FB, cartella 2, 13

STATEMENT RE MONTREAL POWER OF WOMEN COLLECTIVE

Because we are organizing the October conference we feel it is necessary to sum up where things stand with respect to the Montreal Collective and propose a course of action. The post-Montreal conference debate has been in course for many months and must be resolved before the Toronto conference next month if we want to avoid wasting valuable time.

Montreal opened the debate with their paper which called into question positions which many of us had fought to establish and which were accepted as conference positions after the Toronto Group I expulsion. Silvia responded and was in turn attacked as if she were stating personal views rather than organizational positions. Any room for ambiguity was gone once Ruth Hall's paper began circulating -- it elaborated what the Network had achieved politically and organizationally at the February conference and spelled out painstakingly the basis for political agreement. Following that, specific responses to the Montreal Collective's paper were made by the Chicago and Los Angeles groups which were quite clear and covered much of the same political ground. They called for a resolution for which the groundwork has been laid at this point and which we in fact think is long overdue.

At least two things have emerged very clearly in the post-Montreal conference debate:

1) That there is a concensus in the Network that the positions taken at the February conference on libertarianism, autonomy, leadership, wages, etc. -- and expressed more fully in Ruth's paper -- are Network positions, and

2) That the Montreal Collective is not in agreement with these positions from what they have said in their initial paper on the February conference and subsequent replies to Silvia's response.

It is evident from the discussions of Ruth's paper in various cities, from the Los Angeles and Chicago papers, and from Claire Mian's statement on her break with the Montreal Collective, that there has been a vigorous process of clarification throughout the Network around the positions taken at the February conference, and that a higher degree of homogeneity exists as a result.

This shows that, organizationally, the ground we gained at the February conference we have been able to safeguard and build on. And from this fact two things flow -- as the L.A. Statement firmly argued -- which substantially resolve the question of the Montreal collective:

1) No conference time should be given in October to political differences on which the Network has already taken a clear position and, therefore, the Montreal Collective and any other individual or group who share the positions articulated in their documents should not attend the October conference. We feel the urgent necessity to move well beyond the initial ground gained in February, and more firmly secured in the Network debate afterwards, because our ability as an organization to build the campaign for wages for housework, internationally, depends on it.

2) The principle of clarification at the local level should stand once the Network has taken a position and open debate in the Network is no longer necessary for the majority. In this connection we note that following the circulation of their first paper the Montreal Collective was assured several times that we in Toronto were ready to meet to discuss the differences they were expressing with the Network. It was not taken up except for a brief meeting with one of its members, from which no agreement resulted and after which still further divergence was expressed in the open letters to Silvia. This includes Susan Wheeler who, although she moved to Toronto shortly after the February conference did not respond to the Committee's offer to discuss political differences and the consequences for her working/not working with the Committee. Due to this lack of response we have had no contact at all with Susan and very little with the Montreal Collective despite our stated willingness to further clarify positions after the February conference. Because of this, we feel that the principle of local clarifcation of differences is especially important -- why should a group or individual who chooses not to discuss locally with those maintaining Network positions have access to valuable conference time only to force the entire Network over old ground?

Finally, we feel that for the sake of establishing clearer organizational procedures, each group or individual in the Network should take a public stand on what we have proposed by way of conference criteria:

A) That all those who attend be in fundamental agreement with Ruth's paper as the Network position on wages for housework as a political perspective and as an organization.

B) That the Montreal Collective and any others who share the views they have expressed since the February conference not attend the Toronto Conference next month. We ask that this document be endorsed by those who agree with it and that each group communicate with us immediately so that the Network response can be circulated before the conference and we can all be clear as to where we stand.

Further conference materials will follow in a couple of weeks.

Love and power,
Toronto Wages for Housework Committee

STATEMENT RE MONTREAL POWER OF WOMEN COLLECTIVE

Because we are organizing the October conference we feel it is necessary to sum up where things stand with respect to the Montreal Collective and propose a course of action. The post-Montreal conference debate has been in course for many months and must be resolved before the Toronto conference next month if we want to avoid wasting valuable time.

Montreal opened the debate with their paper which called into question positions which many of us had fought to establish and which were accepted as conference positions after the Toronto Group I expulsion. Silvia responded and was in turn attacked as if she were stating personal views rather than organizational positions. Any room for ambiguity was gone once Ruth Hall's paper began circulating -- it elaborated what the Network had achieved politically and organizationally at the February conference and spelled out painstakingly the basis for political agreement. Following that, specific responses to the Montreal Collective's paper were made by the Chicago and Los Angeles groups which were quite clear and covered much of the same political ground. They called for a resolution for which the groundwork has been laid at this point and which we in fact think is long overdue.

At least two things have emerged very clearly in the post-Montreal conference debate:

1) That there is a concensus in the Network that the positions taken at the February conference on libertarianism, autonomy, leadership, wages, etc. -- and expressed more fully in Ruth's paper -- are Network positions, and

2) That the Montreal Collective is not in agreement with these positions from what they have said in their initial paper on the February conference and subsequent replies to Silvia's response.

It is evident from the discussions of Ruth's paper in various cities, from the Los Angeles and Chicago papers, and from Claire Mian's statement on her break with the Montreal Collective, that there has been a vigorous process of clarification throughout the Network around the positions taken at the February conference, and that a higher degree of homogeneity exists as a result.

This shows that, organizationally, the ground we gained at the February conference we have been able to safeguard and build on. And from this fact two things flow -- as the L.A. Statement firmly argued -- which substantially resolve the question of the Montreal collective:

1) No conference time should be given in October to political differences on which the Network has already taken a clear position and, therefore, the Montreal Collective and any other individual or group who share the positions articulated in their documents should not attend the October conference. We feel the urgent necessity to move well beyond the initial ground gained in February, and more firmly secured in the Network debate afterwards, because our ability as an organization to build the campaign for wages for housework, internationally, depends on it.

2) The principle of clarification at the local level should stand once the Network has taken a position and open debate in the Network is no longer necessary for the majority. In this connection we note that following the circulation of their first paper the Montreal Collective was assured several times that we in Toronto were ready to meet to discuss the differences they were expressing with the Network. It was not taken up except for a brief meeting with one of its members, from which no agreement resulted and after which still further divergence was expressed in the open letters to Silvia. This includes Susan Wheeler who, although she moved to Toronto shortly after the February conference did not respond to the Committee's offer to discuss political differences and the consequences for her working/not working with the Committee. Due to this lack of response we have had no contact at all with Susan and very little with the Montreal Collective despite our stated willingness to further clarify positions after the February conference. Because of this, we feel that the principle of local clarifcation of differences is especially important -- why should a group or individual who chooses not to discuss locally with those maintaining Network positions have access to valuable conference time only to force the entire Network over old ground?

Finally, we feel that for the sake of establishing clearer organizational procedures, each group or individual in the Network should take a public stand on what we have proposed by way of conference criteria:

A) That all those who attend be in fundamental agreement with Ruth's paper as the Network position on wages for housework as a political perspective and as an organization.

B) That the Montreal Collective and any others who share the views they have expressed since the February conference not attend the Toronto Conference next month. We ask that this document be endorsed by those who agree with it and that each group communicate with us immediately so that the Network response can be circulated before the conference and we can all be clear as to where we stand.

Further conference materials will follow in a couple of weeks.

Love and power,
Toronto Wages for Housework Committee

STATEMENT RE MONTREAL POWER OF WOMEN COLLECTIVE

Because we are organizing the October conference we feel it is necessary to sum up where things stand with respect to the Montreal Collective and propose a course of action. The post-Montreal conference debate has been in course for many months and must be resolved before the Toronto conference next month if we want to avoid wasting valuable time.

Montreal opened the debate with their paper which called into question positions which many of us had fought to establish and which were accepted as conference positions after the Toronto Group I expulsion. Silvia responded and was in turn attacked as if she were stating personal views rather than organizational positions. Any room for ambiguity was gone once Ruth Hall's paper began circulating -- it elaborated what the Network had achieved politically and organizationally at the February conference and spelled out painstakingly the basis for political agreement. Following that, specific responses to the Montreal Collective's paper were made by the Chicago and Los Angeles groups which were quite clear and covered much of the same political ground. They called for a resolution for which the groundwork has been laid at this point and which we in fact think is long overdue.

At least two things have emerged very clearly in the post-Montreal conference debate:

1) That there is a concensus in the Network that the positions taken at the February conference on libertarianism, autonomy, leadership, wages, etc. -- and expressed more fully in Ruth's paper -- are Network positions, and

2) That the Montreal Collective is not in agreement with these positions from what they have said in their initial paper on the February conference and subsequent replies to Silvia's response.

It is evident from the discussions of Ruth's paper in various cities, from the Los Angeles and Chicago papers, and from Claire Mian's statement on her break with the Montreal Collective, that there has been a vigorous process of clarification throughout the Network around the positions taken at the February conference, and that a higher degree of homogeneity exists as a result.

This shows that, organizationally, the ground we gained at the February conference we have been able to safeguard and build on. And from this fact two things flow -- as the L.A. Statement firmly argued -- which substantially resolve the question of the Montreal collective:

1) No conference time should be given in October to political differences on which the Network has already taken a clear position and, therefore, the Montreal Collective and any other individual or group who share the positions articulated in their documents should not attend the October conference. We feel the urgent necessity to move well beyond the initial ground gained in February, and more firmly secured in the Network debate afterwards, because our ability as an organization to build the campaign for wages for housework, internationally, depends on it.

2) The principle of clarification at the local level should stand once the Network has taken a position and open debate in the Network is no longer necessary for the majority. In this connection we note that following the circulation of their first paper the Montreal Collective was assured several times that we in Toronto were ready to meet to discuss the differences they were expressing with the Network. It was not taken up except for a brief meeting with one of its members, from which no agreement resulted and after which still further divergence was expressed in the open letters to Silvia. This includes Susan Wheeler who, although she moved to Toronto shortly after the February conference did not respond to the Committee's offer to discuss political differences and the consequences for her working/not working with the Committee. Due to this lack of response we have had no contact at all with Susan and very little with the Montreal Collective despite our stated willingness to further clarify positions after the February conference. Because of this, we feel that the principle of local clarifcation of differences is especially important -- why should a group or individual who chooses not to discuss locally with those maintaining Network positions have access to valuable conference time only to force the entire Network over old ground?

Finally, we feel that for the sake of establishing clearer organizational procedures, each group or individual in the Network should take a public stand on what we have proposed by way of conference criteria:

A) That all those who attend be in fundamental agreement with Ruth's paper as the Network position on wages for housework as a political perspective and as an organization.

B) That the Montreal Collective and any others who share the views they have expressed since the February conference not attend the Toronto Conference next month. We ask that this document be endorsed by those who agree with it and that each group communicate with us immediately so that the Network response can be circulated before the conference and we can all be clear as to where we stand.

Further conference materials will follow in a couple of weeks.

Love and power,
Toronto Wages for Housework Committee

STATEMENT RE MONTREAL POWER OF WOMEN COLLECTIVE

Because we are organizing the October conference we feel it is necessary to sum up where things stand with respect to the Montreal Collective and propose a course of action. The post-Montreal conference debate has been in course for many months and must be resolved before the Toronto conference next month if we want to avoid wasting valuable time.

Montreal opened the debate with their paper which called into question positions which many of us had fought to establish and which were accepted as conference positions after the Toronto Group I expulsion. Silvia responded and was in turn attacked as if she were stating personal views rather than organizational positions. Any room for ambiguity was gone once Ruth Hall's paper began circulating -- it elaborated what the Network had achieved politically and organizationally at the February conference and spelled out painstakingly the basis for political agreement. Following that, specific responses to the Montreal Collective's paper were made by the Chicago and Los Angeles groups which were quite clear and covered much of the same political ground. They called for a resolution for which the groundwork has been laid at this point and which we in fact think is long overdue.

At least two things have emerged very clearly in the post-Montreal conference debate:

1) That there is a concensus in the Network that the positions taken at the February conference on libertarianism, autonomy, leadership, wages, etc. -- and expressed more fully in Ruth's paper -- are Network positions, and

2) That the Montreal Collective is not in agreement with these positions from what they have said in their initial paper on the February conference and subsequent replies to Silvia's response.

It is evident from the discussions of Ruth's paper in various cities, from the Los Angeles and Chicago papers, and from Claire Mian's statement on her break with the Montreal Collective, that there has been a vigorous process of clarification throughout the Network around the positions taken at the February conference, and that a higher degree of homogeneity exists as a result.

This shows that, organizationally, the ground we gained at the February conference we have been able to safeguard and build on. And from this fact two things flow -- as the L.A. Statement firmly argued -- which substantially resolve the question of the Montreal collective:

1) No conference time should be given in October to political differences on which the Network has already taken a clear position and, therefore, the Montreal Collective and any other individual or group who share the positions articulated in their documents should not attend the October conference. We feel the urgent necessity to move well beyond the initial ground gained in February, and more firmly secured in the Network debate afterwards, because our ability as an organization to build the campaign for wages for housework, internationally, depends on it.

2) The principle of clarification at the local level should stand once the Network has taken a position and open debate in the Network is no longer necessary for the majority. In this connection we note that following the circulation of their first paper the Montreal Collective was assured several times that we in Toronto were ready to meet to discuss the differences they were expressing with the Network. It was not taken up except for a brief meeting with one of its members, from which no agreement resulted and after which still further divergence was expressed in the open letters to Silvia. This includes Susan Wheeler who, although she moved to Toronto shortly after the February conference did not respond to the Committee's offer to discuss political differences and the consequences for her working/not working with the Committee. Due to this lack of response we have had no contact at all with Susan and very little with the Montreal Collective despite our stated willingness to further clarify positions after the February conference. Because of this, we feel that the principle of local clarifcation of differences is especially important -- why should a group or individual who chooses not to discuss locally with those maintaining Network positions have access to valuable conference time only to force the entire Network over old ground?

Finally, we feel that for the sake of establishing clearer organizational procedures, each group or individual in the Network should take a public stand on what we have proposed by way of conference criteria:

A) That all those who attend be in fundamental agreement with Ruth's paper as the Network position on wages for housework as a political perspective and as an organization.

B) That the Montreal Collective and any others who share the views they have expressed since the February conference not attend the Toronto Conference next month. We ask that this document be endorsed by those who agree with it and that each group communicate with us immediately so that the Network response can be circulated before the conference and we can all be clear as to where we stand.

Further conference materials will follow in a couple of weeks.

Love and power,
Toronto Wages for Housework Committee

STATEMENT RE MONTREAL POWER OF WOMEN COLLECTIVE

Because we are organizing the October conference we feel it is necessary to sum up where things stand with respect to the Montreal Collective and propose a course of action. The post-Montreal conference debate has been in course for many months and must be resolved before the Toronto conference next month if we want to avoid wasting valuable time.

Montreal opened the debate with their paper which called into question positions which many of us had fought to establish and which were accepted as conference positions after the Toronto Group I expulsion. Silvia responded and was in turn attacked as if she were stating personal views rather than organizational positions. Any room for ambiguity was gone once Ruth Hall's paper began circulating -- it elaborated what the Network had achieved politically and organizationally at the February conference and spelled out painstakingly the basis for political agreement. Following that, specific responses to the Montreal Collective's paper were made by the Chicago and Los Angeles groups which were quite clear and covered much of the same political ground. They called for a resolution for which the groundwork has been laid at this point and which we in fact think is long overdue.

At least two things have emerged very clearly in the post-Montreal conference debate:

1) That there is a concensus in the Network that the positions taken at the February conference on libertarianism, autonomy, leadership, wages, etc. -- and expressed more fully in Ruth's paper -- are Network positions, and

2) That the Montreal Collective is not in agreement with these positions from what they have said in their initial paper on the February conference and subsequent replies to Silvia's response.

It is evident from the discussions of Ruth's paper in various cities, from the Los Angeles and Chicago papers, and from Claire Mian's statement on her break with the Montreal Collective, that there has been a vigorous process of clarification throughout the Network around the positions taken at the February conference, and that a higher degree of homogeneity exists as a result.

This shows that, organizationally, the ground we gained at the February conference we have been able to safeguard and build on. And from this fact two things flow -- as the L.A. Statement firmly argued -- which substantially resolve the question of the Montreal collective:

1) No conference time should be given in October to political differences on which the Network has already taken a clear position and, therefore, the Montreal Collective and any other individual or group who share the positions articulated in their documents should not attend the October conference. We feel the urgent necessity to move well beyond the initial ground gained in February, and more firmly secured in the Network debate afterwards, because our ability as an organization to build the campaign for wages for housework, internationally, depends on it.

2) The principle of clarification at the local level should stand once the Network has taken a position and open debate in the Network is no longer necessary for the majority. In this connection we note that following the circulation of their first paper the Montreal Collective was assured several times that we in Toronto were ready to meet to discuss the differences they were expressing with the Network. It was not taken up except for a brief meeting with one of its members, from which no agreement resulted and after which still further divergence was expressed in the open letters to Silvia. This includes Susan Wheeler who, although she moved to Toronto shortly after the February conference did not respond to the Committee's offer to discuss political differences and the consequences for her working/not working with the Committee. Due to this lack of response we have had no contact at all with Susan and very little with the Montreal Collective despite our stated willingness to further clarify positions after the February conference. Because of this, we feel that the principle of local clarifcation of differences is especially important -- why should a group or individual who chooses not to discuss locally with those maintaining Network positions have access to valuable conference time only to force the entire Network over old ground?

Finally, we feel that for the sake of establishing clearer organizational procedures, each group or individual in the Network should take a public stand on what we have proposed by way of conference criteria:

A) That all those who attend be in fundamental agreement with Ruth's paper as the Network position on wages for housework as a political perspective and as an organization.

B) That the Montreal Collective and any others who share the views they have expressed since the February conference not attend the Toronto Conference next month. We ask that this document be endorsed by those who agree with it and that each group communicate with us immediately so that the Network response can be circulated before the conference and we can all be clear as to where we stand.

Further conference materials will follow in a couple of weeks.

Love and power,
Toronto Wages for Housework Committee