

ON MIKE U. and KEN B. LABOR AMMENDMENTS
by Steve Z., N. Y. C

1. Why are these more or less traditional but substantive ammendments necessary? Why are the not already in the EC labor document, despite the fact that you you have undoubtedly called the EC's attention to your objections? Any explanation for the ommissions?

2. Why have you not proposed deletion of sections of the EC document which clearly contradict your ^{obj} ammendments? Doesn't that increase the danger of even less clarity in the final document?

3. Why are no concrete examples given which might reveal the real content of these ammendments? For example; What can one conclude from them about your attitude to the EC's and WP's insistence that Patrick did NOT betray and help break the miners wildcats? How do you explain this persistent blindness to this date? What significance do you attach to this failure to correct this past "blunder"? When, in short, shall we have the written motivation for the ammendments?

Do you beleive WP was wrong in not criticisg Weissman's breaking of his ^{Leccq/} wildcat in the UA and if so, how do you expalin this "error"? If you beleive WP was wrong, was it just an individ isolated error, like the Patrick case(?), was was it more? (On the other hand, if you beleive WP and the EC were correct on these issues, doesn't that reduce the real meaning of your ammendments to mere verbal differences with little practiacl consequences?)

4. Your ammendments say nothing about the projected Labor Paper or its policies. Some two months ago you viewed the labor paper as a symptom of liquidationism (in logic if not in intent). Have you abandoned that view, and why? Further, do you still believe that within the projected labor paper we must build a left-wing? If so, how do you evaluate the EC's express rejection of that perspective? And why is there no ammendment on this concrete question? Is the building of left-wing in the labor paper a major or a miner issue?

5. The last sentence of ammendment #4 reads: "... we must show that we are the best fighters and that the strategy and tactics of the bureaucracy hold back the struggle at crucial junctures." Does your inclusion of this statement mean that you think this policy has not been observed by the organization (any examples of this?), or does it mean merely that you are correcting an oversight ~~in~~ in the document of the EC?

6. Re: your ammendment #6 (which rejects silence about detremental acts by our allies such as racist or undemocratic practices). Does your objection also hold when leaders commit other impermissable acts, such as Andrews pursuit of a policy different from that of the R&F (as in the case of the bricklayers strike in local 1010, or the opposition movement's policy at the steel convention), not to speak of Harry Patrick conduct?

7. Re: ammendment #7 (which tells us not to be indifferent to our allies past record and probable or possible future conduct). Is this a critique of our work in Sadlowski campaign in which we refused to mention his pre-election methods and policies, and the objective situation which influence, modl, his future conduct as a bureaucrat? Is it also intended as a critique of WP's uncritical attitude not just to Weissman in the UAW, but to Runnels and Oginsky's conduct as well-- a conduct which was easily anticipatable, given their past (which you, unlike the EC, do admit, abstractly at least, is relevant and necessary to mention)?

8. Do you beleive that in an anlytic, propaganda book on the lessons of the coal strike, we should argue the need for a R&F movement as one of the lessons of both the coal strike AND of the experience with the "reform movement" in the UMW? Or do you beleive that a national R&F movement is not necessary, and that new elections are the solution to be called for?