

AMENDMENTS TO THE' DRAFT INTERNAL STATEMENT ON THE HISTORY OF THE RCLB'.

1. Page 2. after para 7. line 4, after Manchester, insert:-

"Class Struggle was increased to fortnightly publication".

2. Page 3. after para 3 insert:-

"Also in hindsight a negative aspect of the increased publication of CS to a fortnightly , can be said that the decision was premature, short sighted and rushed. Adequate conditions were not laid or planned for its systematic sustained growth over a fairly long period of time".

---

As I am unable to attend the Conference because it is my daughter's birthday, I wish these amendments to be seen as reference, if no other cde will put them in my absence.

The reason for them is more of a reminder of the fundamental role of our political paper to industrial base building and broader mass work, rather than to debate that importance at this conference. I understand that we will be having a national conference on the role of our paper in the coming months.

Class Struggle should be seen as an intergral part of the history of the League. It's omission reflects the fact that it does not play a central role in our mass work, or that its production is underplayed as a important part of party building.

Also the particular decision to go fortnightly at that time, though undoubtedly an enormous boost to industrial work, resulted in some serious negative effects in the print production cell, namely a left sectarian separation from district tasks and mass work, and even its actual publication has even been at risk, in the early part of the RS. This should also be summed up from a national point of view at the forthcoming conference.

SB. 19.4.80.

Amendment to "History of RCL", plus criticism of inadequacies of our line on women's emancipation for attention of CC.

Amendment, to be inserted between para.s "the reassessment" and "On the particular question of finance" on p5.

"The question of women's emancipation has been neglected: the incorrect over-concentration on industrial work negated the importance of women's struggles other than at the workplace, and putting this right has not been an aspect of the rectification campaign. It is vital to strengthen both the line and our practice on this issue."

I am putting this amendment so as to open the door to debate on this vital question. The need for it has been proved to me by the following facts: six months or so ago a comrade argued that Equal Pay legislation should be opposed because it had not improved women's position and simply meant that men got taken on instead of women - worse, only one other cde in the cell discussion could refute the argument; the experience of two non member cdes in Speke doing battle with the SS has highlighted for me how impracticable women are often at the forefront of battles against the state, be it housing corporation, education or the welfare system; the lack of leadership given by CS on the issue of free and safe abortion (Corrie article contradicted by letter, with no comment) and the abysmally economist article on IWWD. When I re examined what's written in the Manifesto, I find that all these errors stem from there!

---

Criticism of Manifesto, section on "Women's oppression" on p2 p 17 and divisions between Men and Women" p 23.

Para 54: "oppressed....because the exploiting classes have continually forced them to accept an inferior position" - not a thoroughly materialist way of putting it: W's oppression has private property at its root, as does class society, and it is her exclusion from social production (total or partial) and her main responsibility for the family which constitutes her oppression; and is built in to the foundations of class society; Putting it as the Manifesto does can open the door to an idealist way of looking at how the ruling class oppress women, as if they did it just for spite.

Para 55: How can you measure if women are mainly oppressed economically? This is really a nonsensical sentence, but dangerous because it could (and already has) lead to us concentrating solely on Women's industrial struggles: that the down-playing of other forms of struggle has its roots in our line is shown to me by the pathetic sentence "Women also suffer political and social inequality".

Although very general intone, these paragraphs neglect to say anything about why socialism lays be the basis for the complete emancipation of

women, viz the material basis which is the socialisation of housework, and the bringing of women into social production fully.

Section D; "Divisions between men and women" - This whole section has the tendency of downplaying the question of women's oppression by only objecting to it because it divides the working class. Also it carries the same idealist error criticised re para. 54: as if discrimination against women is something consciously practised by the bourgeoisie (which it is, I don't mean to deny that) rather than being an inbuilt feature of all class societies.

Secondly it places male superiority and feminism on the same level, though one is the ideology of the oppressor and the other the reaction of the oppressed, and further fails to differentiate between bourgeois feminism (of the "We need more Women Prime Ministers") and the sort of spontaneous feminism that a lot of women fall into in response to their oppression.

I apologise for the rough and inaccurate nature of this criticism, but thought it better to get something down on paper to provoke further discussion rather than to wait longer and produce something better thought out.

Comradely greetings, RG, L'pool.