

June 3 1986

Dear comrades:

Regarding the proposal of the IWW for an international anarcho-syndicalist communication network, I have a few observations.

In reading the Industrial Worker for two decades now, and the IWW General Organizational Bulletin for the several years that I was an IWW member, I can recall very, very few (if any) references to other anarcho-syndicalist unions or groups around the world, or to the International Workers Association. This is doubtless because the IWW has no really coherent reason for not aligning itself with the IWA, other than the fact that it considers itself as at least the embryo of a world syndicalist organization, as its name implies. Therefore it must ignore the existence of any potential rival.

This type of double-think can no longer be so easily maintained because of the existence of the WSA. The Wobblies are in a state of anxiety because of our open affiliation with Madrid, to witness the behavior of their national office over the last year or so. In order to ease their bad conscience they've concocted this idea [the international network--ed. note] (which may formally violate their own constitution, which forbids alliances with anti-political groups), something which they have rejected for at least 20 years.

With the exception of the Japanese WSM, the organizations the Wobblies list are either unwilling or unable to affiliate with the IWA. The Wobs are in fact trying to form a mini-International, their denial of this intention notwithstanding.

As I've always been saying, I feel our relation with the IWW should be as courteous as possible, and on the local level I think we can work together from time to time. But we should steer clear of the IWW national office. We will just get involved with more trouble and petty aggravation, as with the Edwards bullshit.

I suggest we respond in a courteous and concise manner that, although we do not have the resources to implement their 7 Point Program at the moment, that we are always ready to communicate with other revolutionary unionists, etc. Being polite but vague, we should neither accept nor reject.

Salud,

Marty Comack