

CARTON 151

THE GUARDIAN

INTERNAL PLANS / FUTURE OF PAPER

1967-1968

2017/193
c

1323 Micheltorena St., #3
Los Angeles, Calif. 90026
November 9, 1968

Mr. Jack A. Smith
Managing Editor
The Guardian
197 E. Fourth St.
~~Room 411~~ New York, N.Y. 10009

Dear Jack:

Thank you very much for your note. It arrived a few hours after I sent you a note wondering why you hadn't sent me one. While I'm at it, please tell Davidson that the reason I seemed secretive when I answered the phone was that I thought he might be the LA Times checking up to see why I didn't show up for work Saturday.

The reason I didn't make it to the Times will interest you in connection with Guardian coverage in Southern California. Ken Cloke, Bill Vandercook of SDS regional and The Movement, Freddy Khonsky (Mike's brother) of SDS regional and I had a meeting to discuss ways of getting news out of Los Angeles and Southern California. We have the beginnings of a proposal. We will meet again on Nov. 19, so we could use an indication of what you think before then.

We envision a Los Angeles Media Project (LAMP) which would have a number of components. One of them would be a news bureau with one full-time, subsistence-paid editor-manager and a number of other people active in the movement here. The bureau would produce a local wire-service-like report for the Southern California movement. It also would produce a national edition of the same file for the Guardian, the Movement, Liberation News Service (NY) and New Left Notes. We see this in two ways: (1) The local edition, which would be more detailed, would serve to pull the region together and give us information on what non-SDS people are doing, as well as giving the entire movement a sense of cohesiveness which is so important in a spread-out, impersonal town like LA; (2) The national edition, which would be written for readers in Philadelphia and so on, would provide the movement's national media with regular, full coverage from an area we feel be be very important. More of the country is going to be like LA than Union Square. In time, we would hope to build the local service into an external paper, but this would not conflict with the national service.

Additionally, LAMP would contain a circulation-promotion unit for the Guardian, the Movement and NLN. (The Movement part would be handled by a Los Angeles Editorial Board which would be part of LAMP, too.)

One suggestion (by Vandercook) was that the circulation-promotion unit drum up bulk orders for the national publications at college chapters and from other movement groups. This would extend the circulation of the Guardian and also give LAMP some funds from the wholesale angle.

Another approach we discussed was more of a special-service thing. We realize that there could be some conflicts as between client publications. The Guardian may not think that it's getting enough news, etc. The special-services approach would make a distinction ~~between~~ among the papers. Take the Valley State story, for example. Based on our reading of the new left press, we would say that the Guardian would want a hard news story, the Movement would want an analysis by a participant, NLN would want an organizational story, Ramparts would want a cultural story about how everybody went into a drug scene, and so on. There would be no conflicts here, then, taking into account the differing natures of the media.

We also discussed our ⁶⁴relations with the Guardian on a past, individual basis and we discovered that each of us has had a different understanding of your requirements and desires. A collective approach, with a unified proposal out of Los Angeles, would, we believe, enable everybody to pull the thing together in a way which would assure LAMP and its ~~members~~ clientele a continuous, predictable relationship.

We would like to know if the Guardian would be willing to go \$35 or \$40 a week for the subsistence of the full-time LAMP editor-manager. We do not have a complete cost breakdown for LAMP yet, but if all the other media other LAMP members will be contacting agree, we should be able to set it up. We also will try to collect funds here on the basis that we also will be providing a service to our Los Angeles people. That is why we are restricting our request to you to the subsistence matter. (I have a special interest in this since it may be that I'll be the one who is assigned this apparatchik job.)

That is about the extent of our collective thinking. Vandercook drew up an organization chart, which is the damndest thing I've ever seen, full of overlapping circles showing how LAMP components are both independent and interrelated. He's very dialectical. I'm not, so I won't try to describe it.

This is getting to be a long letter, but if you would prop your feet up on the nearest bust of Che, I would like to add some comments of my own.

I'd say that my biggest problem right now is the Los Angeles Times. It takes up too damn much time that should be--must be--going to the movement. The Times is a morning paper. That means my shift usually runs from 12:30 p.m. to 8:45 p.m., cutting hell out of both the day and the night. And I work Saturdays and Sundays, too. I find it very difficult to cover much movement news because of this. I had to take off another Saturday to do that demonstration story (which turned out

to be not as good a story as it might have been.) When somebody asks me to cover an area, or even do a single story, I have this thing about doing it the most complete way possible. A very structured dude, I am. So it really bothers me when I have to go through all kinds of short-cuts to get something, anything, to you on time. And it bothers me even more if I have to miss a story entirely. What it does to my head isn't so important, but it hurts the Guardian, too. I know you want to build up your circulation here. There is a hell of a readership in LA. But there is a lot of competition, too. The People's World, Free Press and Open Cityall have substantial circulations here and much later deadlines. I am sure the Guardian can be provided with superior coverage from Southern California, but I can't do it on a part-time basis for the reasons given above. On a part-time basis, I can only do as much as I have been doing for you which, in my news judgement, is not an adequate job.

My hunch is that the Guardian does not wish to open a full-time Los Angeles news bureau. Even if it did, though, I would prefer--we all here would prefer--to handle our movement responsibilities in a collective way. I know you'll agree that writing for a radical paper is qualitatively different from writing LA news for Women's Wear Daily. As much as what we write, the manner in which we organize this coverage must have revolutionary political content which, for outfits like the cooperatively owned Guardian and the LAMP collective, takes on certain forms which Women's Wear Daily would find strange.

Furthermore, under the LAMP arrangement, the Guardian would, in fact, be receiving the services of a full-time news and circulation bureau at far less cost than if it were solely a Guardian bureau. It is true, of course, that the LAMP benefits would not accrue to the Guardian alone. But I do not think that this need be a point of great concern. As I indicated earlier, the possible areas of conflict would well be minimized. And such arrangements are not unique. In San Francisco, for example, some Movement staff members are also on the Express Times staff. In Chicago, the Movement Editorial Board overlaps with SDS, NOC and the Firing Line.

Anyway, that is what we have in mind. It is probably a longer outline than you cared to slog through. So that the punishment is apportioned each according to his need, I'm sending a copy to Bob Allen in SF.

For revolution,

Bob

Bob Dudnick

Pam: this is a
copy of one of the
letters I sent out;
no response from any
of them yet, so???

3 October, 1968

Emile Capouya
2 Bank Street
New York, N.Y.

Dear Emile Capouya:

We haven't met, but since I am part of the present Guardian fund-raising effort, it has fallen to me to write you this letter on behalf of the staff, especially on behalf of Bill Rose, our new acting general manager.

You have heard no doubt of the changes in management here, particularly those involving Jane McManus. The reasons for the changes are complex, but they reduce to the fact that our business staff was not pressing the Guardian forward to the 70,000 or 80,000 circulation that is possible now in a society undergoing so pronounced a left-right polarization. We are a fine paper with a fresh revolutionary style and direction. We believe that we can become the organizing center of whatever contemporary U.S. Marxist movement should begin to develop. If we survive, we will expand in any number of direction, including the theoretical, and already we are putting together our first book -- a new study of the Vietnamese NLF by Wilfred Burchett, to be published in early November.

First, of course, now that we have shored up our business structure, we must try to survive. Toward that end, Bill Rose and I (and/or, possibly, Jack Smith and Walter Lowenfels and Irwin Silber) would like to meet with you to discuss the new Guardian at length and to study the idea of a kind of national advisory committee which ultimately would include a wide range of U.S. radicals, including yourself and John Simon and Walter and perhaps Carl Oglesby and Julius Lester. Such a committee might conceivably become a major step toward unifying and underpinning the mainstream of the whole American radical movement -- though I wouldn't hazard a guarantee in that direction.

The important thing is that we meet with our friends and begin a serious, protracted dialogue. Our first concern, again, is money -- we need as much of it as we can attract, and we need it now. Then, with our near future assured, the dialogue will go much further, pushing finally to the politics of the American revolution itself.

Will you meet with us as soon as possible?

We would be happy to meet you for dinner some evening or to have you visit us here at the Guardian office.

Will you phone me or drop me a note in reply?

Thank you.

For the staff,

Ray Reese

Plans for the future

1. The growing student movement and peace movements implies ~~the-possibility~~ potential growth in readers by double or triple. Our continued growth ~~of~~ in circulation with little or no promotional activity substantiates that their ~~are~~ potential readers who recognize the value of the paper when made acquainted with it.
2. We have found that the student movement is still too disorganized to promote the paper for us so we must reach out to them, we must get to the students and the disaffected McCarthy supporters.
4. Therefore it is necessary to establish offices across the country to distribute the paper, bring relevant speakers and cover the news.
3. We know that the mass media is unreliable and to ensure correct coverage of events we must have people there. Also with the country awakening events are happening all over the country/ We need people there to cover event.
5. We have already set up two such offices - in SF and Chicago. We are hoping to develop more as money and personnel permits.
6. With the situation in the world today being what it is it is necessary that the paper have a solid understanding of world events as well as good communication with the socialist countries. Trips such as Bob's to N. Vietnam in '67 and Bill Rose's to Cuba and N. Korea are vitally important. However these cost money.
7. We need reliable correspondents all over the world. We have Burchett in SE Asia and Lionel Martin in Cuba. We have contacts in Africa, China etc.
8. The Third world Socialist countries of Vietnam, N. Korea and Cuba have expressed their confidence in the Guardian both by word and deed. Bob was told by the North Vietnamese as was Bill by the N. Koreans and Cubans of the important role the paper plays/ Also the fact that Bill and Lionel Martin were invited to North Korea and the only given interviews with the captured crew members of the Pueblo plus other exclusive material shows in fact that they do respect the paper.
9. In regard to Cuba it has been agreed that the Guardian will begin to publish the magazine: Tricontinental and other material for the Organization of Solidarity with the Peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America (OSPAAL).
10. These latter events show in practice the ways in which the paper must expand its services to serve both the interests of the American radical movement ~~by~~ printing the most relevant news both nationally and internationally and by serving the needs of the socialist countries as well.

US newsmen to go
to NK in 15 yrs.

Sept. 27, 1968

Dear Pam and Bob

The September 28 issue of the Guardian carries the announcement of my resignation from the paper following a New Left coup which deposed the business management on vague and sweeping charges.

The coup has resulted in an inter-regnum vacuum of responsibility for the planning and execution of promotion, fund-raising and business operations at the Guardian in a time of severe financial difficulty. Indeed, the coup was fed on frustration and impatience with management's "failures" to solve the Guardian's financial difficulties over this past year.

The generational incompatibility evident in the situation has now been resolved: the New Left is in complete control of the Guardian. I sincerely hope they can develop the program and the personnel which will solve these difficult problems.

Any support you may wish to give should be sent directly to the Guardian, of course. If there is anything further you would like to know about this particular situation, I will be glad to answer any questions.

Cordially,

Jane

Jane B. McManus

P.S. as insiders who know how Jack operates, you may be interested in the details: The Verifax is a letter I sent my mother; the detailed report was made to the staff in answer to Ray Reese's highly emotional presentation. Irving, of course, continues to operate, as he always has despite his alleged removal. Silber may or may not take over - he's the only one who possibly could. Hightower is a disturbed pest to you both - Jane

September 19, 1968

A funny thing happened when I got back from Moscow: I was axed. Both the Moscow story and the Guardian story are pretty funny in their own particulars, but let me brief you on the Guardian.

What happened, basically, was that the Young Turks of the editorial floor, manipulated by the master-minding managing editor Jack Smith, decided to take over the business departments of the Guardian -- "shake up the management" as they say. They held a little pot session while I was away -- attended by noone who has been on the staff for more than six months except Smith -- and came up with an answer to all the financial problems, all the circulation problems, all the personnel problems, all the promotion problems the Guardian has, namely, the removal of the management and its replacement with no management at all -- inter-regnum at least. So I was removed as General Manager, Irving Beinin was removed as Business Manager, and a couple of people quit -- and a five-man committee from the editorial side of the paper was appointed to investigate and suggest a reorganization of responsibilities and personnel. It was beautiful. And they had the votes. Never believe that manipulation doesn't pay off; it does.

The charges? They are so broad as to be irrefutable and so patently absurd in their documentation as to be laughable. But they do boil down to a general charge: lack of bold, imaginative management authority; and a generational charge of style which seems to mean, in the language of youth, a failure to "groove" with them.

But of course the charges are unimportant, really, since the manner in which they were pressed made the outcome inevitable. I didn't even try to do anything beyond pointing to Smith's dangerous manipulative method of camouflaging his paranoia and consolidating power. So it's been a great week of horror meetings which has now been resolved by my complete resignation from the paper.

A bland statement of what has happened will appear in the next issue -- along with an exclusive interview from our Havana correspondent old Lionel Martin, the only American who was in Pyongyang last week and interviewed the Pueblo crew and captain.

That's great for promotion which is good for circulation -- or should be. But I'm not at all sure these kids can pull themselves together for anything except the quick sprint. However, the problem is now academic as far as I'm concerned. What they need is money, unfortunately, and they don't have the vaguest idea about how to get that.

Me, I plan to go on unemployment compensation and play it from there -- the income is just what I've been eating here anyhow.

Bob Allen

first draft, April 11, 1967

NEW COOPERATIVE STRUCTURE OF THE NATIONAL GUARDIAN

preamble

The National Guardian is an independent radical newsweekly owned and operated cooperatively by its working staff and dedicated to the struggle for social change in America.

The ultimate authority for the operation and policy of the National Guardian resides with the staff. Though certain managerial responsibilities are delegated, the only "boss" is the collective will of the staff.

Top managerial posts—editorial manager and ^{general}~~business~~ manager—are elective. A guiding principle in the management of the National Guardian is creative leadership, not stultifying authority; cooperative responsibility, not bureaucracy.

basic structure

Execution of staff mandates is channeled through three basic committees. Each worker belongs to at least one committee. The committee performing managerial functions is the coordinating council. The other committees, each directly responsible to the coordinating council, are the editorial group and the business group, comprised of all the workers in each department. An external advisory board, composed of persons outside the ~~staff~~ National Guardian, will advise the staff.

staff mandates

The will of the staff is expressed at monthly meetings designed for that purpose, at editorial conferences and at special meetings.

Basic policy and political decisions will be developed at the monthly meetings. The coordinating council will report to these meetings and receive instructions. The concept of ~~constructive~~ criticism and self-criticism shall prevail at the meetings. Extraordinary meetings of the entire staff may be called by ^{a majority of} the coordinating council, by either or both managers, and by the petition of at least five staff workers to the coordinating council, which must call a meeting within three days...

coordinating council (CC)

This five-member body, directly responsible to the staff, shall function as an executive charged with directing and coordinating the editorial and business groups within ~~the content~~ of mandates ~~specified~~ by the staff.

Members of the CC are elected or recalled by (3/5ths ?) vote of the staff. Three at-large members, who continue to perform their normal job functions, are elected for one year. Two managers--editorial manager and ^{general} ~~business~~ manager--are elected from within the staff to two year terms. The managerial title and co-chairmanship of the CC ^{are} ~~is~~ automatically conferred upon election. The at-large members are elected after simple nomination and a second. The managers are nominated by a majority of the members of the editorial or business groups and then elected by the staff. All CC members may stand for reelection.

The editorial manager is specifically responsible for the operations of the editorial group. The ^{general} ~~business~~ manager is specifically responsible for the business group. ~~As a result~~ the CC is responsible for managing the National Guardian.

All members of the CC have equal voting rights. Decisions are made by 3/5ths vote. Any decision, even when considered by the CC to fall within the staff mandate, may be challenged by a staff worker, who would bring the challenge before the entire staff for ultimate disposition. Any CC decision may be overturned by a (3/5ths) (majority) vote of the staff. A deadlock on the CC is resolved by requesting staff instruction.

Any CC member may be recalled at any time. Recall proceedings may be instituted either by (3/5ths ?) vote of the CC or by petition of a majority of the staff. The matter is then put before the staff for a vote. A (3/5ths ?) vote is sufficient to ~~and~~ depose a CC member.

A manager who decides not to run again, who loses election or who is deposed, would return to his normal job function.

Managers can only be elected from within the staff. In a situation where a non-staff worker is desired to fulfill a management post, the individual would be hired in a normal job category and then elected as usual. However, the staff could beforehand conduct a nonbinding (3/5ths ?)"vote of intention" that this individual would be elected to the post in question shortly after beginning employment.

The CC is expected to keep in close contact with the staff. In addition to monthly meetings, the CC would issue brief reports to the staff every two weeks, detailing its activities. These reports would be posted on the bulletin boards.

editorial group (EG)

This group is composed of (non-clerical) staff workers who produce the weekly newspaper. The editorial group performs the function of an editor, in that it initiates, organizes and is responsible for the contents of the paper under the ~~general~~ staff mandate and its responsibilities to the coordinating council. The editorial manager is in general charge of the editorial group, and directly represents the group on the CC.

The day-to-day operation of the ^{editorial}~~news~~ group is directed by the ^(editorial) news coordinator (news editor?), who would work closely with the editorial manager. The ~~news~~ coordinator, in addition to his regular job function, would be responsible for the weekly contents of the paper, relations with correspondents, editorial conferences, news planning and the general functioning of the editorial group.

~~Editorial group~~ The editorial group would meet formally at least once a week to engage in ~~mutual~~ constructive criticism and self-criticism, to discuss news developments and general approach to the news, to plan for future issues and to organize a tentative outline of the next week's issue of the paper. An editorial conference, attended by all staff workers, would follow the editorial group meeting. The tentative outline would be discussed and amended, ~~planned~~ the past issue of the paper would be criticized and future issues would be discussed. Forthcoming editorials, the responsibility of the news manager, would be formulated. Disputes about editorial line are resolved by the staff.

The editorial group is conceived as a functioning body of the whole, with no autonomous parts. Individual departments are responsible to the group, as the group is responsible to the collective.

business group (BG)

This group is composed of all business department and clerical workers. The business group is responsible for all business functions of the National Guardian under the staff mandate and its responsibilities to the coordinating council. The general manager is in ~~the~~ general charge of the business group, and directly represents the group on the CC.

The day-to-day operation of the business group is directed by the business coordinator (business manager ?), who would work closely with the general manager. The function of the business coordinator is ...

The business group would meet formally at least once a week to engage in constructive criticism and self-criticism, to discuss business developments, plan for the future, and discuss hear reports from various business departments ...

As with the editorial group, the business group is a body of the whole, with no ~~some~~ autonomous parts. Departments are responsible to the group.

conflicts

Individual conflicts within the cooperative are expected to be resolved creatively, with the interests of the cooperative in mind. The method of resolving these conflicts is through persuasion, education, criticism and self-criticism. Care must be taken that these conflicts do not become antagonistic to the detriment of the cooperative. It must be ^{admonished} ~~kept in mind~~ that disputes within the cooperative differ markedly from disputes between the cooperative and--for instance--the system of society the cooperative has been ² organized to struggle against. Thus, as Mao has written, "To criticize...shortcomings is necessary...but...to treat comrades like enemies is to go over to the stand of the enemy."

Conflicts between staff workers or a staff worker and a coordinator or manager must first be worked out between the individuals. Failing this, the conflict must be made a matter for open discussion in the editorial or business group. The next step is to ask the CC to intervene and give advice. If the conflict still remains, the solution is to bring it to the entire staff and allow the cooperative to decide. It is expected that this ^{would be viewed} decision ~~as~~ the correct decision.

Conflicts about political line must also be resolved by persuasion, education, criticism and self-criticism. If the cooperative is absolutely split on an interpretation of a political development, the advisory board will be asked to act as an intermediary. If the conflict still remains, the solution is to publish both sides in an editorial.

NORTHERN CALIFORNIA GUARDIAN BUREAU

REVIEW OF EXPERIENCE 10/65 - 9/66

<u>APPROXIMATE INCOME</u>	<u>10/64 - 9/65</u>	<u>10/65 - 9/66</u>
Subscriptions	\$7540 (1508)	\$ 8360 (1672, 4/66)
Sustainers (SONG, Pledges)	3250 (128)	9444 (241, 8/66)
Contributions	668 (49)	713 (68, 8/66)
Rack Income*	325+ (Berkeley only, 10/64 - 6/65)	468+ (Berkeley only, 10/65 - 6/66)
Literature Sales	Ø	50
Advertising (Paid)	460 (10/64 - 6/65 - 78")	1060 (10/65 - 6/66 - 194")
Events (Fund Raising)	300	1513 (10/65 - 9/5/66)
Campus Representatives	Ø	92+
Miscellaneous (San Jose Comm.)	Ø	45
	\$12,543	\$21,745 plus additional income from racks and campus reps sent direct- ly to New York
DIFFERENCE: \$9,202+		

* Rack Income: The SF Office has records only for the racks maintained by V. Bown in Berkeley (and Lee Coe, same area, 10/64 - 9/65). Other racks, in SF Oakland, San Jose, Peninsula, etc. maintain direct relations with NY office and we have no way of knowing returns from these operations (since they are relatively new, the amount would not be great).

**Campus Representatives: Records in the SF Office are incomplete as regards the income from various campuses, in that several reps have sent their receipts directly to the NY Office (also minor amounts).

<u>APPROXIMATE EXPENSES</u>	<u>10/64 - 9/65</u>	<u>10/65 - 9/66</u>	***Average Per Month
Salary	Ø	\$3511.44	(\$292.62)
Rent and utilities	Ø	490.00	(40.80)
Telephone	Ø	343.44	(28.62)
Office Equipment & Supplies	Ø	372.72	(31.06)
Postage	Ø	237.36	(19.78)
Transportation	Ø	323.88	(26.99)
Printing (Duplicating)	Ø	39.12	(3.26)
Miscellaneous (racks)	Ø	97.50	(8.13)
		\$5,415.46	

*** Average per month based on expenses 11/65 - 6/66 - Actual total costs for year somewhat less, due to three-week vacation period, July 1966

SUMMARY Income to GUARDIAN from Northern California 10/64 - 9/65: \$12,543+
Income to GUARDIAN from Northern California 10/65 - 9/66: \$21,745+

Net to GUARDIAN 10/65 - 9/66: \$16,330 . . . an increase of \$3787, first year of SFBureau.

NORTHERN CALIFORNIA GUARDIAN BUREAU . . . PROJECTED BUDGET 9/66 - 8/67
(TWO Proposals)

SOURCES OF INCOME

	PLAN I (Staff of 1)	PLAN II (Staff of 1½)
Current subscriptions (1672, 4/66)	\$ 8360	\$ 8360
New subscriptions (net)	1000 (200)	1500 (300)
Current sustainers (SONG, Pledges)	9444	9444
New sustainers	1200	12300*
Advertising (Paid)	1500	2000
Racks (10 additional)	1000	1000
Literature sales	50	150
Current Fund Raising ** (Events)	4300	7000
New Fund Raising *** (Events)	500	500
Contributions	750	750
	<u>\$ 28104</u>	<u>\$ 42954</u>
		<u>\$ 43004</u>

*New Sustainers Campaign:	5 @ \$100 per month	\$6000
	5 @ 50 per month	3000
	10 @ 25 per month	3000
	25 @ 1 per month	300
		<u>\$12300</u>

NOTE: \$5 and \$10 per month pledges are purposely omitted to permit cushion if larger commitments fall short (it is estimated that in order to obtain the above commitments, a minimum of 100 personal visits and telephone follow-ups as well as notes will be required. We believe and the Committee concurred - that securing 50 @ \$10.00 per month, or/and 50 @ \$5 per month would require the same attention and approach but, obviously much more time and effort, so would try the above plan first.

**Current Fund Raising <u>Organized</u>	Plan I	Plan II
N. Calif. Committee	\$1000	\$ 2500
San Francisco Committee	1500	2000
Peninsula Committee	300	500
San Jose Committee	500	700
Marin Committee	500	700
Santa Cruz Committee	250	250
Berkeley Committee	250	250
	<u>(\$4,300)</u>	<u>(\$7,000)</u>

***New Fund Raising <u>to be Organized</u>		
Eastbay Committee	100	100
Monterey Committee	100	100
Santa Rosa Committee	100	100
Sacramento Committee	100	100
Fresno Committee	100	100
	<u>(\$ 500)</u>	<u>(\$ 500)</u>

(more)

NORTHERN CALIFORNIA GUARDIAN BUREAU
Projected Budget 9/66 - 8/67 (TWO Proposals)
Page 2

estimated EXPENSES

	<u>PLAN I</u> (Staff of 1)	<u>PLAN II</u> (Staff of 1½)
Salary(ies)	\$7,233.20	\$10,849.80
Payroll taxes, insurance	240.00	360.00
Rent, utilities	600.00	600.00
Telephone	360.00	600.00
Postage	240.00	480.00
Office Supplies, equipment	360.00	540.00
Transportation	400.00	700.00
Printing	120.00	180.00
Miscellaneous	120.00	180.00
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$9,673.20	\$14,489.80

NOTE: Estimates are based on nearly a full year of experience and are considered maximum rather than minimum.

There are two aspects to the situation at hand and -- without attemptint to alter a fait accompli -- I would like to address myself to both and at some length in the hope that the record up to now will be instructive for the future. The first aspect is the manner in which this radical "decision" has been taken; the second -- inter-related of course -- is the result of such action.

What is quite obvious without any very deep analysis at all is that every major decision on this paper is political. This applies to decision to remove managerial and other personnel just as it applies to the content of any Viewpoint or to a developing and more subtle political line the paper may follow. In the current situation there are factors which are obviously at work -- factors of power politics, of generational gap, of subtle political differences, of differing analysis of the problems confronting us. For anyone to deny this is simply false -- yet it has been denied by the managing editor himself who, I gather from our discussion of last week, conceives of the editorial management as having no relationship to the business management -- at least in this particular situation.

Indeed, the managing editor Jack Smith met in caucus with a group of individuals, some of whom work at the Guardian, some of whom do not, some of whom are members of the Guardian cooperative, others of whom are not.

those who have been a round longer-- ~~whether~~ whatever
~~business~~ ~~business~~ ~~30~~ ~~business~~ ~~40~~ ~~business~~ ~~50~~ their
 chronological age.

This then places a special responsibility on the more sophisticated members of the cooperative not to behave in charlatan fashion; not to operate as authoritarian pied pipers, wooing in order to manipulate, disrupting in order to control. Now when the Guardian became a cooperative in May of 1967, the then members of the cooperative -- who perhaps knew Jack Smith better than some of the newer staff embers do -- had so little confidence in Jack Smith's personal and political maturity that they were unwilling to have him step into the role of managing editor despite his obvious journalistic qualifications . And so the job was divided between two people, and an intensive search made for someone from outside to fill that top job. The internal tension of that situation finally forced its resolution in the election of Jack to the managing editorship -- after preceded by and followed by certain directly connected departures from the editorial staff, xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx including the forced resignation of Bill Price, who had originally shared the top responsibilities.

One would think that would have been the end of the power struggle. After all, the man had what he wanted. Or did he? His paranoia continued -- and continues to this day -- and even some of the people in the particular caucus that met at Ron's house surely have reason to know first-hand, the extent of that paranoia. I can only assume that Jack's role in this caucus stems from what he again considers to be a need to consolidate his personal power. And he will continue to operate that way. He can't help it. The Montrose Summit Meeting at my house in May was called for that reason -- to abort an alleged threat to Jack Smith's control -- and not at all for the broader communal and cooperative reasons stated.

Perhaps in this current situation as in the abortive attempt to hire Jack Lang earlier this summer, Jack Smith sees the current Pied Piper of the New-Left, at-the-Guardian, Irwin Silber, as his latest power threat. But Pied Piper's have followers, perhaps too many to buck. At times the exigencies of power struggle call for the joining of enemy forces.

Now I state all this without rancor. Nor do I overstate it. The sketch is a perfectly accurate picture of how the managing editor of the Guardian normally functions in his relations with other people. Whether or not the picture is accurate in all its details only time and a new staff will tell. The flaws of authoritarianism

and paranoia are ever present, flourishing and operative in the tactics of the managing editor.

Politically, Jack Smith is a romantic anarchist -- perhaps a redundancy -- and this is still another key to what makes Jack tick, in this particular situation as in others. He is, in fact, bored by the entire business side of the paper. It doesn't interest him. His suggestions for improving it have been of the most naive, superficial and sloganized nature: exaggerated goals, instant success and the rejection of attempts at realistic evaluation and solution of the circulation and the financial problems that ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ do, indeed, exist.

Among the suggestions has been that Irving be transferred, a suggestion originally made four years ago shortly after it became apparent to a number of people on staff -- including myself -- that Irving was not functioning efficiently in his capacity as business-circulation manager. His removal from the staff at that time was precluded by still another power struggle and has not been suggested since. But his transfer has been openly and consistently requested -- and rejected by the managing editor until most recently. I do not believe Irving is anything beyond the classic victim in the present situation. I know he will continue to cling to the Guardian in one capacity or another instead of ever stating where he's at and why. That's his personal

problem and political need.

His transfer should have been effected earlier. But that is a decision properly taken by the coordinating committee with the concurrence of the individual and his co-workers and the entire staff.

The solution to this and any other general or personnel problem is not to go outside the cooperative structure, utilizing power plays, coups and other highly authoritarian and manipulative tactics. These tactics should be quite alien to the construction of a cooperative atmosphere and a revolutionary political publication.

I have dealt at some length with the manner in which a "decision" -- for that is how it has been worded -- has been presented to the other members of the cooperative in an effort to make it abundantly clear that the Guardian cooperative is, indeed, a smokescreen carefully utilized to continue the game of power politics. Now it may be that a revolutionary movement can be built on power plays and purges. But at least then the New Left should not pretend to a certain consistency in attitudes, behavior, responsibility and candor in one's life style and one's political style. More than likely, however, many of the participants in the caucus are quite unaware that they have been engaged in a Guardian Revolution built on disruption, destruction,

fratricide and power politics.

Nor am I advocating that Jack Smith be removed as general manager. No, he brings to his job many editorial skills and they have begin to show in a consistently improved product since last February 10. Moreover, he has successfully fought the power battles on the editorial floor so that there is currently no-one on the floor who could handle his job.

Since the charges levelled against the business management of the paper have explicitly and implicitly contrasted its ineffectiveness with the excellence of the editorial management, let me comment briefly on that. The paper has improved, no question. It is highly uneven in quality but this has its advantages. It reflects a movement which is highly uneven in its own development. The paper is brighter. It's also bigger so that the reader need not, any longer, hang on every article and every word as the biblical word from the left. At the same time, the larger size of the paper and the involvement of most of the more politically-minded members of the staff in strengthening the Guardian's ties to the domestic^{movement} and the international socialist and third world movements has had a positive effect on the paper's political development.

The improvements in the paper began last February, as

already stated, though there had been changes between May of 1967 and February of 1968 -- changes and some good issues, but no consistent improvement. Indeed, the paper was so bad last fall around the time of the Hilton demonstration that serious people were in despair. I myself re-did one complete issue from the point of view of content, style, editorial placement and headlines -- in an effort to show graphically the serious weaknesses in the new Guardian at that time.

There are many editorial problems remaining, not the least of which is that the completion of each weekly issue still seems to be a technical miracle every week. But because it does come out there is apparently some illusion that matters editorial are well-managed, creatively directed, planned long in advance and that everybody just grooves along together in political and communal harmony. At least that's the illusion which Ray Reece has presented in contrasting the editorial and business sides of the paper.

The same movement which the Guardian reports and reflects in its pages with increasing skill and penetration has evidenced a singular lack of stability and loyalty in supporting the Guardian. It is interested in reading about itself but does not, as yet, see itself in any closer relationship to the paper. This can be said to explain some of the personnel problems on the staff as well as our inability to engage advanced segments of

We need support of our old friends &
help us to reach the large numbers
of potential new readers.

To begin reaching out implied
new ~~stys~~ approaches & style.

Our dual approach of ^{limiting ourselves to} ~~using~~ old
approaches
~~for ourselves~~ + relying on movement
to promote paper ~~a~~ with its own, did
not work. ~~But~~ for old constituency very weakened
thus G activities large failures. Movement failed us.
Financial

prob. new left enjoys reading paper but
we have not been able to engage leaders

leadership of student movement has expressed
commitment to paper but has not in
fact given support except for occasional
writing & speaking commitments.

we based much of our promotional
activity on hopes that SDS could supply
us with new readers. Found that we
must do our own promotional activity.

This ST-
Chicago office

New Left still too ~~unstable~~ ^{disorganized} to do this
for us.

We need your help to make it possible
for us to expand.

Guardian: political history in recent years loss of
one constituency + search for another

paper supported by remnants of
Progressive party

lost its relevancy in early 60's with
emergence of black + student movements.

Shifts in management (i.e. Aronson)
paper ~~is~~ aligned itself w/ political
reality. However no well defined
constituency. Bulk of new subs: Students
+ then blacks. - poor sectors of population
appropriate for a radical paper
but raises question of raising funds.

movement readership in anything much beyond an occasional s peaking or writing commitment. This is one factor involved in the attempts to solve circulation, promotion and fund raising problems but there is no evidence that it has been given any credence by those levelling charges of total mismanagement.

As to the charges themselves, they are so general as to be irrefutable. The specifics mentioned are quite easily answered. But surely it was not intended that answering specifics would in any way change the situation.

In this context it is interesting that Ray Reece was selected as spokesman for the rump group; that the general and specific charges (which he insists are not his alone but which he has seen fit to particularize, to ammend and to alter at whim) have been presented by him with great personal emotion and without any attempt on other participants in the caucus to contradict the obvious distortions inherent in them.

Ray, as he said, has twice left the paper in his sic months of association with it. And incidentally, each time he has departed he has addressed the reasons for his departure to Jack Smith, not to me. There have been continuing re-affirmations on the job as well, of his difficulty in relating to older co-workers generally, but particularly to women operating in any capacity of authority. I have

I am amused that I wasn't even given a first -- or good carbon -- copy of the charges against me and that, in any case, Ray had altered certain of the specifics between last week and this.

As far as Ray's contributions to the Guardian are concerned, it is probably true that he should have been fired. ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ Continuing personnel crisis operating throughout the paper -- no more prevalent on the third than on the fourth floor -- have ~~xxxxxxxx~~ resulted in the wildest kinds of turnovers in personnel. The management can, of course, be held responsible for every individual hang-up going-- and, in fact, has been.

Now Ray has his own ambivalences about his relationship to the establishment. This may affect his relationship to the Guardian at some point. It has certainly reflected itself in evaluations and judgments which are quite damaging to his total concept of Guardian promotion. He has cited a number of these in his specific charges against me. I refer not so much to his citing of Charlotte's quite incredible performance last week (which occurred after the rump party), nor to his addition in the written charges of Neil's resignation this week -- these are simple ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ charges against the management.

But he also gives two additional examples of management's political, personal and stylistic ineptness; unfortunately

they rather reflect Ray's own faulty evaluation. The Archie Shepp concert in one sense should be perceived as a management error -- and responsibility for holding it has long since been accepted. But not in the sense of Ray's all-too-thinly veiled accusation of racism. No, the error was in the confidence the general manager placed in information supposedly accurately researched by several staff members and proving that Archie Shepp was that name and that musical talent around which the Guardian could run an effective fund raising concert. Moreover, the specific contractual arrangements were delegated to a staff member who is also a friend of Archie Shepp's and who failed to make the Guardian's aim clear. So Archie Shepp was contracted at an enormous fee which he thought was groovy of the Guardian and which we thought, on the basis of totally inaccurate information, would allow us to make money even so. For instance, what was described as an overflow concert in Carnegie Hall turned out -- too late -- to have been 200 people in Carnegie Recital Hall; and further checking -- also too late -- with people in the musical field, reveal that Archie Shepp just isn't, unfortunately, the kind of name or talent that draws the crowds. True, the general manager should not have accepted the ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ mis-information as fact. Having done so -- and winding up \$800 in the hole which was precisely what we owed Archie Shepp -- it was my

responsibility to explain the situation to Shepp and try -- just try -- to see if he would be willing to reduce the fee. Well he wasn't. So he got the full amount. And that aspect of it I would certainly handle in the same way again.

As for the press conference, Ray is just plain incorrect. So were others. Why? Because they had pre-judged it as they have everything else. In addition, Ray brought to it his own ambivalence about dealing with the Establishment in any form. How absurd. First, we had a responsibility to the Koreans to get that message out -- and it had to be done fast. As soon as I learned (from outside sources, it's true, but anyhow I did learn) that there was such a message, I immediately suggested that we hold a press conference, conferred with Bill Rose and with Jack Smith about it, worded the ~~invitation~~ invitation in just the proper way to get the entire press out, ~~sent~~ sent that message to the specific individuals who had to receive it, set up the press conference, discussed its content and purpose with Bill -- who after all had to conduct it. The press conference went well. I stress that because I have participated in many press conferences that didn't. It got the message out. Its timing was correct since it was followed the next day by the announcement from Korea that Lionel Martin had participated in a special Pueblo interview there.

The combination is important. Without the press conference followed by the announcement from Pyongyang, the commercial press would not have known who or how to query at the Guardian and Bill would not have had the continuing opportunity to make political and promotional capital for the Guardian out of his trip. I mention this only to point out that subjective reactions are ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ quite often dangerous. Ray, Astrid, Charlotte, perhaps others all reacted from a lack of knowledge, a lack of sophistication, a lack of trust and a lack of political responsibility to the paper. It would be a good thing if, sometimes, the approach could be one of open inquiry rather than subjective negativism.

~~xxxxxx~~ I could go on with the specific charges: of lack of coordination between jobs and departments. Not true, of course. Yes, we have had some real problems in the promotion department and not for lack of planning; but rather because the turnover in personnel and in responsibility was critical. There was a serious evaluation of promotional efforts last June and tentative programs (some fairly specific) were evolved. Without personnel you can't move and the promotion department has again gone through another personnel crisis not dissimilar in any way to other personnel crisis in other areas of the paper.

The advertising department too has been in a constant state of chaos for the same reasons -- namely that no one in the new left takes it seriously and is willing to handle it as it should be handled. This includes Ray himself who has constantly avoided the major responsibility of advertising solicitation to which he was assigned and is now, I gather, removing himself from that aspect of the job altogether. It certainly includes Ron who refused to be trained to handle the few advertisers we do have, who insisted on doing his own thing which meant that he has dealt with them haphazardly, incompetently and cavalierly and has openly stated his antipathy toward them.

Again on the question of job definition - of course there are job definitions. People are not simply shuffled around as if they are worthless ~~ant~~ pieces of furniture. On the contrary they are hired to do specific jobs which they many times refuse to do because they don't like them. So the answer is re-structuring. And to restructure, as has been suggested, so that some of the so-called shit jobs are eliminated, will indeed create the chaos which seems so eminently desirable.

And so there is no point in attempting to refute any particular charge or make any kind of statement of the aims, ~~and~~ achievements and problems of the business

operations of the Guardian. The essential facts in this situation cannot be answered rationally. They cannot, in fact, be answered at all. What is ~~xxxxxxxx~~ critical is that the managing editor of the Guardian in caucus with a peculiarly unqualified minority of staff members and a number of outsiders, has condoned sweeping charges presented in a highly emotional and distorted fashion against the general manager of the Guardian.

In such a situation you lose when you win -- so let the revolution proceed to its logical conclusion. Perhaps the alternatives have been considered; I wouldn't know. Perhaps the outside savior waits at the downstairs door. Perhaps you anticipate that Irwin Silber, who has momentarily beguiled you into believing he has all the answers, will be the new general manager. And if not Irwin who? Susan Sutheim who is currently wallowing in confusion and is, anyhow, another woman, though younger. Ray Reece whose stability and judgment are highly questionable? Ron Fehd who has managed to mess up a growing number of jobs he has held at the Guardian? Randy Furst who often - though not always - turns in a fine story but can hardly be suspected of hidden managerial talents. Believe me, to mention as possible managerial candidates, the participants in that rump caucus does indeed create a credibility gap.

The individual members of the cooperative who have played this dangerous and destructive game should be censured for it. In style and in execution what has happened here is no different from other power seizures on the left. The parallels with LNS invite serious scrutiny -- except that the general manager will not play the game by the ordinary rules of in-fighting.

The Guardian - or a minority of its staff and non-staff - has acted out of frustration and in the pattern of idealism and utopianism which has consistently plagued the left and which is always so ~~destructive~~ destructive to the development of true revolutionary socialism.

But conclusion grows out of intent. And the only real option in this fratricidal climate is to remove the general manager - which you should do at once.

There will be some minor rumblings outside the Guardian but they will be from among those old readers whom you do not value in any case. There should be a statement in the paper -- an attempt at honesty would be desirable from your point of view but perhaps is not possible.

I would suggest that instead of the vague and easily refutable charges offered, that you might remove me on grounds of generational incompatibility. That should

be a clear signal that the new left has once more decided to ride a revolutionary wave of the ~~future~~ future. Let us all hope that this one breaks on a cleaner shore.

From: BR

Some thoughts on the Guardian political perspective

The political history of the Guardian in recent years has been the loss of one constituency and the search for another. The Guardian began as the organ of a political party--the Progressive Party which ran Henry Wallace for the presidency. That party fell apart after his defeat and the following period of repression, but the Guardian continued to be supported by the remnants of that party, the little "Guardian family" which included the wealthy leftists who provided the financial support for the paper. This led to a very unhealthy political situation fostered by the repressive political atmosphere of the times: instead of seeking a mass base by broadening its circulation, which is the main function of a political publication, it contented itself with the dwindling circulation it had, and was able to do so since it was supported by contributions, not circulation. The Guardian finally lost all relevancy to the real political scene in the U.S. and the movement which was emerging from the civil rights struggle and the student movement.

As a result of a number of shifts in management the paper has once again aligned itself with its political reality as it was when it was founded, but with a big difference. Now there is no political party to support the paper and no well-defined constituency within which to seek financial support. Still, it is obvious that the bulk of subs are coming in from students and, to a much lesser degree, from the black liberation movement. Our new readers are not and never will be able to make large financial contributions to the paper, because they come from the poorest sectors of the population, which is entirely appropriate and desirable for a radical paper.

So we are faced with the problem of raising funds with a readership which cannot afford to make large contributions. Hence we must try to build up a base of many supporters who regularly make small contributions rather than a few giving large amounts of money. How can we accomplish this? Obviously not by simply asking them to in ads, because this was tried and failed. The support committee idea as hitherto implemented has also failed. And it seems to me that all such attempts will end in failure unless we conduct everything we do within a political framework. People will not support us with the dedication we now require for our continued survival and expansion unless we conduct all of our activities ~~with~~--fundraising, ~~at~~ circulation drives and editorial work--within a clear political framework to which they can relate. I do not believe that we will get this support on the basis of simply being a newspaper of political reportage and analysis alone, no matter how excellent. We must of course aim to be such a paper, but it must also be clear from our editorial position and the type of activities we organize, as well as from our own personal political activities that we are actively trying to organize a revolutionary socialist movement which will lead, ~~maybe~~ hopefully in the not too distant future, to the creation of a vanguard party. Of course, we should not try to get people to sign their party cards on the dotted line next week, because such a movement and party must be created from the base up, and must arise from our political circumstances, from the movement, from practice. However, we must put everything we do within this

political context and not be afraid to do so explicitly if we expect to be successful in our work. In effect, people must come to see the Guardian as an organizing tool, something we have said very often without specifying what the tool is to be used to organize. I believe that we must be as clear as possible about this without falling into sectarianism, a danger we don't have to worry about as long as we base our political perspective firmly on the living movement and a profound analysis of the American political reality, without being afraid to face unpleasant facts or facts which may seem to contradict our preconceived political notions. Our comrades all over the world agree that the American revolution must seek its own analysis of the reality it must cope with and its own road within the general framework of Marxist-Leninist thought and methodology and world revolutionary practice--where it is pertinent to us, as indeed all revolutionary movements must, wherever they are located. We can reveal ourselves as socialists and Marxist-Leninists without thereby falling into sectarianism as long as we do not try to simply mindlessly imitate the foreign models of revolution or mouth revolutionary rhetoric without thinking out its application to our reality. And we can fall into sectarianism quite easily without ever identifying ourselves with socialism, as witness some of the more simplistic new leftists. In short, we are new leftists, inasmuch as that means radicals who have broken out of the outmoded forms of the past and are determined to form a new mass movement which can be an effective vehicle of social change, but we are also revolutionaries allied to a worldwide revolutionary movement and with a wealth of historical and theoretical knowledge and experience, and we should not be afraid to say so. I really don't think we have been, but I do think we must begin to self-consciously express in our activities and our writings what it is we are about--socialist revolution. And this means the organization of a movement and a party.

If we begin to do this, I believe people will begin to see us for what we are, and we can begin to build that type of support which we must have: groups of people who will pledge some amount, no matter how small it ~~may~~ may be, to the Guardian on a regular basis and will work with real dedication to build the circulation of the paper. This and much more can be accomplished, because they will see us as much more than just a newspaper.

This will be aided by many of our current projects: the publication of radical books, beginning with Burchett's; the publication of Tricontinental magazine and other OSPAAAL materials; and the publication of a monthly theoretical-analytical magazine. The publishing of Tricontinental magazine is of particular significance, because it links us more clearly with the third world revolutionary movement and the Cuba-Vietnam-Korea alliance. I believe it will mark a qualitative stage in our growth and will win us more support and prestige among the people we want to reach than almost anything else we could do, aside from our main business, which is to publish the best radical newspaper in the United States.

From: BR

Some thoughts on the Guardian political perspective

The political history of the Guardian in recent years has been the loss of one constituency and the search for another. The Guardian began as the organ of a political party--the Progressive Party which ran Henry Wallace for the presidency. That party fell apart after his defeat and the following period of repression, but the Guardian continued to be supported by the remnants of that party, the little "Guardian family" which included the wealthy leftists who provided the financial support for the paper. This led to a very unhealthy political situation fostered by the repressive political atmosphere of the times: instead of seeking a mass base by broadening its circulation, which is the main function of a political publication, it contented itself with the dwindling circulation it had, and was able to do so since it was supported by contributions, not circulation. The Guardian finally lost all relevancy to the real political scene in the U.S. and the movement which was emerging from the civil rights struggle and the student movement.

As a result of a number of shifts in management the paper has once again aligned itself with its political reality as it was when it was founded, but with a big difference. Now there is no political party to support the paper and no well-defined constituency within which to seek financial support. Still, it is obvious that the bulk of subs are coming in from students and, to a much lesser degree, from the black liberation movement. Our new readers are not and never will be able to make large financial contributions to the paper, because they come from the poorest sectors of the population, which is entirely appropriate and desirable for a radical paper.

So we are faced with the problem of raising funds with a readership which cannot afford to make large contributions. Hence we must try to build up a base of many supporters who regularly make small contributions rather than a few giving large amounts of money. How can we accomplish this? Obviously not by simply asking them to in ads, because this was tried and failed. The support committee idea as hitherto implemented has also failed. And it seems to me that all such attempts will end in failure unless we conduct everything we do within a political framework. People will not support us with the dedication we now require for our continued survival and expansion unless we conduct all of our activities ~~within~~--fundraising, ~~and~~ circulation drives and editorial work--within a clear political framework to which they can relate. I do not believe that we will get this support on the basis of simply being a newspaper of political reportage and analysis alone, no matter how excellent. We must of course aim to be such a paper, but it must also be clear from our editorial position and the type of activities we organize, as well as from our own personal political activities that we are actively trying to organize a revolutionary socialist movement which will lead, ~~hopefully~~ hopefully in the not too distant future, to the creation of a vanguard party. Of course, we should not try to get people to sign their party cards on the dotted line next week, because such a movement and party must be created from the base up, and must arise from our political circumstances, from the movement, from practice. However, we must put everything we do within this

From: BR

Some thoughts on the Guardian political perspective

The political history of the Guardian in recent years has been the loss of one constituency and the search for another. The Guardian began as the organ of a political party--the Progressive Party which ran Henry Wallace for the presidency. That party fell apart after his defeat and the following period of repression, but the Guardian continued to be supported by the remnants of that party, the little "Guardian family" which included the wealthy leftists who provided the financial support for the paper. This led to a very unhealthy political situation fostered by the repressive political atmosphere of the times: instead of seeking a mass base by broadening its circulation, which is the main function of a political publication, it contented itself with the dwindling circulation it had, and was able to do so since it was supported by contributions, not circulation. The Guardian finally lost all relevancy to the real political scene in the U.S. and the movement which was emerging from the civil rights struggle and the student movement.

As a result of a number of shifts in management the paper has once again aligned itself with its political reality as it was when it was founded, but with a big difference. Now there is no political party to support the paper and no well-defined constituency within which to seek financial support. Still, it is obvious that the bulk of subs are coming in from students and, to a much lesser degree, from the black liberation movement. Our new readers are not and never will be able to make large financial contributions to the paper, because they come from the poorest sectors of the population, which is entirely appropriate and desirable for a radical paper.

So we are faced with the problem of raising funds with a readership which cannot afford to make large contributions. Hence we must try to build up a base of many supporters who regularly make small contributions rather than a few giving large amounts of money. How can we accomplish this? Obviously not by simply asking them to in ads, because this was tried and failed. The support committee idea as hitherto implemented has also failed. And it seems to me that all such attempts will end in failure unless we conduct everything we do within a political framework. People will not support us with the dedication we now require for our continued survival and expansion unless we conduct all of our activities ~~with~~--fundraising, ~~and~~ circulation drives and editorial work--within a clear political framework to which they can relate. I do not believe that we will get this support on the basis of simply being a newspaper of political reportage and analysis alone, no matter how excellent. We must of course aim to be such a paper, but it must also be clear from our editorial position and the type of activities we organize, as well as from our own personal political activities that we are actively trying to organize a revolutionary socialist movement which will lead, ~~maybe~~ hopefully in the not too distant future, to the creation of a vanguard party. Of course, we should not try to get people to sign their party cards on the dotted line next week, because such a movement and party must be created from the base up, and must arise from our political circumstances, from the movement, from practice. However, we must put everything we do within this