

U.S. Labor Party:

Report From W. Virginia Coalfields

James Gelvin, the Western Pennsylvania tour coordinator for the U.S. Labor Party, spent two days in Charleston, West Virginia last week, consulting with press, trade union, industry, and government representatives on the national implications of the United Mine Workers (UMW) strike. Reproduced here are excerpts of an interview with Gelvin on the results of that trip.

Q: What was the purpose of your visit?

A: We went to West Virginia primarily to probe reactions to the miners' strike, and especially to meet with the press. In the course of our two days there, we had 15 interviews, including one 45-minute radio broadcast and one newspaper and two television interviews. We also met with the state head of the AFL-CIO, representatives of the Teamsters and Building Trades union, the city Chamber of Commerce and State Chamber of Commerce, the Association of Manufacturers, and with the office of the President of the Senate of the West Virginia legislature.

Q: What was the population's reaction to the strike?

A: They are scared, very scared. We were told that in Districts 17 and 1 of the UMW — the districts most infested with the provocateur Miners' Right to Strike group — the workers are expecting bloodshed. It was clear that in Charleston, where District 17 is based, the people are armed to the teeth. People in the streets were trying to make "light" of the situation — like one woman who joked, "I should drop dead between now and Tuesday (Dec. 6) before the benefits expire."

The most telling reaction, however, was a deep suspicion of outsiders. It is common knowledge throughout the area that the force behind the miners' strike is the Revolutionary Union and October League abomination, the Miners' Right to Strike group. The suspicion of "outside" interference is rampant. In fact while we were meeting with the State Chamber of Commerce, they were calling our Pittsburgh office to make sure that James Gelvin really was a member of the U.S. Labor Party.

Q: What are the other unions doing around the strike?

A: There were two characteristic responses exemplified by the State AFL-CIO representative and the Building Trades people. The AFL-CIO leader was acutely aware of the operation to destroy the UMW through strikes like this one, readily agreeing that the same networks that destroyed the Autoworkers and that are trying to destroy the Teamsters are at work on the miners — people like Joe Rauh, and the Rogovin, Stern, and Huge crew. However, he emphasized that as far as the rest of West Virginia labor is concerned (and there is a very strong union base there in the Building Trades, steel, oil and chemical workers) the UMW phenomenon does not pose

much of a problem. If anything, it is looked at as a renegade union that needs to be quarantined to keep the internal rot from spreading to other unions. But what particularly stood out in the AFL-CIO leader's remarks was his receptivity to the national implications of the strike and what can and should be done about it. In particular, he was very open and favorable to our nuclear energy development program, saying he would raise it with others at the upcoming national conference.

The opposite reaction stems from the vicious manipulation of the backward "mountain" ideology prevalent within the UMW rank and file. The profiled response is very localist, to the point that Building Trades reps denied the need for nuclear energy because West Virginia is a coal state. We were told point blank by the same reps that yes, the miners' strike is being precipitated by the Miners' Right to Strike; yes, the strike will destroy the union. But the miners are gutsy fighters. Gutsy fighters in the style of the Hatfields vs. the McCoys, where no one remembers why there is a feud. In fact, there is an almost religious regard for picket lines; five guys can bring out an entire district, even though it is obvious that those five guys are being deployed by the RU or OL right off the University of West Virginia campus at Morgantown.

Q: What about the industrialists you met with?

A: They were very receptive to our programmatic materials, but they feel very isolated in a somewhat similar way to that reflected with the Building Trades people. For example, some of the members of the Manufacturers Association had sent several telegrams to Congress supporting a broad-based energy policy, including nuclear energy development. But when push comes to shove, or when it comes to West Virginia, their reaction was "the legislature would kill us if we pushed nuclear energy" because this is a coal state.

As far as the Bituminous Coal Operators Association is concerned, it seems there is a faction fight taking place there. On the other hand, there is a group committed to waiting out the UMW, sitting back on their stockpiles of coal until the union collapses and then negotiating district by district. On the other hand, there is a group looking for another way out of the situation, and finding that in part by reading our material.

Q: How was the press coverage of your trip?

A: On the whole, the press representatives were far and away the most cosmopolitan of the people we spoke to. They had a very sharp sense of how the strike had been set up, how it fit in with Energy Secretary Schlesinger's winter energy emergency (WEEP) scenario, and what would be needed to solve the strike in a positive way. On the WEEP question, in particular, the AP bureau ran a wire based on an interview with us after okaying it with their Washington office; similarly the *Daily Mail* ran a

straight column on what the economic consequences of the strike would be. Generally speaking, the press carried our analysis of the WEEP question as the most obvious answer to why the strike is taking place at this point.

But I think two examples will give you the best sense of how the press handled our interviews. In a broadcast interview with TV station WSAZ, the interviewer was quizzing us on the RU and OL links to the Miners Right to Strike crew. He first asked if the Labor Party was communist, and when we explained the humanist tradition our organization represented, he asked the obvious question, well, aren't the RU and OL communist organizations? His jaw dropped as we proceeded to explain that in fact these groups were Maoist advocates of pick and shovel technology, while the U.S. coal industry could stand to learn some lessons from the advanced long-wall mining methods and MHD experimental technology work now taking place in the Soviet Union.

The other example is our 45-minute radio interview on one of the Charleston stations. The interviewer prefaced his questions to us on energy policy by noting that the Charleston mayor is an advocate of solar energy, while

Governor Jay Rockefeller is pushing coal and gas development. What we did was to outline a \$100-billion energy development policy, which would take the fullest advantage of West Virginia's coal resources through the introduction of advanced mining techniques such as MHD and advanced steelmaking processes, such as the Jordan process. But most important of all, we stressed over and over again that what is happening to the UMW and to West Virginia is not unique.

To make matters worse — if it is indeed possible to do that — Miller is now reportedly being “led around by the nose” by so-called labor economist and top labor counter-insurgency agent Stanley Ruttenberg and “lawyer” Harry Hugo, of the law firm that handles IPS, Rogovia, Hugo and Stern. Both these individuals are playing a major role in the negotiations — thereby all but insuring that in the words of one observer, “without the direct intervention of God Himself,” no real progress will be made.

It appears therefore that the 20-year project of IPS and its controllers to destroy the United Mineworkers union of John L. Lewis is in the final stages. Said one union leader, “If we can't turn the current situation around, I give the UMW six months to live...”

Recommended Law Firm Be Disqualified In UAW Suit

NEW YORK, Dec. 5 — Federal Magistrate Kent Sinclair has recommended to Federal Judge Lawrence Pierce that the law firm of Cowan, Liebowitz and Latman, plus the United Auto Worker's former General Counsel, Steven Schlossberg, be disqualified from further participation in the union's \$60 million lawsuit against the National Caucus of Labor Committees, Counsel for the NCLC was notified today. The suit is now pending before Judge Pierce in New York's Southern District Federal Court.

Magistrate Sinclair's “Report and Recommendation” responds to a motion by NCLC attorneys that the law firm and Schlossberg be disqualified in the case. The motion also sought to disqualify FBI informant Gregory Rose's testimony as a witness for the UAW, while seeking dismissal of the entire lawsuit. The motion was made following the revelations that Rose was to appear as a key witness for the UAW in the case.

Rose is a former member of the NCLC who was expelled from the organization. According to FBI documents subsequently released to the NCLC, Rose was an FBI informant while a member from May 1975. While Rose was a member of the NCLC, he was directly involved in strategy discussions with the organization's counsel for the UAW suit, and served as a liaison between the security and legal staffs on the case. It has also been alleged that Rose stole work product from one of the NCLC's attorneys.

The NCLC also put into evidence before Magistrate

Sinclair numerous documents released to the organization under the Freedom of Information Act, showing that Steven Schlossberg, while UAW counsel sought to use Rose's tainted “information” about the organization. In 1975 Schlossberg visited Attorney General Edward Levi with wild allegations about purported plots by the NCLC to assassinate Leonard Woodcock and Nelson Rockefeller. Schlossberg's visits with Levi followed attempts to enlist previous Attorney Generals, the FBI, and the Department of Labor in prosecutions of the NCLC parallel to the UAW's efforts in its southern district action.

“Integrity of the Bar”

Magistrate Sinclair relies on two recent second circuit decisions, *Hull v. Celanese* and *The Fund of Funds, LTD v. Arthur Anderson and Co.*, aimed at “preserving the integrity of the bar before the public,” in his conclusions that “there is no principled distinction to be drawn between the duties of a lawyer concerning withdrawal based on whether the source of his adversary's confidences is a client, or as here, a witness....” “Here there is a dispute between Rose's affidavit's claim that no privileged communication ever passed in his presence during his tenure at the NCLC and the defendant's affidavits which suggest that on many occasions such communications were had in Mr. Rose's presence...The facts here show at present only the more limited instance of a former assistant in the employer's own legal endeavors, indeed involving in some respects the very