POSTAL WORKERS THREATEN STRIKE

Demanding a decent contract and an end to layoffs, no work, thousands of postal workers across the country joined in demonstrations on July 12. Responding to a call from locals in New York and New Jersey, over 3,000 postal workers picketed the United States Postal Service (USPS) in Washington, D.C., and thousands more turned out in Los Angeles, New York City, the San Francisco Bay Area, and Chicago. With their contract due to expire on July 20 and negotiations still going on in Washington, these workers served notice to both the Postal Service and the union’s national leadership that a strike is a real possibility.

This contract covers 650,000 workers in three unions -- the American Postal Workers Union (APWU), the National Association of Letter Carriers (NALC), and the Mail Handlers Division of the Laborers Union. It is the largest contract to be negotiated this year. Postal workers are demanding, among other things, to cut their wages, against the deterioration of their working conditions, against layoffs, and against a union leadership which refuses to lead a struggle in the interests of the rank and file.

PUBLIC SERVICE CUTBACKS REFLECT CRISIS

What postal workers are fighting is no different from the fight of other workers. Jobs in the public sector do not protect workers from imperialist crisis. The same takeaway strategy that monopoly capital has been following in industry is affecting government agencies. In 1979, the deposing of a expansived war machine and the multiplication of dependent industries caused an expansion in war production. Cutbacks are a part of the same process.
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BAKKE DECISION ATTACKS AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

On Wednesday morning, June 28th, the United States Supreme Court, in a 5 to 4 decision, ruled in Bakke's favor. The court's decision upheld the Bakke quota system, which required that at least 16 of 100 places in the University of California Medical School at Davis be reserved for whites. Violation of Bakke's constitutional rights as guaranteed by the 14th amendment, according to the court, was Justice Powell's majority opinion, "Preferring members of any one group for no reason other than race or ethnic origin is discrimination for its own sake. This the Constitution forbids!"

Thus, in one fell swoop, the court gave its constitutional stamp of approval to the bourgeois myth of "reverse discrimination". This offensive must be met with increased efforts on our part to unite all who can be united against the attack on affirmative action programs and all other democratic rights and oppressed nationalities.

We must broaden our outlook in building this counter-offensive as part of our international responsibility to build the broadest united front against superpower hegemonism and war preparations.

In the largest mass demonstration in Washington DC since the Vietnam War nearly 150,000 people marched in support of the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) on July 9th. This was the largest women's rights rally on record, and involved participation of more than 100 groups from every state of the Union. The focus of the march was to put pressure on Congress to support an extension of the March for Equality and to approve the ERA.

The ERA was originally introduced in Congress in 1923. Three years after women got the vote, by Dr. Alice Paul, a life time advocate of suffrage, it was approved by the House. The July 4th march celebrated the 75th anniversary of her birthday.

The present version of the ERA was adopted at the Convention in 1972. So far 35 states have ratified the ERA, still short of the 38 required to make it law.

SEVEN YEAR EXTENSION DEMANDED

The current struggle focuses on the proposed Congressional Resolution to extend the deadline for ratification of the amendment for seven years.

Opponents of the ERA say that such an extension is unfair. They view the failure of the ERA to have won ratification in three additional states as a measure that the people don't want it.

But the purpose of the ERA is to establish full legal equality for women. It is not a time test or a race. There is no tradition of customary law abolishing the seven year deadline for ratification. The first 18 amendments, including the Bill of Rights, had no such limit on women's rights. The ERA is not part of the actual amendment, but is one of the rules Congress proposed for its passage by the states. Congress is completely within its powers to change the time period for ratification and extend it.

WIDESPREAD SUPPORT FOR ERA

The demonstration showed that there is widespread support for both the ERA and the extension of the ratification period. And, that this support is multinational as well as including both men and women. Groups represented included the NAACP, the National Conference of Puerto Rican Women, AFSCME, the UAW, the AFL-CIO, Local 1199 of the Hospital Workers Union, the Coalition of Labor Union Women, the Gray Panthers, the Uniied Women's Auxiliary, the Puerto Rican Women, AFSCME, the UAW, the AFL-CIO, Local 1199 of the Hospital Workers Union, the Coalition of Labor Union Women, the Gray Panthers, and many others.
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A new decision from the Supreme Court, BAKKE v. Regents of the University of California, has brought into focus the issue of affirmative action in higher education.

The case was brought by Lloyd B. B, a black student who was denied admission to the University of California at Davis. B was one of several qualified black applicants who were rejected in favor of white candidates with lower test scores. The University of California had a policy of affirmative action, which took into account race as a factor in admissions decisions.

The Supreme Court ruled that the University of California's affirmative action program, which categorized applicants on the basis of percentage, was constitutional. However, the Court also ruled that the University's use of a single numerical score to determine eligibility was unconstitutional.

The case of BAKKE v. Regents of the University of California has implications for all colleges and universities that use affirmative action programs. The Court's decision states that affirmative action programs should not be used in a way that discriminates against individuals.

The decision also states that affirmative action programs should be designed to eliminate discrimination and to promote equal opportunity. The Court's decision is a significant victory for affirmative action programs, and it is expected to have a positive impact on higher education institutions across the country.

This article was submitted to THE COMMUNIST on MAY 29 by ALAN WELFORD. It is a regular column of THE COMMUNIST, VOL. IV No. 1.

The collapse of the Willow Island Disaster Organization has led to confusion over the Supreme Court's Bakke decision. The disaster site was set up when information received June 8 by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) investigation team.
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If you were an oppressed national minority, the majority opinion assumes that universities are opposed to affirmative action programs and that university administrators and departments are eager to assign "plus points" to oppressed national minorities applicants. It pretends that they are falling all over themselves to remedy centuries of discrimination.

Facts dispel this fantasy. The UC Davis Admissions Office examined the records of the applicants in the class of 1978 and found no reverse discrimination charges. It is helping them prepare their case, and the UC Regents themselves, who were the ones answerable to the Bakke challenge and who had the responsibility under affirmative action programs, put together a lackluster defense. When that incoherent decision came down they expressed their satisfaction with it. In fact, the Harvard plan itself, which the majority opinion held up as a model, was created after World War II to limit the number of Jewish applicants. It is applied primarily from the East Coast. That is why the Harvard plan leaves the university accountable only to itself. It means in practice no affirmative action for acceptance of very few minority applicants. It is a plan to render the university accountable only to itself.

In fact to make sure that every door is closed shut, Portland, Oregon, courts must ignore centuries of evidence of the universal sanctioning by every kind of legislation of systematic and organized racism. The woman or minority can prove that as an individual they were not supported against "State universal racism," have as objective the remedying of "societal dis- crimination" at large." In plain English, as institutions of the bourgeoiis state, they function to perpetuate it.

RESPONSE TO THE DECISION
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