LA) and the Puerto Rican Revolutionary Workers Organizing Committee. We have heard that they are moving a bulk of their people to Detroit.

National Secretary's Report continued

2. NO: We have completed the pamphlet on the miners and it is being sent out to the branches. Branches should aim to use it in building support for the miners strike, and to really push the pamphlet, as it will be out of date after the strike.

3. Mistake: Please note, due to a typist error, EE (Detroit) was not included in the list of NC members on the ~~Left~~ NC committee on the Left.

4. NYC: The rank and file conference last weekend there was excellent. 120 people registered, with approximately half contacts from NYC, New Jersey, Washington DC, Philadelphia and Boston. Comrades from Detroit, Cleveland, Boston as well as NYC were in attendance and participated in the conference. For the first time there were soft Maoists in attendance, most of whom were moved substantially in our direction. We now have an excellent chance for a branch in Philadelphia as a result of the conference. The only weakness in the conference was that we were not successful in getting out worker contacts that we'd been working with in industry. Two long time friends in NYC joined.

5. Bay Area: BG debated the SL in an old friend's class on the campus, and MP will debate the RU in the same class this week. We were not allowed to have a table at the Puerto Rican Solidarity Day demonstration because we were Trotskyists despite our ongoing participation in the committee in an effort to build the rally.

6. Recruitment: six more people have joined the IS since the last National Report.

O.NOTE: Li'l Joe (formerly from the SC) has arrived in Detroit and is now a member of the EC.

1. BOSTON AND THE QUESTION OF FEDERAL TROOPS. The greater part of this meeting was taken up in a lengthy discussion about the issue of the call for the ~~task~~ stationing of federal troops in Boston to protect black children attending South Boston High school under the court-ordered busing plan. The original draft of the IS statement on busing (drafted by JT) contained the following paragraph:

"In the course of the struggle the blacks have demanded that police, including state police and federal marshalls or troops, be brought in to protect them from the white mobs. This call is of course an admission of weakness of the black community. The fact is the black community in Boston is weak. Were this development to take place in Detroit or Chicago, where the black communities are much stronger, it would take a different course. Under the circumstances, such a demand can be legitimate. It is by no means precluded to call upon the state for protection from racist mob attacks. However, it can be and usually is a disastrous course of action from our point of view and needs to be handled very carefully."

The draft also went on to raise the following points: any demand for federal protection must not be allowed to become the strategy for the struggle; there must be no reliance on troops or the state; the demand must be tied to the condition that there be no restriction on the freedom of the black community to organize its own defense; there must be no troops, etc. in the black community itself. In brief this position called for critical and conditional support of the demand that the government provide protection and physical enforcement of the busing of black children from mob assaults (using the case of LittleRock as a rough historical parallel).

The following counterposition was put forward by JG as a substitute for the entire section of the draft dealing with the ~~task~~ demand for federal protection;

"The IS is opposed to relying upon, or calling upon, federal troops in Boston. If troops are sent in, how and when we openly raise opposition to their presence is a matter of tactics (i.e. we are politically opposed at all points to the presence of troops, but will tactically choose the correct time to demand their withdrawal).

"The use of federal troops, as ~~shown~~ shown by their use during the movement of the '60's when they entered the situation supposedly to defend the black community - is in reality a defense of the ~~racist~~ racist social order, which is racist. In the last analysis troops were used to put down those militant forces in the black community who attempted to organize defense and to fight the racist social order which the troops defended. Hence our opposition to the call for the use of federal troops in the South, where the black community was presumably "weaker" than in Boston, our hostility to the slogan raised by the SWP of bringing troops "home from Vietnam and into Mississippi." The "weakness" of the black community is political - its leadership's reliance on the state, the illusions it peddles about the National Guard, and its failure to politically organize and mobilize the black masses in militant activity. Instead of relying on troops and farming out the defense of the black community or the struggle against racism to the National Guard and the state, we are for unleashing the enormous political power of the black community in Boston, calling for the mobilization of the black community, armed self-defense, job actions by black workers and the trade unions, and a national mobilization of black and radical activists to Boston to win this battle."

The political line of the JT draft was supported by JT, KM and DF; the line of the JG substitute was supported by JG, MD and Joe; with JW abstaining.

The following new motions were put forward: MOTION (JW): At this time the IS will neither agitate for nor actively oppose the call for the stationing of federal troops in Boston. We will not actively oppose this demand insofar as it is being raised by elements of the Boston black community who are insisting that the federal government enforce its own school desegregation order. We do not, however, take any responsibility for the federal troops or their actions. The thrust of our agitation is the need for the black community to organize its own defense -- that it cannot count on the federal government or other law enforcement agencies to defend or protect it. In particular we pose the need for organized armed self-defense. We condemn and will freely oppose any use of troops or other police agencies to attack the black community.

~~AMEND~~ AMENDMENT TO JT DRAFT (Joe): Replace the phrase "the blacks have demanded" in the first sentence with "The NAACP and black politicians have demanded". Delete the second and third sentences, and substitute "This call is of course consistent with the strategy of the NAACP whose strategy is to rely upon the state and whose role is to prevent the independent mobilization of the strength of the black community. In the fourth sentence, replace the phrase "where the black communities are much stronger" with "where the black communities are more militant and independent of the NAACP." ~~Reintex~~

AMENDMENT TO JT DRAFT (MD): To add second paragraph of JG substitute motion as an addition.

JW Motion PASSED (JT, DF, KM abstain). The amendments by Joe were ACCEPTED; in addition, the last two sentences of the JT draft (starting with "It is by no means precluded...") were considered deleted since they would clearly fail on a 3-3-1 vote. The addition of the JG ~~xxxxx~~ paragraph PASSED 5-2 (DF, KM against).

The entire document as amended then PASSED ALL FOR.

MOTION: For Joe to make a trip to Boston to organize IS activity around this crisis. ALL FOR.

2. INDUSTRIALIZATION. Major part of industrialization document presented by KM. Some specific motions on some of the branches still to be added. Document in partial form APPROVED (ALL FOR except Joe abstaining).

3. ATTICA, Possibility of IS setting up speaking tour for Attica defendants. Proposal APPROVED as a modest perspective to be implemented where it will not interfere with UMW support campaign already in progress.

4. REPORTS. Report by JG and Joe on West Coast tour. See NATSEC REPORT for summary of other reports.

---

O. NATSEC REPORT. New York conference was quite successful; 120 were registered. The conference was as good or better than the Cleveland conference in most respects, except that there was less turnout of industrialized people.

Discussion of industrial possibilities for New York branch. Industrialization document for NC will indicate these; a committee of JT and Gay will be responsible for consulting with NY branch on perspectives.

Report from Boston: IS is becoming involved in the struggle to defend busing and black community. A Boston Common rally last weekend was supported by IS, SWP, SL and OL. An EC committee of JT, MD, and ~~Y~~ Joe will continue to guide this work on a daily basis. If possible comrades who ~~xxx~~ have gone to Boston will be asked to arrange return in time for important Detroit conference Nov. 3.

Brief report by JG on the position taken by RU on busing (people must unite to smash busing plan) and new information on major Maoist groups.

The fund drive is over 10% behind schedule. Phone calls will be made to branches that are behind telling them they must catch up.

Motion received from Cal W. that NC be set back to Dec. 7-8. FAILED 0-6.

Report by KM on opposition activity in Chicago Truck Drivers Union.

JG will present an over-all report on security to the EC in two weeks.

EC is instituting referendum to add Joe and Leslie to NC (see Report).

1. ELECTIONS. WP editorial will focus on attack on the Democratic Party and its wage-price control program, fighting against working people voting for the Democrats, Republicans or Wallaceite parties as being parties of their own exploitation and oppression. The question came up of whether we call for protest vote for independent radical or socialist candidates (it is understood that we are not building or giving "critical support" to any such candidates in this election as they are generally completely worthless), or whether we urge abstention.

MOTION (JG): We call for a protest vote against the capitalist system and its economic mess. In the absence of a real socialist or independent radical or labor campaign, we are for a protest vote for any of the radical or socialist slates on the ballot. PASSED 3-2-1 (KM, MD against; JW abstain).

2. THE ECONOMY; or, THE COMING DEPRESSION. Initial presentation by KM and discussion on document in preparation for NC.

3. INDUSTRIALIZATION. Additions to document by KM, specifically on New York branch priorities, PASSED ALL FOR. (West Coast branch perspectives still to be added).

4. SADLOWSKI. Discussion on Sadlowski opposition campaign in USW District 31. While Sadlowski is not a class struggle unionist, and will not be the organizer of a rank and file movement, his election will represent an important victory for the rank and file struggle which is emerging. We place no political confidence or reliance on Sadlowski, but support his election and are for working for it. PASSED ALL FOR (to be spelled out in WP).

5. CLUW. MOTION: To add Stephanie to CLUW fraction steering committee to broaden its direct involvement in CLUW work. ALL FOR.

A clarification of our position on CLUW membership is needed because of obvious confusion in the organization. We are, and have been from the beginning, for CLUW membership being open not only to union members but also to women in organizing drives, and to women in jobs which could be organized and who are interested in being organized. The notion that this question was up for a new discussion and that the EC was going to ~~xxx~~ take a vote on the issue of CLUW membership was a complete misunderstanding. In CLUW meetings where the question of membership comes up, we raise our position - as a whole or specific aspects of it - as appropriate in that situation.

IMPORTANT      IMPORTANT      IMPORTANT      IMPORTANT      IMPORTANT      IMPORTANT      IM

TO: All branches, Organizing Committees, and MALs:

FROM: National Secretary

SUBJECT: Membership referendum on adding two ~~new~~ comrades formally of the Socialist Collective to the National Committee; and 2 comrades formally of the SC as alternates to the NC.

MOTION: THAT LI'L JOE (Detroit) AND LESLIE D (CHICAGO) BE MADE FULL MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE, EFFECTIVE UPON A MAJORITY VOTE BY THE ORGANIZATION, TO BE TALLIED ON NOVEMBER 21; AND THAT CONNIE R. (DETROIT) AND MICHELLE S (CHICAGO) BE MADE ALTERNATES TO THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE EFFECTIVE UPON A MAJORITY VOTE OF THE ORGANIZATION TO BE TALLIED BY ON NOVEMBER 21.

CA

MOTIVATION

In order to fully integrate and assimilate the comrades formally of the Socialist Collective, the EC believes that it is important that these comrades be involved in all levels of leadership as full members of the national leadership of the IS. Li'l Joe has been elected to the EC by a majority vote of the NC 3 weeks ago.

These comrades recommended are fully qualified and have demonstrated through their past activities as leaders of the SC and during the last month as leaders of the IS, their ability to guide and direct the organization. We believe that the addition of these comrades to the NC will qualitatively expand that body's ability to ~~not~~ guide the organization as a whole, and that the contributions they have already made to the organization in the short time they have been members testifies to this statement. This motion has the unanimous recommendation of the Executive Committee.

NOTE: IT IS VERY IMPORTANT THAT THIS REFERENDUM BE COMPLETED BEFORE THE NOVEMBER NC (November 29-December 1). Votes should be taken in each branch and organizing committee before November 21, and reported to me. MALs should send me their vote. The final tally will be reported in the National Report following receipt of the ~~xxx~~ votes of the branches, organizing committees and MALs.

**FOR A NEW INDUSTRIALIZATION CAMPAIGN**  
To be presented to the November NC

KM for the EC

The year and a half between the split and the 1974 convention was a period of political and organizational consolidation for the entire organization. Our industrial work reflected this fact. Up to the recent convention there was no major expansion in our industrialization program or in the percentage of industrialized members. The number of comrades in the top three industrial priorities ~~ga~~ hovered around 40, or about 20% of the membership. Like our membership figures generally, there was no real growth until the 1974 Convention.

As with the organization generally, however, that time was not wasted. During that year the organization pulled itself together and laid the basis for significant and rapid expansion. The same can be said of our industrialization program.

During the period prior to the convention some of our more established work began to pay off. In particular, our auto work in Detroit and telephone work in New York emerged as successful caucuses were built. In both of these cases comrades with three or more years of experience were able to use their experience and reputations ~~x~~ to build viable groups or to expand our periphery. In short, in these situations we were prepared to take advantage of a positive change in the objective situation.

Equally important, was the development of our IBT fraction. Here, where we were newer, that past year and a ~~xk~~ half was spent getting some comrades into the industry, putting in the time necessary to become known, and laying the basis for more advanced work when the situation allows.

Also, we got our first ~~xxxx~~ toe-hold in the steel industry. Though this was not really done by design, we were able to intervene in the past six months in the small political opposition in the USW. While only a couple of comrades work in that industry, energetic assistance of comrades outside of steel made our political intervention effective and laid the basis for some expansion in this industry.

In ~~xxxx~~ spite of these advances however, serious problems plague our industrialization program. Foremost among these is simply the problem of quantity. Like capitalism itself, our industrial presence must expand ~~mk~~ or face defeat. Equally important and connected to this problem is the question of women's industrialization. The long standing sexist hiring practices of basic industry has meant that most of our priorities are male dominated industries. Additionally, we face the problem, related to expansion, of fleshing out our existing fractions and placing them on a firmer organizational basis.

#### Quantitative Expansion

Fortunately, the situation in and around the IS has changed. Consolidation is now paying off and the organization is growing. A very high percentage of our new membership and immediate periphery is committed to industrializing in a priority industry. Of the 40 or so new members recruited between the convention and the early part of October, well over half are committed to industrializing immediately. The new dynamism of the organization is also creating a greater willingness among older members to industrialize. I estimate that as of early October there are at least 25 people waiting to get hired into one or another priority - this includes new and old members. Additionally, a number of people have made commitments to industrialize within the coming year. If the organization doubles its membership during this year (1974-75), it will almost certainly triple the number of members industrialized as of the 1974 convention. This is not even taking into consideration the possibility of recruiting workers already in industry as a result of our political work there.



The question of numerical expansion is also the question of where and how many. That is, which fractions do we beef-up in which proportions. It is no longer sufficient to have a list of priorities that is ~~xxxx~~ presumed to apply everywhere. In addition to maintaining our top three priorities, the organization must specify ~~which cities~~ in which cities which industries are most important. Where do we ~~xxxx~~ need to re-enforce local fractions of one or another industry to make our national fraction most effective?

From the vantage point of the industries, the following generalizations can be made ~~sufficiently~~ about the priorities within the priorities: auto has now been sufficiently built in Detroit (this includes the assumed industrialization of at least two of the former ~~SD~~ SC comrades into Detroit auto) but desperately needs building in other midwest cities. Priorities for building an effective national auto fraction are the establishment of fractions in St. Louis, Cleveland, and Louisville. In each of these cities comrades are already trying to get in to the industry. During the coming year, we should also build up the existing fraction in Chicago and establish a fraction in LA.

So far, the only really strong fraction in IBT is that in Cleveland. LA is building a strong fraction, but is very new to the industry. The fractions in Seattle and the Bay Area are composed too much of comrades outside the industry. The reputations of the papers around which we work in those two areas allows us enormous opportunities, but to take full advantage more comrades must work in that industry. The Chicago fraction has already engaged in important political work in spite of its newness. The Chicago fraction should be expanded this year. Additionally, we should plan for the beginnings of IBT fractions in Detroit and St. Louis.

Only one CWA fraction that is ~~x~~strong exists, the one in NY. In five other cities there is one member each who is actually in CWA. The up-surge around the contract, however, demonstrated the possibility of effective intervention in that union in places other than just New York. To build a real national fraction the organization will have to build serious local fractions in at least Detroit and Louisville and, if possible, in Cleveland and the Bay Area.

AFT has always been a different sort of priority than the other three. We have not favored actually sending people in to teaching but rather have urged those who are committed to teaching as a career to concentrate in the public schools rather than colleges. Unfortunately, those comrades who are in AFT are not always well situated. That is, far too many of our AFT comrades are in small suburban or small city locals. A politically effective AFT fraction will have to be built in the major locals of the AFT, particularly in NYC, Detroit and Chicago. This means that the most important job of the AFT fraction is to begin concentrating its existing forces or any new teacher comrades we recruit, in these cities.

This should be the general plan under which we direct industrialization in the coming year. However, it will be necessary, at the conclusion of this document, to spell out specifically in terms of branches what the emphasis of each branch is to be in the coming months.

### USW: A New Priority

The growth of the organization and political developments in the labor movement itself make it necessary for us to expand our priority industries by adding steel on a strictly limited basis. Within the past year and a half, the USW bureaucracy has ~~xtaken~~ the political lead in the offensive against the ranks. [The ENA was an audacious move to the right and is seen throughout the labor bureaucracy as the future.] With the retirement of Abel in 1977, the likelihood of a victory by Sadlowski in District 31, and the beginnings of regional opposition formations, the internal political life of the USW is likely to open up rapidly within the next three years. Events in the USW will be as important to the labor movement as the emergence of a self-conscious opposition movement in the UAW. We cannot afford to miss out on these developments.

We propose that the IS establish local steel fractions in Cleveland, Chicago, and Pittsburgh as soon as we have a branch there. Cleveland, Pittsburgh and the area between represent our political toe-hold. It is in this area that a regional opposition has begun to take shape around RAFT. Our political credibility in the RAFT milieu is already quite high in spite of the limited input the organization has been able to make. The building of stable fractions in Cleveland and Pittsburgh can guarantee our continued presence in the leadership of the RAFT milieu and in the regional movement we expect to develop there in the coming two or three years.

Chicago is important because it is the largest District (31) in the USW (175,000 members) and one of the most politically volatile. District 31 has been a hotbed of opposition to Abel for years and to MacDonald before him. Additionally, Sadlowski, while no more than a liberal (an Arnold Miller type), has become the focus of a real opposition movement in that district. An election between him and Abel's man, Evett, will take place on November 19. While this is less a rank and file phenomenon than the RAFT milieu, it will be a major political event in the USW. If Sadlowski wins, which is almost certain, District 31 will be the focus for the development of a fight for power in 1977 against whoever Abel picks as his successor. We must have a political presence in that district by that time.

A perspective for the steel industry has yet to be worked out. For the time being, however, it is fairly clear that the greatest opportunities in steel exist in these two areas. This is true even though it will probably not be possible to participate in the same opposition groups; that is, we do not expect RAFT to become national yet, nor do we expect Sadlowski and his supporters to form a national opposition for some time to come. Nevertheless, it is clear that a relatively limited input - with a potential for recruitment in the industry - can net us some big political dividends within the next year or two.

We do not propose that steel fractions be built in cities other than those listed in the coming year. That means that steel is a priority only for three cities in this coming year.

#### The Problem of Women's Industrialization

Due to the male dominated character of most of our priorities, the number and percentage of women in the industrialization program is small. Furthermore, women who feel they want to industrialize specifically to work with working women face frustration. Auto, IBT and now steel are industries with relatively small proportions of women. CWA is a more complex problem and will be discussed later. As a result, a number of proposals have arisen to deal specifically with women's industrialization. In particular, AFSCME and hospitals have been put forth. Before laying out a positive plan for expanded women's industrialization, I want to deal with these two proposals.

AFSCME, like AFGE, is one of the few unions that has recruited tens of thousands of women to the union movement in recent years. Because much of the expansion of women in the work force is concentrated in public service jobs, it has been these two unions who have played a big role in organizing women. It is undeniable that there are many locals of AFSCME in which women predominate. The desire to work directly with women makes these facts attractive.

The problem, however, is that there is no evidence that these sectors of AFSCME are dynamic, well organized, or politically important to that union. In fact, AFSCME itself, while numerically expanding, is not a strong union at all. Most of the locals are organized along job lines rather than by agency or employer. The strongest and best organized locals in AFSCME are more thoroughly male than the UAW or USW. These are the sanitation locals which are mostly composed of black men.

Politically, AFSCME is probably less important in the labor movement as a whole than the AFT. The professional and semi-professional white collar jobs are not the sort of jobs we want to "industrialize" into, while the clerical jobs are dispersed and extremely low paying. Anyone willing to do the latter jobs should certainly be willing to work as a telephone operator or telephone plant clerk.

Hospitals are a different case. To an even greater degree than public employment, hospitals are not really a national industry at all. A result of that is that hospitals are poorly organized. Many are completely unorganized and others poorly so. Most problematic for building a national fraction is that hospital workers, where they are organized, are split up into a number of different unions. At least four unions (1199, AFSCME; SEIU, AFGE) represent non-professional hospital workers in different cities, or even within the same city. In addition, nurses are generally organized by independent associations which may or may not act like a union. The political problems inherent in this sort of situation are enormous. In any case, none of the unions involved is particularly important today. This doesn't contradict the importance of hospitals in CLUW organizing drives.

There is an additional problem in both hospital and most public service work. That is the problem of the social relations on the job. In industry social relations are relatively simple; there is us and them, workers and bosses. In hospital and public service there are also patients and clients of various sorts. The existence of such an intermediary group has always had an adverse effect on the class consciousness of most service workers. No worker feels ~~easy about shutting~~ easy about shutting down a steel mill or an auto plant. The attitude of fuck the boss includes the notion of fuck the job. But when your job involved serving human beings who need help the matter becomes much more complicated. This is part of the reason why there is very little real shop floor organization in hospitals or various public service agencies.

Of course, it can be argued that the service nature of these jobs tend to make union affairs more political. That is true in many ~~ways~~ ways, but also presents additional problems - namely the kinds of service politics and mushy liberalism that lend themselves to these situations. Most decisive for us, however, is ~~is~~ simply the weakness of work place organization which is reflected in the weakness of virtually all of the unions organizing these jobs.

What then is the answer?

If we were to pick a new priority in which women could concentrate it would certainly be something like the electrical and electronics industry. The female work force in this industry is far more analogous to the males in auto, steel, etc. However, this would require a large commitment on the part of the organization in terms of personnel. It is our assessment that this is not really possible right now, though it may become so in the future.

The perspective and strategy of the IS has been based on the centrality of the major industrial unions and industries. Realizing that it would be impossible to dig our roots in the working class even in all sectors of these central unions and industries, we choose priorities within that strategic conception. These priorities were also chosen with an eye to strategy and maximum effectiveness for the small number of cadre we have. Events in all of our priorities have indicated that our choices were correct. Our estimate that the rank and file movement would break through first in these unions and that the movement in these unions would represent the leading elements of a working class movement, is receiving more and more support every day.

If the IS perspective is correct, then it is these sectors of industry and the labor movement that will lead the rest, and indeed, aid and abet rank and file movements throughout industry and the trade union movement generally. It is essential that women be in the leadership of the movement in these industries and unions. (We do not believe and it has not been argued that the women's rank and file movement will arise separately or in a vacuum from the overall movement. Women workers will go into motion as the class goes into motion. But if there are no women leaders in the strongest sections of the rank and file movement, it is not likely that the bulk of working women - who work in dispersed and poorly organized jobs - will be able to play a leading role. There must be women leaders in basic industry and in the biggest industrial unions who can provide political leadership and direction for working women throughout industry. IS and other revolutionary socialist women will be that leadership. To be effective they must be located in the heart of the rank and file movement and not at its periphery.)

It is therefore important that a good number of women industrialize in the top priorities, even though these industries have a relatively small percentage of women. This industrialization, however, should be considered in a plant by plant basis. That is, women should seek to get into those plants that do have large numbers of women. There are many such plants covered by the UAW. Because of the EEOC cases the number of women in steel and certain companies covered by the IBT is rising significantly - though it will be set back by the coming depression. While it will be difficult to get jobs in just the right auto, steel or IBT shops, where the most women are concentrated, it will not be impossible.

Clearly, however, the greatest opportunities for direct work with large numbers of women exist in telephone. A majority of the CWA's members are women. Hiring is slow, but that will be true in all industries including hospitals and public service. Matters are further complicated by the fact that often the only way to get in at all is through the plant department, which is mostly male. Superficially, because of current hiring patterns, it doesn't look like CWA is a good place for working with women. This impression, however, is wrong if you look deeper.

First, in one city (Detroit) in which the CWA fraction must be built, nearly 40% of the plant work force is women. This is because the frames are worked by women and because of the fairly large number of women hired into other craft jobs due to affirmative action.

Second, on the west coast, CWA represents the Western Electric production workers, the majority of which are women. There is no reason why we must limit ourselves to Bell system operating companies. Western, and ATT Long Lines are additional possibilities in which the workforce is mostly women.

Third, even where it is necessary to go into plant to get a job there is often an industrial local. That means that traffic and plant are in the same local and, therefore, the majority of local members are women. Furthermore, the men and women often work in the same building. So, even if you are hired into a "male" job, say switchman, there is plenty of opportunity for contact with other women workers.

Finally, in at least one city, Louisville, it is possible to get hired into traffic - which is, of course, almost entirely women.

So, if you begin to break this down by branch, you discover that there are plenty of opportunities to work directly with masses of women workers. This is particularly true in Detroit, Louisville and the Bay Area (WeCO). In New York, and most places it is possible to work directly with large numbers of women in plant - even though they are not the majority, there are probably close to 2,000 women in Local 1101, plant. In

Cleveland, Louisville, Bay Area, and Seattle it is possible to work with women in the same local union, and probably in the same building, even if you are hired into a plant job and work next to a man.

We suspect that the hesitance of many women to go into CWA has not stemmed from a lack of opportunities to work with women, but from the fact - apparent to all - that the organization has not taken CWA seriously. That is, aside from a few individuals, the organization and its leadership has not pushed CWA for women or anyone else. No one wants to go somewhere where they will not be taken seriously.

Thus, while women's industrialization is a broader question than just the CWA, a serious campaign to expand the number and proportion of women in the industrialization program must include the building of the CWA fraction nationally. That is, it must be pushed, discussed, analyzed, and followed with the same dedication and seriousness that built the ~~the~~ auto fraction.

#### Jobs, Depressions and Priorities

There has always been a certain amount of confusion about what priorities mean in the IS. There has been no small amount of moralism and romanticism concerning "the priorities." But our priorities have been picked on a political basis, not a moral one. We picked the union we did, because we thought we could be the most politically effective there. Indeed, where we have put in time and gained experience (Detroit auto, NYC CWA) we seem to be vindicated.

Additionally, we have learned that to be effective we must concentrate our personnel and resources. That is part of the reason why we have been able to capitalize on events in Detroit and New York. That is also why our first breakthrough in IBT is likely to be in Cleveland. We can't abandon the strengthening of our existing fractions and attempt to spread ourselves thin. But we face, now, a problem we cannot control. That is, we face the likelihood of a serious depression, mass employment, and a shrinking of employment possibilities.

Like the rest of the working class, most of us need jobs to live. So, members are understandably reluctant to give up present jobs for a job from which they may get laid off, eg auto. So, our industrialization program must have a sense of urgency and timing. In brief, the sooner you are hired, the more seniority you accumulate, and the less likely you are to be permanently laid off.

Auto will be the most difficult to get into and stay in. But even under depression conditions it will not be impossible if people are persistent. Keep your present job, but also keep your application current. If you are laid off you can collect unemployment on the basis of your old job as well as the one in auto - and if you have been there long enough you can collect SUB. In other words, there are risks, but you are not likely to starve to death if you go about it the right way.

Steel is still going fairly strong and is expected to hold up for another year or so. So, people who go into steel now may be relatively safe - in any case there is SUB.

IBT is a different story altogether. Because the union organizes scores of companies in any one area it is possible to move from one job to another in the event of lay offs. That is, different companies will be effected differently by a depression. Food, fuel, and some delivery are likely to be fairly inelastic and won't experience mass layoffs. Over the road trucking would probably be the hardest.

X The Bell System does lay off various kinds of Western workers - already has in fact. Rumors also have it that they have just x laid off regular operating company personnel in New England. Nevertheless, mass lay offs are unlikely in telephone. For one thing, there is a lot of turn over in traffic, while the plant work force is still growing and in any case cannot be reduced by much even if there is some decline in telephone use - which is, itself, unlikely.

Current conditions and a depression will make everything harder, but not impossible. It will, however, probably necessitate less choice for the individual Iser who wishes to industrialize. We recommend, therefore, that those who industrialize put in and pursue applications that are consistent with all the local priorities that follow.

### Priorities by Branch

While the top three priorities remain just that, we need to specify what areas of our work must be strengthened and, therefore, where new personnel should industrialize in each branch/city. The following are recommendations for what should be considered the top priorities for each city. These recommendations should come first and in the order mentioned. Naturally, we will not always be able to work things out just the way we want. But comrades should apply in these areas and pursue these priorities, even while they are holding other jobs. Where people are slated for auto, let's say, but get hired in a slightly lower priority for that city, eg CWA, they should take the job but keep their application current in the higher priority.

### Detroit

The priority for Detroit has always been auto. Now the auto fraction is fairly well fleshed out and concentration is high. The number of women in auto in Detroit is also high, relative to the IS and to the proportion of women workers in auto. Clearly, the one task remaining is the industrialization of black cadre into auto - where most of our contacts are black. For those black comrades moving to Detroit to industrialize, auto is the top ~~ric~~ priority. For white comrades who do not yet have jobs in auto, it should no longer be the top priority.

The next steps to be taken in Detroit are the expansion of the CWA fraction and the building of an IBT fraction - in that order. The CWA fraction is particularly important for women's industrialization as Detroit is the only city with such a large proportion of women in plant jobs. The Detroit plant local is also one of the most militant in the country - and has been for years. The first steps toward establishing an IBT g fraction should be possible this year. We have yet to determine whether the big drivers local 299 is viable, having been Hoffa's and Fitz' home local, or whether to go into IBT through delivery or the grocery local, which is reputed to be militant.

### Cleveland

The IBT fraction is the strongest in the branch and the strongest IBT fraction nationally. It doesn't ~~has~~ require reenforcement at this time. More important is expanding into auto and steel. Recent ~~recruitment~~ recruitment makes both possible. In general, we should attempt to maintain the current strength of the Cleveland steel fraction. The expansion of this fraction should come only after the establishment of an auto fraction of at least 3-4 comrades. Auto then is the priority for new industrialization, followed by steel. If it turns out to be possible to do both and even to expand steel slightly within the coming year,

then the next priority should be the strengthening of the CWA fraction. Women who are unable to work in or get hired in one of the first two priorities, should apply to telephone immediately.

#### Louisville

So far Louisville has only in industrialized comrade, in CWA. However, there are contacts in a couple of auto plants. It is crucial that auto be a priority in Louisville and that a fraction of 3-4 be built within the next year. Following this, it is important to strengthen the CWA fraction, where good work has already been done and a basis for further work laid. CWA in Louisville offers an opportunity to work with women, either in the local or by hiring directly into traffic. In building CWA fraction here women's industrialization should be a primary consideration, although it is not at all excluded that women in Louisville will also go into auto. Following the building of an auto fraction and the strengthening of CWA, to somewhere around 3 people, the branch should begin building an IBT fraction. As in the case of Detroit, further investigation into where to enter IBT should be made, delivery, the large drivers local, etc.

#### New York

As it stands now, the only priority fraction in New York is CWA. Women should continue to apply to CWA in NY with a view to building UA and a strong women's movement in Local 1199 1101 - the largest local in CWA. The current branch plans to send people into hospitals organized by 1199 should not be viewed as a priority. In line with our national policy and strategy the hospital plan and the publishing organizing drive by District 65 should not justify local priorities in conflict with the national priorities of the IS, industrial or otherwise.

Given the growth of IBT work in NY, it is crucial that the NY IBT fraction be enlarged and become a central part of NY branch activity. Women should apply to delivery and possibly other jobs covered by major IBT contracts, such as grocery.

Additionally, the Linden auto plant will be hiring on a large scale in 1/75. This is an important and unusual opportunity. The branch should make a special effort to help comrades apply for and be able to accept jobs at Linden. This may include helping comrades re-locate to parts of the city closer to Linden and getting suitable transportation. Both men and women should apply to Linden.

---

NOTE: There will be additional sections of the document coming out covering especially the west coast branches.

## 1974 I.S. Convention

### RULES OF PROCEDURE

I. The chairperson plays a crucial role in guiding the convention through procedural hassles. The c.p. should be a member of the Convention Steering Committee (described below). The chair should have considerable discretionary power in ruling on procedural questions. The check on this power is Motion To Overrule the Chair: 1) Requires seconding by estimated 10% of the body; 2) Maker of motion gets 1 minute for the motion; 3) Chair 1 minute against; 4) Immediately vote. The chair's ruling may not be challenged, nor may there be a demand for a show of delegates cards (except at the chair's discretion) on those rulings involving estimation of number of seconds where the chair rules the number sufficient. The chair may be challenged where she or he rules the number of seconds insufficient for consideration of the motion.

II. Convention Steering Committee shall be established or approved at the start of the Convention. It shall recommend to the body Chairpersons, a general agenda, and procedures for handling the substantive points on the agenda. Its recommendations shall be put before the body for approval with no discussion unless there is a minority viewpoint on the committee. In such a case limited discussion shall precede a vote. Alternate procedures may, of course, be proposed from the floor.

III. Seating. Delegates and alternates for delegates will be seated at the beginning of each session for the entire session. Seating of delegates or changing of delegates during a session is permitted only under exceptional circumstances or by the Convention Steering Committee in advance of the specific session. A general exception to this rule and the use of proxy votes will be permitted for the last session of the convention

IV. A Quorum shall consist of 50% of the registered seated delegates (seated alternates counted toward a quorum). A call for a quorum must come from a speaker recognized by the chair, but may be raised on a point of procedure. A call for a quorum is out of order for one hour following a previous call. Quorum is established by raising of delegates cards.

V. Voting may be done in any of the following ways: 1) Voice vote, 2) Delegate card showing (on demand of any delegate or the chair's discretion); 3) Delegate card count (on demand of 10% of the delegates, estimated by chair); 4) Delegate roll call (on demand of 25% of the delegates, as estimated by the chair).

VI. Unless otherwise specified, all motions require a simple majority (50% plus 1) of the delegates present voting aye or nay.

#### VII. Substantive Motions.

A. The steering committee shall make recommendations for each session of the procedure for discussion and voting on substantive questions. The committee may recommend suspension of the rules described herein in its procedures.

##### B. Motions:

1. No substantive motion or amendment may be entertained unless it has FIRST been submitted to the Convention Secretary in writing.

2. All motions or amendments ruled "stylistic" by the chair shall be submitted to a styles committee established by whatever continuing body is established by the convention.

3. No substantive motion or amendment of more than one paragraph or 50 words in length shall be entertained which has not been mimeographed and distributed, unless seconded by one-third of the delegates.



4. All substantive motions or amendments must have an estimated 10% of the delegates as seconds to be considered, unless placed on the agenda as part of the Steering Committee's report.

#### VII. Miscellaneous Motions.

A. To table: requires simple majority, not debatable.

B. To commit (i.e., to a committee) or postpone (to a specific time) requires a simple majority, with limited debate at chair's discretion (e.g. two speakers for, two against). This procedure may be suspended in a proposal by the Steering Committee.

C. To reconsider: must be made by someone who voted on the prevailing side and seconded by an estimated 10% of the delegates. Limited debate. This procedure may be suspended by the Steering committee in a proposal from it.

D. Procedural (suggesting a procedure on a given point). Nondebatable except by chair's discretion. Requires simple majority.

E. To recess: non-debatable except by chair's discretion; may be ruled out of order by chair if previously made within an hour; requires simple majority.

F. To end debate and come to a vote (call or move the question); non-debatable. Chair must ask for a voice vote first showing those who do not wish to end debate, and then take a normal vote. Requires simple majority.

G. To adjourn: same procedure as to recess; the meeting is not adjourned until the chair declares it is adjourned. The chair at his or her discretion may announce or inquire about the business remaining before the body.

#### VIII. Discussion.

A. The Steering Committee shall recommend the time of presentations, floor discussion and summaries.

B. Unless otherwise provided, no speaker may speak more than 3 minutes nor more than once in the same round of floor discussion.

C. Where there are more persons desiring to speak than the scheduled time for the item permits, the speakers cards shall be turned into the chair at the beginning of the round indicated the name, local group, and approximate position on the issue. The chair shall select randomly from these cards attempting to be sure all points of view are represented.

D. Where not time limit has been proposed by the Steering Committee, the chair may propose one.

E. Speaking rights are limited to delegates, seated alternates, and NC members who have failed to be elected as delegates or where special provision has been made. Special speaking rights will be given to the authors of documents, amendments, etc. for the session involved. Observers, who notify the chair, will be given speaking rights at the end of each session, time permitting.

#### IX. Miscellaneous Points.

A. Point of personal privilege: to be used only when there is an impairment to participation in the meeting such as a draft, high noise level, etc. It may NOT be used as a way of getting the floor if verbally attacked or even slandered by another

B. Point of procedure: motion to alter or add to the procedure of the body.

C. Point of order: to be used when it is felt that the body or chair has deviated from its previously established rules or procedures. May not be used to challenge the relevance of a speakers remarks. May challenge ruling of the chair.

D. Point of information: to ASK a question of the chair. May not be used to give information or to interrogate another delegate.

E. Point of clarification: there is NO SUCH THING.

All these points may be made by shouting out. Except for personal privilege, they may not interrupt someone while she or he is speaking. The chair is not required to recognize all persons who rise to various points if he or she feels that the meeting is degenerating or seriously impaired.

1974 Convention of the International Socialists

MINUTES

Session I., Sat. A.M. - Mike P., chairing

Singing of the "International"

Announcements

Additions to the Rules:

Delegates seated at the beginning of the session for the entire session. Exceptions must be cleared in advance with the Steering Committee, except for the last session. Sessions will begin as soon as quorum.

NAC and SC recommending no extensions of speaking time.

Asking no general tape recording of sessions. Presentations will be taped.

SC will make different proposals for different sessions on speaking time.

Smoking and drinking will be ruled on later.

Rules Adopted, no objections.

NAC Nominations for Steering Committee. Mike P, Mike S. Barbara W, Marilyn

No additional nominations. Approved unanimously.

Adoption of Agenda. Fourth and fifth sessions have been reversed, IV. State of the Unions, V. Class Struggle Unionism.

Report on Credentials by Marilyn. NC and SC motions:

1) to seat two Portland delegates as full delegates ALL FOR 2) to grant one speaker in each discussion round each to Socialist Collective and British I.S. ALL FOR. 3) to accept all branch delegates. ALL FOR

Seating of delegates.

SC proposal to cut 10 minutes off discussion round to make up for starting late.

15 Minutes. Marilyn D: National Secretary's Report

Questions

3 minute round

5 minute Summary by Marilyn

Vote to Accept National Secretary's Report ALL FOR

Announcements

Session 2, Saturday afternoon - Marilyn chairing

Announcements on Security by Mary F.

15 minute presentation by Mike S.  
30 minute counterpresentation by David M.  
Discussion - 5 minutes each

4 speakers on PAE: 1) Jack T 3) Kim 4) Joel 6) Dave F  
2 speakers for DM: 2) Milt F 5) Jeff H  
Ken B (Chicago)  
Barry (San F.)

ATTACHMENT I - by Sam F (LA)

10 minute summary by D.M.  
10 minute summary by M.S.

Voting on Amendments by DM, FAILED, 5 1/4 - 40 - 4 1/4

10 minute MS presentation on Document

3 minute round  
7 minute summary by MS

Vote on document as a whole. PASSED

Opposed: Milt (Bloomington)  
Abstaining: Jeff (Bloomington)  
John (Carbondale)  
Ron (Madison)  
Mike P. (Bay Area)  
John (Portland) - Changed, see below  
Rich (Seattle)  
Sheila (Bay Area)

ATTACHMENT II - Dave E., LA

Announcements

Change - John from Portland wishes to change his vote to YES on the Michael Stewart document.

Session 3, Saturday evening - Barbara W. chairing

SC motions:

1) that agenda remain as is (Dave F, speaker for)

vs.

2) that agenda be MP - 10 minutes for BC, EC, 10 minutes for State Cap.  
(Barbara W. speaks for)

one speaker for, one speaker against - 5 minutes a piece

vs.

3) that 20 minutes, Mike P, 20 minutes Emmet C (Jan)  
as amendment to #2 (Mike P speaking against)

Hand Vote

2 passed over 1.  
3 passed 18 5/4 - 11

20 minute presentation, Mike P  
20 minute Presentation by Emmet C

Seating of delegates

Speaker for BC: Ken B  
Speaker for State cap: Jack W.

Vote BC PASSED, 35 - 7 1/4 - 7  
SC FAILED, 5 1/4 - 34 - 10

20 minutes presentation by Mike P  
10 minute presentation by Dave F  
one hour discussion - 4 minutes round

Vote to extend discussion 1/2 hour FAILED  
FOR 17 5/4 AGAINST 19

Move to extend debate for 15 minutes (Leslye) PASSED

Motion (Neil) to divide NAC amendment beginning on p. 10, Stalinism, Underdevelopment  
and National Liberation

5 minute summary by Dave F.  
10 minute summary by Mike P.

Neil's motion as amendment to Dave, FAILED

Dave's amendment FAILED, 12 1/2 - 27 1/4 - 9 1/4

Announcements

Vote on Parker document as whole PASSED, 37 1/4 - 5 - 7

Announcements

ATTACHMENT III (Ted D., Chicago)

4th Session, Sunday A.M. - Mike S, chairing

Seating of delegates

Announcements

15 minute presentation by Kim: State of the Unions

2 minute extension NO OBJECTION  
5 minute presentation by Sandy (Chicago)  
3 minute round - 45 minutes

MOTION: (Kay E) to extend discussion one-half hour

MOTION: (Kevin B) to make presentation and then extend

Speaker against extension, Mike S.

Amendment (Joan H) to Kay - to limit round to 2 minutes

Motion: (Mary) to allow discussion on Bradley amendment only by cards already turned in

VOTE: Kay E. as amended by Joan M. 19 - 19 delegates, 3/4 - 4/4 MAL's FAILS

VOTE: Mary's motion PASSED

7 minute presentation by Kevin B.  
5 minute presentation by Kim  
30 minute discussion, 3 minute round  
5 minute summary by Kevin B  
7 minute summary by Kim

VOTE: Move to divide Bradley amendments FAILED  
Move to divide Sandy's amendment #2, A & B PASSED

KB 5 - 40 3/4 - 2 1/2 FAILED  
Sandy #1 10 1/4 - 32 1/4 - 5 3/4 FAILED  
Sandy #2A 16 1/2 - 13 - 18 3/4 PASSED  
Sandy #2B 19 1/4 - 12 3/4 - 16 1/4 PASSED

#### Announcements

ATTACHMENT IV (Ken S and Joel G)

5th Session, Sunday afternoon - Barbara W, chairing

Seating of delegates

Announcements

Agenda - SC recommendations, presented by Mike P

Class Struggle Unionism: 20 minutes presentation, 5 minute summary  
45 minute round, 3 minutes each

Session on the Left, amendments referred to NC and NAC: 15 minute presentation  
7 minute summary, 45 minute round of 3 min. each

No break between, 9 p.m. Women's Caucus and UFW

Monday, Session on CLUW

NO OBJECTIONS TO CHANGES IN AGENDA

Report on Vote on Amendments to State of the Unions

Vote on State of Unions Document

NO: Steve, Cleveland ATTACHMENT V

ABSTAIN: Jon, Carbondale

Document PASSED

Cards of those not called this morning will be called first in this speaking round AGREED

20 minutes, Jack W. Presentation on C lass Struggle Unionism  
45 minute round, 3 minutes each  
5 minute summary by Jack W.

6th Session - the Left, Marilyn chairing

Seating of delegates

Agenda explained: No votes, perhaps straw votes

15 minute presentation by Joel G  
5 minute presentation by Harry  
5 minute presentation by Sam  
50 minute discussion, 3 minute round  
10 minute summary by Joel

STRAW POLL on amendments, hand vote FOR  
Hand vote against explanation by Joel

MOTION: (Ken S) for real vote on amendments. Speaker for Steering Committee  
against: Marilyn (People hadn't had time to read)

Speaker for MOTION: Ken S.  
Motion PASSED (hand vote)

Sam #1, "as well as socialism from below"  
#3 dealing only with RSL  
#2 defense of other sects

Announcements

Harry amendments accepted

VOTE: #1 PASSED, 34 - 10 - 5  
#2 PASSED, 35 1/2 - 9 - 4 1/4  
#3 PASSED, 26 1/4 - 15 1/2 - 7 1/4

Dave F. announcement of NC slate of 20

Ken B  
Sam F  
Mike P  
Steve Z  
Mike S  
Barbara W  
Ken S  
Cal W  
Joe F  
Bill R  
Bill H  
Enid  
Wendy  
Gay  
Marilyn  
Joel G  
Jack T  
Jack W  
Kim  
Dave F

7th Session, Monday A.M. - CLUW - Mike S, chairing

Seating of delegates

Agenda:

15 minutes, Barbara

5 minutes Joan

1 hr. 15 minutes discussion, 3 minute round

Reading of Mike P. and Sam F. motion - ATTACHMENT VI

VOTE: Joel G document on the Left: PASSED, 43 1/2 - 0 - 4 1/2

Announcements:

Jolie amendment withdrawn

Leslye amendment accepted as changed

sentence 1 on first page of amendments: "Collecting on the promise of CLUW will substantially be determined..."

Paragraph 2: "For our purposes, one of the most important groups in the work force..."

Paragraph 3: "If your goal is to organize a broad social movement, these women must be amongst those at the heart..."

Paragraph 4: last sentence: "This will continue to be a major fight in CLUW in the coming period."

Women's Commission has accepted Joan M's amendments as part of the ongoing discussion. See Women's Commission statement on amendments.

\*\*\* SEE WOMEN'S COMMISSION FOR FURTHER DETAILS

Presentations:

15 minutes Barbara W

5 minutes Joan M

3 minute round of 1 hour 15 minutes

5 minute summary by Barbara W

MOTION: (Kay, Detroit) to divide paragraph of Joan's first amendment and to table

MOTION: (Sheila, Bay Area) to delete paragraph of Joan's first amendment "However, CLUW work should not be limited..."

VOTE on motion to table PASSED

Motion to delete out of order

MOTION (Jan): to table entire section in Joan's amendment on CLUW committees, section 2, FAILED

MOTION (Chris, Bloomington) to table entire document, FAILED

VOTE on document, PASSED

OPPOSED: Chris (Bloomington)

Anne (Bloomington)

ABSTAINING: no delegates or MAL's

NOT VOTING - Steve, Cleveland

Announcements



8th Session, Monday afternoon, Organization - Mike P chairing

Proposed NC Alternates slate

1. Bob M (Detroit)
2. Steve C (Cleveland)
3. Ilene W (New York)

Harry, Chicago  
Leslye, Bay Area  
Mark, Detroit  
Mary F, L.A.  
Michael L, L.A.

MOTION on security - ATTACHMENT VII

MOTION: to suspend provision of constitution that no more than 1/3 of NC be from any one city

Seating of delegates

Statement by those joining I.S.

Christina for Modern Times (5)  
Pam from Madison  
Dan from Cleveland  
Charles from Bakersfield, CA.  
Steve of Detroit  
Jane from Washington (Detroit now)

Statement of welcome by Marilyn

Announcement on Transportation

Thanks by Marilyn to those who did work that made convention possible: Stephanie, Jim, Karen, Joe, Herry, Bob

MOTION on dues structure (Sam and Mike P) See ATTACHMENT VI

Presented by Sam F

No speakers against

PASSED, all for except two abstentions

Report by Gay from Women's Caucus MOTIONS PASSED on (to be presented to NAC)

Child care  
more women travellers  
CLUW as serious for organization and branches  
reprinting Laurie L. pamphlet

More coverage in WP

Reintroduction of Bread and Roses column in WP

Women's Commission to explore possibility of industrialization priorities in Hospital and AFSCME, and  
discussion of I.S. women role in industry

Women's Caucus meetings earlier in convention

MOTION (Joe F): that the Convention mandate the NAC to standardize security measures see ATTACHMENT VII - PASSED unanimously

Mike P Presentation of framework for NC slate for outgoing NC

together with MOTION to suspend I.S. Constitutional provision for no more than 1/3 of NC from any one branch

PRESENTATION by Joel on NC slate 20 minutes

PRESENTATION by Joel on slate of alternates 7 minutes  
extension, no objection

additional nominations - none now

3 minute round

Kay E etc. statement for the minutes ATTACHMENT VIII

Mike P etc. MOTION to NAC ATTACHMENT IX that NC be a working body

5 minute summary by Joel re: slates

Announcements

No additional nominations

VOTE: MOTION to suspend 1/3 rule PASSED, all for  
NC slate, PASSED, all for, 1 abstention

MOTION (Jack T) to change name of NAC to EC RULED OUT OF ORDER

Challenge - 1 minute by Jack T.

MOTION: (Jack W) to table to NAC

counter MOTION (Diane) to table to NC

VOTE to uphold chair PASSED

Announcements: Thanks by Marilyn to Tom (St. Louis) for timing and Barbary (N.Y.)  
for taking minutes, and others

Singing of International

Convention Adjourned

## ATTACHMENTS TO MINUTES

### ATTACHMENT I. Statement by Sam F (L.A.)

I vote yes with reservations on the Steward document. My reservations concerned serious doubts as to whether PAE Theory explains current situation as well as it did the period from WW II to the late sixties. I also have serious doubts as to whether all the claims made by Kidron and Stewart are justified (e.g., why Russia must also build arms for economic as well as political reasons, how Japan can do without an arms economy, etc.). However, I do disagree with Miller's Modern Capitalist Economy: A Contribution to the Discussion.

### ATTACHMENT II. Statement by Dave E (L.A.) on the Stewart document.

I support the document as a first approximation, in spite of deficiencies, including an inadequate economic analysis, and its treatment of the Third World.

### ATTACHMENT III. Statement by Ted D (Chicago) on his vote on the Mike P. document on Bureaucratic Collectivism:

I abstained on the final vote because the Finkel amendment did not pass. Consequently, I believe the document contains a grievous theoretical error by ruling out the possibility of a Stalinist revolution in the advanced capitalist countries. In every other respect, I support the document.

### ATTACHMENT IV. Statement by Ken S (Cleveland) and Joel G (Detroit) on Bradley Amendments to "State of the Unions"

We voted no on the Bradley Amendment because we preferred the analysis of the bureaucracy contained in the original document.

However, the discussion revealed that many opponents of Bradley make more serious errors than he does. For example, statements that we should never give critical support to bureaucrats were made, as were statements that the bureaucracy should be analyzed separately from its relationship to the ranks.

### ATTACHMENT V. Statement concerning my negative vote on the Moody Labor Document and all amendments to it, Steve C (Cleveland).

While the discussion of the Moody document and its amendments was interesting if unfocused, the document does not constitute either an advance or a concretization of our analysis, our general theory or of our specific perspectives. Therefore, we did not need either the discussion in valuable convention time or the document in our already cluttered archive of "positions."

### ATTACHMENT VI. Motion by Sam F (L.A.) and Mike P (Bay Area).

The National Committee is authorized to begin to move toward the establishment of a national dues structure, including 1) a single dues schedule for all branches and MAL's, and 2) a procedure which will result in the transfer of funds from wealthier branches to poorer ones and new organizing situations.

Motivation:

The above are transitional steps aimed towards achieving the final goal of a fully centralized national dues structure. We would thus avoid immediately confronting the National Office with huge bookkeeping and bureaucratic tasks which it is not ready to handle at present.

Note: A national dues structure can and should take into account cost of living differences in various parts of the country.

ATTACHMENT VII. Motion by Joe F (St. Louis).

The convention instructs the NAC to establish uniform guidelines on security matters (e.g. use of names, restrictions on telephone communications, etc.) to be ready by Thanksgiving.

ATTACHMENT VIII. Statement for the minutes.

The composition of the N.C. is disappointing in two ways. The N.C. plays a role in communication as well as being the political leadership. From this standpoint, the fact that all five women on the N.C. are from two branches is a problem. There are no women from East Coast, West Coast, or Lower Midwest. We also feel that from the standpoint of training our many women branch leaders to become national leaders, five women on the N.C. is insufficient.

- |                          |                               |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Kay E (East Bay)         | Stan G (Cleveland)            |
| Jan A (SF)               | Frances B (N.Y.)              |
| Manja A (East Bay)       | Kay S (Detroit)               |
| Ilene W (New York)       | Richard E (Detroit)           |
| Mary F (Los Angeles)     | Gene W (New York) ? illegible |
| Kadi S (Seattle)         | Steve L (Seattle)             |
| Jole B (Portland)        | Steve O (Bay Area)            |
| Terry H (Portland)       | Karen K (Detroit)             |
| Tom D (St. Louis)        |                               |
| Carl B (St. Louis)       |                               |
| Steve S (Seattle)        |                               |
| Jon S. (Carbondale)      |                               |
| Leslye A (East Bay)      |                               |
| Barbara L (Chicago)      |                               |
| Barry G (Bay Area)       |                               |
| Shiela A (N.Y.)          |                               |
| Michael R (Cleveland)    |                               |
| Richard C (Seattle)      |                               |
| Nancy H (Madison)        |                               |
| Anne (Bloomington)       |                               |
| Chris K (Bloomington)    |                               |
| David S (Portland)       |                               |
| Greta L (Chicago)        |                               |
| Laura H (Chicago)        |                               |
| Richard S (LA)           |                               |
| Michael (LA)             |                               |
| John R (Portland)        |                               |
| Pat M (Seattle)          |                               |
| Debbie R (Seattle)       |                               |
| Stephanie (Detroit)      |                               |
| Harry P (Chicago)        |                               |
| Geoffrey H (Bloomington) |                               |

CONVENTION VOTING RECORD (Refer to Minutes for any further notes)

	David M. Am.	Bur. Coll.	State Cap.	Finkel Am. =	Mike P. Doc.	Bradley Am.	Sandy #1 Am.	Sandy #2a Am.	Sandy #2b Am.	Sam #1	Sam #2	Sam #3	
<u>DELEGATES</u>													
<u>NY</u>													
1. Mike S.	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
2. Ilene	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	AB	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y
3. Geo W.	N					N	Y	N	Y	N	AB	N	Y
4. Eric H.	N									AB	Y	AB	Y
5. Joan	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	AB	AB	Y	Y	Y	Y
6. Steve Z.	Y	AB	AB	AB	AB					Y	Y	Y	Y
7. Sheila A.	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
<u>CLEVELAND</u>													
8. Barbara W.	N	N	AB	AB	N	N	N	N	AB	N	N	N	Y
9. Bob P.	N												
10. Steve C.		N	AB	AB	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
<u>LOUISVILLE</u>													
11. H.K.	Y					N	N	Y	Y				
12. T.J.		Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
<u>BLOOMINGTON</u>													
13. Anne T.		Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
14. Frank T.		Y	AB	AB	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
<u>St. Louis</u>													
15. Dave S.		Y	N	N	Y								
<u>DETROIT</u>													
16. Bob M.	N					N	N	AB	AB	N	N	N	Y
17. Bill H.	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
18. Enid		Y	N	N	Y	N	N	AB	AB	Y	Y	N	Y
19. Wendy	N					N	N	AB	AB	N	N	N	Y
20. Mark	N	Y	N	AB	Y	N	N	AB	AB	Y	Y	Y	Y
21. Joe	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	AB	Y	Y	N	Y
22. Gay						N	N	AB	AB	Y	Y	Y	Y
23. Rick	N	AB	AB	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
24. Sarah		Y	N	AB	Y	N	Y	AB	Y				
<u>CHICAGO</u>													
25. Ted	N	Y	N	Y	AB	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
26. Ken B.	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
27. Sandy G.	N					N	Y	Y	Y	Y	AB	AB	Y
<u>LOS ANGELES</u>													
28. Sam F.	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	AB	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
29. Michael						N	N	AB	AB	Y	Y	Y	Y
30. Mary		Y	N	AB	Y	N	AB	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
31. Richard	N					Y	N	Y	AB	N	Y	Y	Y

CONVENTION VOTING RECORD, page 2

	David M.	Bur. Col	State Cap	Finkel	Mike P.	Bradley	Sandy #1	Sandy #2a	Sandy #2b	Sam #1	Sam #2	Sam #3	Joel G.
<b>Bay Area</b>													
32. Jane L.	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	AB	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
33. Barry G.	N	N	Y	N	AB	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	NV
34. Jan A.		N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
35. Margaret	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	AB	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
36. Mike P.	AB	Y	N	N	Y	AB	N	N	Y		Y	Y	Y
37. John L.	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
38. Manja								Y	N				
39. Joel J.	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
40. Kay E.	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	AB	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
<b>PORTLAND</b>													
41. Jolie	N	Y	N	AB	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
42. John	AB	Y	N	N	Y					Y	Y	Y	Y
<b>SEATTLE</b>													
43. Steve L.	N	Y	N	N	Y					Y	Y	AB	Y
44. Steve S.	N	AB	AB	N	AB	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
45. Rich C.	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	AB	AB	AB	AB	AB	Y
46. Diane E.	N							N	N	Y	N	Y	Y
47. Bill R.						N	N	N	N	AB	AB	AB	Y
<b>MAL's</b>													
48. Mike H, Bos	N	N	Y	N	AB	N	N	AB	N	Y	Y	Y	NV
49. Bob G, Bos	N	AB	AB	N	AB			AB	AB	Y	AB	N	NV
50. Jeff S, Ind	Y	AB	AB	AB	AB			AB	AB	Y	Y	Y	Y
51. Jon S, Carl	AB	AB	AB	N	AB	AB	AB	AB	AB	Y	Y	Y	Y
52. Chris M, NJ	N					N	N	AB	AB				
53. Ara D, Atl	AB	Y	N	AB	Y	N	AB	AB	AB	Y	Y	Y	Y
54. Nancy, Mad	AB	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
55. Ron, Mad	AB	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
56. Phyllis, Mad	AB	Y	N	Y	Y								
57. Mike H, Pits	N	AB	AB	N	Y	N	N	AB	AB	Y	Y	Y	Y
<b>CONSULTATIVE</b>													
58. Jack W								N	N				
59. Jack T.	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	AB	AB	AB	N	Y
60. Joel G.	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	NV	NV	NV	N	Y	N	Y
61. Dave F.	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	NV	NV	NV	N	Y	N	Y
62. Kim M.	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	AB	N	Y	N	Y
63. Marilyn D.						N	Y	AB	AB	N	Y	N	Y
<b>(Cleveland)</b>													
64. Cal. W.	N	N	AB	AB	N	~	~	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
65. Ken S.	N	Y	N	N	Y	~	~	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
66. Mike P.										Y	Y	Y	Y

CONVENTION VOTING RECORD, page 3

	David M.	Burr. Coll.	State Cap.	Finkel	Mike P.	Bradley	Sandy #1	Sandy #2a	Sandy #2b	Sam #1	Sam #2	Sam #3	Joel G.
<u>ALTERNATES</u>													
1. Ann(CL)/SC----													
2. John(Lou)/TJ---													
3. Jeff(BL)/AT----													
4. Milt(BL)/FT----													
5. Bill(ST.L)/DS-N													
6. Mar(Det)/EE----													
7. Kay(Det)/GS----													
8. Jack W(Det)/SB-N													
9. David(LA)/ML--Y													
10. Duncan(LA)/MF-N													
11. Sheila(BA)/JA-AB													
12. Leslye(BA)/MA-N	Y	N		Y	Y					Y	Y	Y	Y
13. PatM(Sea)/BR -N	AB	AB		N	AB								
14. Jo B(LA)/GW-(ny)---	Y	N		N	Y								
15. Sandy(NY)/EH-----Y		N		N	Y								
16. Mike(Cleve)/BP-----Y		N		Y	Y	AB	AB	AB	AB	Y	Y	AB	NV
17. Mar(Det)/BN-----Y		N		N	Y								
18. FH(Lou)/HK	AB	AB		Y	Y								
19. JackW(Det)/WW	N	Y		N	N								
20. Neil(Det)/GS	Y	N		N	Y								
21. DanL(Chi)/SG	Y	N		Y	Y								
22. Gary(LA)/RL	N	Y		N	N								
23. JimF(Sea)/DE	AB	AB											
24. Duncan(LA)/ML	Y	N		AB	Y								
25. GeoF(NY)/EH						N	N	AB	AB				
26. Rusty(St.L)/JS						N	N	AB	N				
27. DaveS(Por)/John						N	N	Y	Y				
28. Jim(Sea)/SL						Y	AB	AB	AB				
29. Laura(Clif)/Phyllis(mad)						AB	Y	AB	Y	Y	Y	AB	Y
30. Barbara(NY)/IW										Y	Y	Y	Y
31. John(Lou)/HK										N	N	N	Y
32. Chris(BI)/AT										Y	Y	Y	Y
33. Milt(BI)/FT										Y	Y	Y	Y
34. JackW(Det)/SB										AB	N	N	Y
35. GeneK(BA)/JA										AB	Y	Y	Y
36. SteveO(BA)/MP										Y	Y	Y	Y