our first public "theoretical" text

ON THE SO-CALLED BANKRUPTCY OF CONTRACT UNIONISM

In their paper entitled "Mass Revolutionary Organization for the Workplace", Comrades Hammerquist and Ignatin posit the need for a "new" type of organization to supplant the trade unions. A new organization is needed, they maintain, because the trade union has failed in both its tasks in defending the economic interests of the working class and in making the necessary preparations for the seizure of power. In the course of their discussion Hammerquist and Ignatin go even further in their attacks on trade unions; they imply that unions are inherently class collaborationist and state outright that contracts are by nature bankrupt.

This response to the existing trade unions is not new; it was that of the Wobblies and of a group of German communists for whom Lenin wrote Left Wing Communism: An Infantile Disorder. It results from a situation where class collaborationist trade unionism reflects a general ideological deficiency in the working class. Seeing this rank trade union practice which is emotionally abhorent to them, some honest and well-meaning revolutionaries seize upon a magical solution which somehow has been delivered to them out of the blue. Not pausing to consider how everyone else (including Marx and Lenin) missed this obvious and quite simple solution, our well-intentioned friends try to make the magical solution a real one. Usually this magic takes the concrete form of making a fetish of a given tactic and elevating it to the point of being a revolutionary strategy. One has only to examine the strike support coalition of the National Caucus of Labor Committee or the International Socialist and Spartacist trade union bureaucracy fetish to see how limited such an approach really is.

Nor is the Hammerquist-Ignatin position an accomplished one. The authors contradict themselves, employ slights of hand and generally demonstrate plain confusion more than anything else. They nowhere state outright that trade unions are inherently class collaborationist though they certainly imply it. In one place they state that contracts are inherently bankrupt but a few pages later they imply that their "mass revolutionary organization" itself would enter into contractual agreements (albeit limited ones). Why then is it necessary to critique their paper? For three reasons. First, their arguments play to an emotionalism so characteristic of our New Left background. There is no analysis, merely a recounting of empirical data; dialectics has been lost in the rush and form and content (in the case of trade unions -- practice, organization, membership, etc.) are completely confused. Second, their position has been widely distributed and seems to have gained some adherents. Finally (and most importantly), their approach is sectarian and can lead to disastrous results in practice.

Let me begin with what I consider to be their most serious error -- the implication that the trade union is inherently class-collaborationist. While Hammerquist and Ignatin's position on this question is unclear, allow me to quote a few sentences which seem to indicate that this is the position that they actually hold privately. On the very first page of their paper they argue:

> In the past, many workers, and especially many radicals, have looked to the labor unions to meet the needs of immediate defense and of collective preparation. It has become increasingly obvious thatthe unions fail in both regards. The reason for their failure is that they are guided by the principle of collaboration with the employers instead of struggle against them.

(It cannot be said that the article "the" before unions is refering to the

labor unions in the U.S. -- these unions are not mentioned until the following paragraph). In addition they debunk caucuses (regardless of content?) for "offering only another variety of trade unionism" (of trade unionism in general -- not "existing trade unionism"), p. 3. And they state:

> In short, what is needed is a mass revolutionary workers' organization, independent of the trade union structure, able to provide workers with a real alternative to the trade unions and eventually supplant them. (my italics) p. 4.*

Obviously by a "real alternative to the trade unions" the authors do not mean just a revolutionized trade union or a reformed trade union.

Now our critique. In the first place, the evidence Hammerquist and Ignatin present is not adequate to convict the trade union of an inherent tendency to class collaborationism. They do not analyze the form "trade union" -- that is, what it grows out of, what are its realities and its potentialities -- they indict it merely on the basis of its content today. (This methodology is common to all those who hold to this position -- Andre Gorz included). It should be obvious to every one that the present U.S. trade union movement is rife with class collaborationism, racism, sexism and bureaucracy. It is quite obvious that our trade unions have neither effectively defended the economic interests of the U.S. workers nor have they made the slightest preparations for the seizure of power. But do these facts alone constitute sufficient evidence upon which to convict the form "trade union" of being structurally and inherently class collaborationist?

No, they do not. As Marxists and dialecticians we recognize that a thing cannot be judged by its formal manifestation. Do we believe that we can understand capitalism and its highest stage, imperialism, merely on the basis of how they appear to us in day-to-day life? Do we believe the bourgeoisie's assertions that it can bring harmony and happiness to the world's toiling masses? Dialectics demands that we go much further -- that when we examine a thing we examine all its facets and interrelationships. We abstract the thing from its concrete setting, examine it, and then return it to reality so we will be able to understand how the thing affects its surroundings and vice-versa. In addition, we take into consideration development and change, recognizing that everything, no matter how static it appears, undergoes change.** And further, we try to take into consideration the history of human experience with the object. On this type of analysis we base our judgements, not on one-sided empirical examinations.

This specific empirical examination leads our comrades into the common error of confusing form and content. Just as one can understand very little about the form "money" from even the most detailed examination of the dollar bill (see Capital, Vol. I, Part 1) one will not understand the form "trade union" from examining IUE or the UAW. Nothing we have said should be taken to indicate that we see no connection between form and content. Quite the contrary -- certain forms are inadequate to express certain levels of content e.g. the trade union cannot be the embryonic

---

* We must remember that Hammerquist and Ignatin are discussing what kind of organization is adequate to the two tasks of a trade union (which they outline correctly) i.e. defending the economic interests of the workers and making preparations for the seizure of power. They are not discussing which form of organization is adequate to the tasks of the actual seizure of power (eg Soviets).

** In the case that Hammerquist and Ignatin would argue that trade unions were not originally, but have become, inherently class collaborationist, it would be necessary

(cont. next page)

form of the dictatorship of the proletariat (the CP notwithstanding). What we're trying to expose is that content alone is not enough on which to base a judgement. Would one debunk the "revolutionary party" because the C.P.S.U. and the C.P.U.S.A. are bureaucratic?

While it is not our intention to present a dialectical analysis of the trade unions, allow us a few brief comments on the subject. As long as trade unions have existed they have been held by communists and revolutionary workers to be organizations which have the two tasks that Hammerquist and Ignatin express so concisely. Marx and Engels and Lenin mentioned repeatedly both these tasks in their writings on trade unions. But what they also mentioned (and understood) is that the fact that an organization has tasks does not deny that it can fail to fulfill them. Whether or not the tasks are met will depend first and foremost on both the depth and the breadth of its membership. A disorganized, isolated and ideologically backward working class will tend to reflect its weaknesses in all its institutions, and this quite naturally. To the extent that an institution is truly representative (the less representative th e less it will express the masses' real collective mind) it will express all its members' strengths and weaknesses whether their organizational form be a trade union, soviet, or a vanguard party.

And just as long as communists have looked at trade unions there have been those (more or less well-intentioned) who have seen the root of the backwardness in the trade unions themselves. While some have made quite plausible arguments (at least on the surface), where they all show their weakness is in the alternatives they present. Some like Proudhon have suggested labor banks, others (the more responsible) have suggested a combination of the tradeunion and the soviet. But most often the alternative arrived at -- and this is the case of comrades Hammerquist and Ignatin-- is just a new label attached to the old trade union form.

One has only to examine Hammerquist and Ignatin's discussion of their "mass revolutionary organization" to see that they have written, with a few slight deviations, an excellent presentation of the essense of class struggle trade unionism. This kind of trade unionism is a unionism which would:

> derive its strength . . . from the cohesiveness (sic) and the willingness of the workers to take action at the point of production. (p. 3)

and these revolutionary trade unions would be:

> open to all working people based at the workplace and carrying on a constant struggle relying on all means of (direct) action, in the interest of workers as a class. (p. 3)

("Direct" is in parenthesis because it narrows the field of action too much. There is no reason to be fetishist about "direct" action.)
and would also:

> Intervene in the daily life of the industry in which it is based, concerning itself with production standards, safety, organization of labor, the use of automated equipment and other questions which are now considered beyond the scope of the (class collaborationist) union. (p. 3)

**(cont. from page 2) for them to show how the material conditions in which the working class finds itself have changed such that this is now the case (which they do not).

Everywhere, when the question is asked "What shall we put in the place of class collaborationist unionism?" the answer is CLASS STRUGGLE UNIONISM. And this is because the trade union is basic to the existence of the workers. The trade union springs directly from the market conditions in which the laborer as a seller of labor power finds himself. The union is the organizational response (and an appropriate one) to the day to day existence of wage labor under capitalism. It is a necessary organization as long as capitalism exists and after, during the entire period of the transition to Communism. As Lenin said in 1920, "the time when the trade unions (as far as existence is concerned) are actually called into question is a long way off: it will be up to our grandchildren to discuss that." (Lenin, On Trade Unions, p. 379).

There is another but related error made by our comrades which we wish to critique. They state in their paper that:

> The NATURE of the contract demands that the union do what no workers' organization should ever do -- maintain labor discipline for the boss. The unions become part of the companies' disciplinary apparatus. . . (my italics)

This, they say, is a result of the fact that a major part of a union's ability to win a contract is dependant on the employer's faith in the union's ability to "prevent interruptions in production during the life of the contract."

In addition to this liability, the authors also enumerate two other liabilities of "contract unionism". First, that because contracts have a specific time limit they allow the corporations to stockpile for strikes and consequently force the unions to build up large treasuries of strike funds which make the unions liable to injunctions and legal suits. Secondly, contracts often have seniority clauses which lock in white and male supremacy.

Now it should be obvious to anyone who chooses to look below the surface that these three points do not, whether taken seperately or together, prove the "bankruptcy" of contracts. While it is true that most contracts in the U.S. at this time do show serious weaknesses in these areas, the "root cause" is again not in the contract itself but in the organizational and political backwardness of the U.S. working class. And here again they confuse form and content.

What has to be demonstrated on their part is that all these liabilities are a necessary part of every contract and not either that they exist today or that they are necessary in a given set of circumstances. This they fail to do, whereas the opposite is fairly easily shown to be the case. Let me begin with the second two liabilities. It is quite true that U.S. monopolies stockpile for strikes and that they are often aided by compulsory overtime clauses that exist in most major contracts. It is equally true that the economic position of the major unions today necessitates the gathering of large treasuries in the anticipation of extended strikes. But it is certainly not the case that reforms within a contract cannot be made which will weaken the corporations' ability to stockpile and strengthen the workers' hands. Obviously compulsory overtiem clauses can be eliminated (there is none in the IUE-GE National Agreement) and workers can refuse overtime in anticipation of a strike. The real problem here is of arousing and organizing the rank and file workers to the point where they will act to undercut the monopolies.

As far as strike funds making unions legally vulnerable -- what about a change in the law? One ought also to remember that they also "happen" to be a functional asset. At present there is no other way for workers to insure that they will have some meagre income during a strike. If the working class was more unified and better organized there are any number of alternatives such as welfare, unemployment benefits, donations from non-striking workers. But this is still an "if" and will remain so unless we get to work. One might just as well argue that workers shouldn't have families because they become more dependant on their wages or that they shouldn't buy on time and so on.

The same general line of argument can be used for the Hammerquist-Ignatin assertion that "contract unionism divides the working class". Ah, finally, the truth, the magic key -- it is not racism and sexism that divide workers but the contract. Merely dispense with contract unionism and . . . Obviously the idological and political backwardness of a working class is going to be reflected in its institutions whether they be unions, contracts, soviets. Equally obvious is that what must be done is carry out an ideological struggle against this backwardness and drive it back to the bourgeoisie from whence it came -- not give up on these institutions. Once this is done the appropriate changes in contracts can be made.

Now we come to the strongest point in this 'bankruptcy' argument. Hammerquist and Ignatin argue that contracts necessarily force unions to become part of the company's disciplinary apparatus. In the first place their discussion of a trade union' ability to win a contract is theoretically wrong. As one Antonio Gramsci explained:

> This legality (ie legal existence of unions expressed in contracts) is conditional on the trust the entrepreneur has in [redacted] the SOLVENCY of the union and in its ability to ensure that the working masses respect their contractual obligations. (his italics) Soviets in Italy, p. 14.

Please note that Gramsci does not include in his presentation a word about preventing disruptions of production! The point to be made is that whether "preventing disruptions in production" will be included in a contract will depend on the concrete situation in which workers find themselves relative to capital at the particular moment that the contract is being negotiated; it is quite easy to imagine a situation in which there would be no such clause. Thus such 'no-strike' clauses are no more inherent to contracts than compulsory overtime or double seniority trails.

Ignatin and Hammerquist's errors illustrate not only a misunderstanding of contracts but an incorrect approach to industrial legality in general. Here is a dialectical (and a communist) approach:

> The emergence of an industrial legality is a great victory for the working class, but it is not the ultimate and definitive victory. Industrial legality has improved the working class's material living conditions, but it is no more than a compromise -- a compromise which had to be made and which must be supported until the balance of forces favors the working class. If the officials of the trade union organization regard industrial legality as a necessary, but not permanently necessary compromise; if they devote all the means at the disposal of the union to improving the balance of forces for the working class; and if they make all the indispensable moral and material preparations for the working class at a given moment to be able to launch a successful offensive against capital and subject it to its law, then the trade union is a revolutionary instrument and union

> discipline, even when it is used to make the workers respect industrial legality, is revolutionary discipline. (Gramsci, Ibid, p. 15)

Obviously the ideal contract is no contract at all and the ideal legal situation is one in which the bourgeoisie is illegal, but after all we live in the real world and deal with a real situation. As communists we attempt to analyse the situation, establish a goal, consider the tactics appropriate to the situation, choose the most appropriate and go to work. We do not disgard useful institutions and useful tactics simply because they are presently being used badly; our discussions are based on analysis not impressions. And this is how we should approach the contract and industrial legality. There is no question of the fact that there are liabilities involved in contracts, that the situation can force us to agree to things which are in principle repugnant. The contract is a double-edged sword but the working class can learn to wield it.

That it is possible for trade union leadership to behave in the manner that Gramsci describes can be illustrated in the following example. This spring there were a series of strikes over the issue of compulsory overtime at the Philadelphia General Electric Switchgear plant. While the IUE - GE national agreement carries no compulsory overtime clause there is a modified "no strike" clause. This clause allows for strikes during the life of the contract but only after a grievance has cleared third level and a period of a year has elapsed. Nevertheless our local was on strike within a period of two weeks from the arising of a grievance.

GE management in Philadelphia gave out forty warning notices to workers who refused to work one Saturday. They were legally able to do this because arbitrators have consistently held that a company has the "right" to a reasonable amount of overtime even if there is no compulsory overtime clause. The union's position was that a reasonable amount was none at all and they decided to take action. The course decided upon was subterfuge; formally strikes were called on grievances that had already fulfilled conditions for legal strikes. The company was informed as to the real reason of the strikes and the demand was made that they rescind the warning notices. After four successive Saturday-Monday strikes GE decided to withdraw the warning notices.

None of this is meant to give the impression that IUE local 119 is a class struggle island in a sea of class collaborationism. We are trying to demonstrate the <u>possibility</u> and only the possibility of a trade union leadership acting in a way that Gramsci describes; we are trying to illustrate how a contract can be used. What happened here at GE shows that a local need not subordinate itself completely to the national weakness of its section of the US working class and its leadership; it can, <u>if it has the will</u>, act to change the balance of forces and win concessions.

Thus we see that the arguments of Hammerquist and Ignatin take to the air as soon as we look below the surface and as soon as we apply dialectics. But it is not true that they have contributed nothing to the trade union discussion; they have played an important role in breaking out of the encrusted perspective of the C. P. This is vital and for this we should thank them.

ADDENDUM: The purpose of this article was merely to show the holes in the Hammerquist-Ignatin discussion of contract unionism. We were not attempting to set out a revolutionary perspective on the tradeunion question. [redacted]

[redacted]. Such a perspective is being prepared and will contain the following points:

1) Why the existing trade unions are the most important mass organizations of the working class and (therefore) why it is compulsory for communists to work within them while not subordinating themselves to them.

2) Why nevertheless the trade unions are inadequate to the tasks of proletarian power and a new form has to be created (Soviets) for which class struggle unionism is a prerequisite.

Clay Newlin
October 18, 1972

For the Philadelphia Workers Organizing Committee

JL

Report on Rutgers and PWOC trip submitted to Central Committee

Rutgers-
Was at Rutgers Thursday evening and friday morning and half of the afternoon. Held discussion in depth with Dale Johnson, Johnson Chairman of sociology department Livingston college Rutgers. He considers himself to be a Marxist-Leninist. Is a member of the Raritan Caucus, a campus based group of 25 activists and about 40 others which considers itself to be a socialist grouping. Wide political spectrum in group- several CP, 2 RU members, ACWM member, mostly social-democratic. Have recently put out a pamphlet on oil crisis. They have done some research work for militant caucuses in particular the Black Workers United caucus, which considers itself to be Marxist-Leninist.

The discussions with Dale centered on the necessity to create the new Party, wheather it could be created in September etc. The most important point of contention was whether there should also be formed a Mass based socialist Party. Dale contended that most of the people he knew would not join the new communist party but would join a mass socialist party. We proceeded to have somewhat lenghty discussion of role of social-democratic parties in Europe and their anti-communist orientation. As well to discuss the petty-bourgeois and aristocracy of labor make-up of the possible new mass party. Dale contended that the reality is that it will be formed and could be helpful. I continued to struggle around reasons it shouldn't be formed and then talked about the United Front against Fascism and how if in fact the mass party was formed it should be moved to join the United Front. Dale seems to see himself in the role of a Marxist-Leninist working within the mass party to support the communist party.
Held discussions about the necessity to unite and study the science and not to engage in the level of spontaneous activity which dale wanted tol move the Raritan caucus to. Interesting discussion but generally felt that accept to win support for new party and to begin to put forward idea of united front against fascism was not worth the effort.

PWOC

This part of the report will attempt to put forth the actual discussions which took place and then my impressions of PWOC, their line and how we should move.

The immediate sense when I arrived was that they were highly critical of our line and paper. I had brief discussions with Mark Klimo Friday night and talk for maybe 5 minutes with Ron Whitehorn, that night. Klimo had yet to finish the line was about half through. He was critical of our position on social-imperialism and seemingly strongly disagreed with it although seemed to beleive that the cpsu is revisionist. I was given a paper to read that night which was about a split-expulsion which had occured in the spring or summer of 1973. The paper was finished in March of 1974. It's focus was the struggle against ultra-leftism new leftism in the org and the two opportunists who adopted that vascillating line. The paper seemed to take the position fairly strongly as to the primacy of theory.
Met on Sat. morning for about 3 hours with Clay-chairman of Executive Committee- I believe. Ron Whitehorn, Debbie, V ince Klinger, Bruce, and Mickey. The meeting was characterized by extensive struggle over the relationship of theory and practice , the tasks of the communist movement and how to build a Marxist-Leninist base in the class, what characterizes advanced workers, were MCLL being abstract and possibily dogmatic and purist by not understanding the relationship of theory to practice and what is theory ? is it alone the study of M-L or is it the theory that is developed as to how to move within the class.

The question of the role of activity in the Workers movement was discussed. They expressed the view that we were being dogmatic and left-infantile. That theory is not developed in the abstract and has to be tested out in practice.

Essentially what happedned is that first questions were asked about MCLL's relationship with CL. Two questions were asked about CL positions 1. which was the leading force the industrial proletariat or the most oppressed and expboited and the dialectical relationship between the two. 2 did CL beleive that all of the white workers were bribed? I replied that I beleive that it is a not fully answered question inside of CL as two which is the leading force given the differeing positions taken on being in large plants or small shops were the oppression is much more severe. I stated that the question had not been discussed to the degree necessary wsith MCLL and that both positions seemed to have adhearants. On the question of whether all white workers are considered to be bribed I replied that it was my understanding that the anser was no. Clay stated that in the Proletariat that the position was taken that they all were. I stated that I hadn't seen that statement. We then moved on to a discussion of the role of theory. In which they put forward the necessity of the development of theory on trade-union work, the tasks of communists in this period etc. I put forward the position that M_L is a science and that conditions do not differ that much from the situation in 1920 for Lenin or 1935 for Dimitrov or stalin etc, the idea that we don't need new theories but the study of the old and there being used as a guide given condition, time and place. There had previously been some discussion of what work place work we were going to be doing off of the line and I laid out briefly that there was some disagreement as to wheather we start study groups were possible or we wait until the orgaization asawhole is ready ie cadre have grounded themselves in Marxism-Leninism. There response was that we were becoming abstrated from the day to day struggle and that we must test out theories out. I replied that the people must ground themselves and that as a whole the theory ofM-L has been tested out, they readily agreed with this. There seem to be differences on what level of unity is necessary for the creation of the party. I took the position that unity was necessary on certain fundamental issues , that there had to be unity on a program but that there did not have to be unity on certain tactical questions like trade unions except that we stood by a leninist approach to them and the necessity to dp work in reactionary t-u. Differences as to wheather we had to have unity on everything before Party. They put forward quote by lenin on making clear the lines of demarcation, which I interpreted as making clear the lines as to bing M-L or not and on certain fundamental such as anti-revisionism, not on the development of theory around each of the tactical questions that face communists. They felt we had a one-sided emphasis on propaganda and study. This was after I put out that we did not view that an advanced worker was necessarily one who is leading the spontaneous struggle but very likely may be one who has rejected the struggle and is cynical. Ie that prectice in spontaneous struggles was not the primary criteria although it counted. They gave a definition of advance worker almost word for word what RU's definition is in red papers. They felt that we develop a marxist-leninist base through participation throught the mass struggle. I put forward a position around the three parts of the process of diverting the spontaneous working class struggle and the necessity of the emphasis the primacy of the study of M-L so that we could correctly carry on mass work and have the proper relationship between the reform work and the putting forward the necessity of revolution. They said that Lenin had written an article on What it to be Done rejecting some of the things he said in done playing the spontaneous struggle. It is entitled something like perspective twelve years after. They belive that we have to be actively envolved in working claas movement in the areas where we are

They seemed to hear me say a rejectiiln of all activity in the spontaneous struggle which I did not say or a rejection of all activity and leadership at place of work which I did not say , I continued to put forward the primacy of education-study. They continued to put forward that we have to test out our theory in practice , that we have do devlope theory around all the questions out there and that we and CL are abstracted out not giving understanding of how communists should move. They continued to emphacize importance of theory , I stated a number of times that I felt they were bowing to spontanaeity, that the study and the building of the base in that fashion was necessary as participation in the spontaneous struggles is not going to develop class counsciousness among the class although it may bring about an embryo of class counsciousness and that study was necessary.

They felt that 2 prerequisites to building of party are(there may be more)
Theoretical Unity
communists have base in class and won substantial no on advanced workers-mass ties.
They do not beleiv that a party can be build by september. They however feel that they have been isolated and want to begin discussion and struggle with other groups. said they would join continuations comm. if one was in Phil. so that they could carry on struggle for unity around theoretical questions. They want to get on with us set up more permenat and formal relations. will send us a letter in 3 weeks and send some one out to see and talk to us.

They had many criticasm of the paper which I did not try to defend. they felt it simply stated conclusions and for all its talk of science did not sceintificly prove the things it asserted. an example they gave was around cuba. I talked about recent statement of cuba and ussr affirming principle of peaceful transition, they said the inclusion of that would have been helpful. I stated that we felt there were large number of areas in which we had not developed positions or only tentarive ones that we had priority of study and then the application of science to concrete conditions.
Analysis:

Pwoc is centrist grouping, which bows to spontanaeity. Made up of honewt marxists, who have done fair amount of study. We did not discuss revisionsim in depth or social imperialism, or the national question. They seemingly take a position that would resemble the new voice position. They are adament in there disagreement with the idea of the bribed sections of the class although we did not hav discussion of this. They all seem to be in factories following there line of the leading force being the industrial proletariat.

Pwoc can and should be struggled with, what we did was put forward our line and begin to draw some lines of differences which will obviusly be taken up in our next meeting.

[1972]

Revised Agenda
Grailville
Loveland, Ohio

RG

Sat, Oct 21

9:00am–11:30am REGISTRATION

12:00noon I. National Divisions in the Working Class

A. Fight against White Supremacy
B. Role and Potential of Autonomous Black and Latin Organizations
C. Third World Community Issues and Struggles in Relation to the Workplace.

12:00–1:00 Panelists

Lorenzo Carizaris, Movemiento Obrero Latino, NYC
_____, United Black Workers, Newark, NJ
Ted Allen, Harper's Ferry Organization, NYC
Hilda Ignatin, Sojourner Truth Organization, Chicago

1:00–1:30 Plenary Session

1:30–4:00 Workshops (people from different organizations to be spread about in workshops)

4:00–6:00 Dinner Break

8:00 pm II. Women in the Working Class

A. Family and Culture
B. Non-working women in relation to production
C. Class conscio sness and family
D. Fighting male chauvanism in a workers organization
E. What the specific role of women means to the development of organizatio al forms.

6:00–7:00pm Panelists

Jackie DiSalvo, New Jersey
_____, On the Line, St Louis, Mo.
Paula King, SMO, Portland Ore
_____, Bell Workers Actions Committee, NYC

7:00–7:30pm Plenary Session

7:30–10:00pm Workshops (Mixed up sets)

Sunday, Oct 22

8:30am III. Production Work Strategy

A. Communists and the Trade Unions
B. Rank and File Caucuses
C. Independent organizations
D. Organized vs. Unorganized Workers
E. Workers Control
F. Consequences on the women question
G. The National Question

8:30–9:30am Panelists

Speakers not yet named: organizations supplying speakers are

Danville Collective, Danville, Illinois
Philadelphia Workers organizing Committee, Phila.
United Black Workers, Newark, NJ
Sojourner Truth Organization, Chicago
League of Revolutionary Black Workers, Chicago, Ill

9:30–10:00am Plenary Session

10:00am Workshops A--mixed from all organizations 10–12:30noon

12:30–1:30 LUNCH

1:30–4:00 Workshops B based on work areas.

4:00–4:30pm Break

Sunday Cont.

4:30pm IV Perspectives and problems in development of Communist organization

A. Relations of Communist Organization to Mass Movements (reforms, revolution, etc.)
B. Tasks facing us in light of the need for a national organization
C. The actual situation of the various local groups attending.

4:30pm-5:30pm Panelists

Todd Smith, Modern Times, Cleveland
_____, Sojourner Truth Organization, Chicago, Ill
*Jerry Tung, New York, New York
_____, Detroit Organizing Committee
*Alternate Sojourner Truth , Chicago

5:30-6:00 pm Plenary Session

6:00-8:00pm Workshops A(mixed set up)

End of Sunday session

Monday, Oct 23

8:30 am-10:00 am Workshops B from session IV: Specific Organizational Issues: (internal education, role of newspapers, literature, internal structure)

10:00 am-12:30 am V. Future Relations

Agenda to be set by Presiding Committee

Presiding committee is made up of one member from each of the following groups:

Barberton, Ohio
Danville Collective
St. Louis, On the Line
Louisville Workers Literary Society
Movimiento Obrero Latino, NYC
United Black Workers, NJ
Kansas City Radical Workers Organization
Cleveland, Modern Times
Harper's Ferry Organization, NYC

Maybank for Delegate

My name is Mike Maybank. I have been employed on the waterfront for 11 years, and the working conditions are still the same. I am the son of Perry better known as Roughouse, and he is in agreement with me that there should be changes in the working conditions. I cannot, however, do it alone. With the help of Roughouse, and all union members, we can help bring about this change. So I am asking you AS YOUR CANDIDATE FOR DELEGATE to come along and help me in this fight for better working conditions, and representation, for all union members. I guarantee I will be the kind of delegate you can TRUST and depend upon.

AS CANDIDATE FOR DELEGATE I STAND FOR:

1. BETTER WORKING CONDITIONS

   1. Changes in the hiring system.
   2. Better safety rules on all piers.
   3. Better health conditions on the piers (such as clean rest rooms, showers, heaters, etc.).

2) STRIKE FUND

   I will help in the fight for a STRIKE FUND. We are the only union that I know of that doesn't have any funds available for its members when a strike is in force. With the help of the membership, we can set up this fund very easily.

3) CREDIT UNION

   I will help in the fight for a CREDIT UNION. You are aware, as everyone else is, that there are times when we are caught short of money. There is no reason why a man should not have a union to apply for a loan, if he so qualifies. Our job is just like any other job; we have dues deducted from our salary and the same can be done for a Credit Union.

4) I will help in the fight for BETTER AND FAIRER CONDITIONS AT THE HIRING HALL, such as:

   1. More supervision over hiring; seeing that all members get a fair deal.
   2. Making information available concerning our union; printed reports after meetings for members who were unable to attend; information concerning paid holidays, financial reports, etc.
   3. Activities for union members on idle days (such as: cards, checkers, books on stevedoring).

REMEMBER -- A VOTE FOR ME IS A VOICE FOR YOU!

(labor donated)