

THE COMMUNIST

WORKERS AND OPPRESSED PEOPLE OF THE WORLD, UNITE!

"A communist should have largeness of mind and he should be staunch and active, looking upon the interests of the revolution as his very life and subordinating his personal interests to those of the revolution; always and everywhere he should adhere to principle and wage a tireless struggle against



all incorrect ideas and actions so as to consolidate the collective life of the Party and strengthen the ties between the Party and the masses; he should be more concerned about the Party and the masses than about any individual and more concerned about others than about himself. Only thus can he be considered a Communist."
Mao Tsetung

VOLUME III NO 14

WORKERS CONGRESS (M-L)

POB 1297 CHICAGO, ILL 60690

July 29, 1977

15¢

Lessons of NY Outbreak

The black-out in New York City and the tremendously powerful and destructive outburst that followed it are vivid indications of the internal political and economic crisis presently affecting US imperialism. A result of the deprivation and hardships inflicted on the masses, in particular conditions of unemployment which hit particularly hard at the national minorities, the outburst demonstrated the unpreparedness of the bourgeois state to prevent it, and the inability of the revolutionary movement to lead it in to more productive channels.

In evaluating the importance of these events, we should keep in mind the guidelines that Lenin used to evaluate a revolutionary situation. He wrote, "Only when the 'lower classes' do not want the old way, and when the 'upper classes' cannot carry on in the old way- only then can revolution triumph." While such a situation obviously does not exist in the US today, we can still use these criteria to assess the motion of the class forces revealed in the recent events.

The black-out of New York City which in some areas lasted over an entire day, is itself an indictment of capitalist mismanagement. While the head of Consolidated Edison held lightning and "an act of god" responsible, it is certain that an "act of man" could have lessened the effects of the natural disaster. For years, a widespread electrical "grid" system, spread out over several states- which is utilized in Europe- had been proposed. But despite the lessons of the November, 1965 black-out, nothing was done to develop the system.

In a now widely publicized statement made just three days before the black-out, Charles Luce, Chairman of Consolidated Edison said, "I can guarantee that the chances of a brownout or blackout are less than they have been in the last 15 years and that the chances are less here than in other cities in the United States." The bankruptcy of this statement was quickly revealed. It can only be a cause of concern that Luce considered the "chances" of New York's blackout to be "less" than that of other cities.

The masses of New York are by now all too familiar with disasters brought on by the rule of finance capital. They still suffer the consequences of the "bankruptcy" of the city caused by finance capital's priorities of maximum profit over the welfare of the masses.

This small clique of parasites cannot provide power, cannot provide decent housing, cannot provide education, cannot provide health care and sanitation, cannot provide jobs and have even begun to give up the illusion that their class interests ever were compatible with such things. As Marx said in the Communist Manifesto "They have proven themselves unfit to rule society." The rule of the "upper Classes" has led to a deterioration in all aspects of social services and intolerable living conditions for the majority of the people. The former stability of the US capitalist system has gone forever, victim of the steady erosion of mounting economic and financial crisis and the hammer

blows of the Third World struggle against hegemonism. To a greater degree, US monopoly capitalism can no longer carry on in the old way. It does not deliver the goods and can no longer pretend to deliver the goods.

After the uprisings in the 1960's the government acted as if it had just discovered that the people were suffering from national oppression and promised a great variety of economic and social remedies. The inability to carry through these promises is evident in the conditions thrust on the oppressed masses today, and in the fact that, in the midst of a deep-rooted crisis, the government's response to this most recent outbreak is different from its response in the 1960's. There are no widespread calls for blue ribbon committees to find out "why" the outbreak occurred, nor are there many public speeches being made on the need for "great society" programs of social reform. Carter spoke briefly to the need for "society" to deal with unemployment, but the governments programs are based on a "business man's realism" for slow economic growth and "realistic" attitudes towards the decrease in unemployment.

As Lenin said, the bourgeois state uses two tactics to control the oppressed- the priest, economic reforms, and the hangman, repressive violence by the state. The ability of the capitalist state, caught up in economic crisis, to act as the priest is limited. Carter's "investigation" into the use of the National Guard in future out-breaks is a sign that the working class and the oppressed national minorities will be increasingly faced with the hangman- violent repression. The capitalist cannot, in their present circumstances, prevent further social and economic deterioration. The increasing decay of US society has resulted in a change in the attitudes of the oppressed masses. In 1965 there was relative calm during the blackout. Now in 1977, the masses responded with widespread looting and violence. This measures the distance we have come. It is evidence that increasingly working and oppressed masses no longer accept the conditions of life thrust on them by capitalist rule and will seek to improve their conditions of life by any means necessary. To a greater and greater degree, they will not live in the old way.

A policeman on duty during the outbreak described the mood of the masses in this way: "They couldn't understand why we were arresting them. They were angry with us. They said, 'I'm on welfare. I'm taking what I need. What are you bothering me for?'. The unemployed felt justified in their actions, and showed disdain and anger at the police who were there to protect the private property of the store owners.

As powerful and widespread as the reaction of the masses was, it did not challenge the foundation of capitalist ownership or the state power of the ruling class. Because of the failure of the revolutionary movement and its inability to provide leadership, the outbreak was like a flash fire that flares up quickly but soon dies down. It did not attack the roots of finance capital.

The revolutionary proletariat's stand towards the looting and destruction in New York is diametrically opposed to that of the bourgeoisie. This difference was well presented in a speech by a member of the Unemployed Council of St. Petersburg in Russia in 1906. The comrade, addressing the bourgeois politicians in the city government, said:

"We (class conscious workers) know what is required to put an end to unemployment. But the mass as a whole does not know. Their unemployment drives them to rob and kill. You are afraid of this...We, the vanguard of the workers, also fear it. You fear for yourselves, your wealth. We fear for our strength, since such things weaken and disrupt our ranks." The bourgeoisie wants to smash such outbursts; communists want to channel this energy more effectively so that it can be used in the political overthrow of the capitalist system.

Fear of the outbreak was evident in the capitalist's response. Mayor Beame stated he had contacted court officials to be "assured that they will be punished." The police had made wholesale arrests, often sweeping up people who were not even engaged in the looting. Many were beaten, while some were shot trying to escape the arrests. During the entire period of the blackout, 3,776 people were arrested, eight times more than in the uprisings of the 1960's. The prisoners were herded into crowded jail cells where they had to lay on the floors in sweltering heat. Many were imprisoned up to six days without a hearing. Bonds have been placed extremely high - in one case where the charges were burglary and resisting arrest the judge set bail at \$5,000.

The punitive harshness of these acts is intended to intimidate the masses, but will do no good. In the period following the uprisings in the 1960's, the government made grandiose promises to improve the standards of living of the working and oppressed masses and especially of nationally oppressed minorities. But instead they have been made to bear the brunt of the present crisis. The state will continue to attempt to suppress the aspirations of the masses but their resistance will not be kept down. While the outbreak demonstrated the irresistible destructive force of the masses in rebellion, their tremendous strength, the methods of struggle used were ineffective, and will not bring lasting improvements to the lives of our class and to the lives of all oppressed peoples. The taking of property was on an individual basis rather than a class basis; it was taken in narrow self interest, not to destroy the power of the bourgeoisie; the focus of the attack, in fact, tended to be the small bourgeoisie, rather than the big monopoly capitalists. But it is the monopoly capitalists themselves who drive thousands of petty bourgeoisie out of business each year, who use their powerful capital to squeeze out or swallow up their smaller competitors. But there are no tears shed or disaster relief for this systematic looting far worse than the black-out. In fact, finance capital will be quick to use the destruction

CONTINUED ON PAGE 3

NARCISO & PEREZ

A CHAUVINIST CONVICTION

Leonora Perez and Filipina Narciso were added to the long list of victims of national oppression in the US when, on July 13, they were convicted on charges of poisoning and conspiracy to poison patients at the Veteran's Administration Hospital (VA) in Ann Arbor Michigan. Victims of the present chauvinist campaign by the government against foreign-born workers, these two Filipino nurses face possible life imprisonment from the fraudulent charges.

During a three week period in the summer of 1975, 52 patients in the Ann Arbor VA hospital suffered sudden breathing failures, resulting in 11 deaths. The VA hospitals are notorious through out the country for mismanagement, poor patient care and extreme understaffing. Gary Calhoun, assistant chief of staff, admitted that at the Ann Arbor hospital one registered nurse was often responsible for up to three wards at one time. There was no security and no special cardiac or respiratory teams to deal with emergencies. A petition signed by over 60 nurses concerned over the negligent conditions had been presented to the hospital administration.

Narciso and Perez, who had been working in the intensive care unit (ICU) only three weeks before the series of respiratory arrests, actually went to the administration to call for an investigation. However, Dr. Martin Lindenauer, chief of staff, to draw attention away from the negligent conditions, immediately focused attention on the two foreign-born nurses. He tried to coerce and intimidate them into admitting guilt before a formal investigation was begun. When the FBI entered the case, they cooperated with Lindenauer in the frame-up and did not investigate other possible explanations for the deaths.

This discriminatory focus on the nurses, reflecting both national and male chauvinism, was revealed in the statement of a FBI agent that they focused on the nurses because Lindenauer had directed them "not to harass his doctors".

Some of the biased and FBI extorted testimony used to indict the nurses, and relevant information that was denied as evidence were:

- 1) the "eyewitness" testimony of Richard Neely was gained after three hypnosis sessions where the FBI asked leading questions. Neely was also quoted as claiming the existence of "a nation-wide conspiracy of 1,800 Filipino nurses to murder Americans" which included the "Legionaire Convention" poisonings. His testimony was used in the indictment.
- 2) the FBI and prosecution refused to hand over medical records and nursing reports to the defense until the court ordered them to. When the defense lawyers and the nurses went over these records, they found omissions indicating that the FBI and prosecution had tampered with this evidence.
- 3) throughout the investigation the FBI agents intimidated and harassed the nurses and their family and friends in repeated interrogations
- 4) Pavulon, a powerful muscle relaxant, which the prosecution had claimed the nurses injected into the IV bags of the patients immed-

CONTINUED ON PAGE 3

US MAINTAINS DIVIDED KOREA

In 1950, fearful of the effects of the successful new democratic revolution in China led by the Communist Party, US imperialism launched a war of aggression in Korea in an attempt to subjugate the whole of Korea under its rule. The setback it suffered after three years of fighting marked the beginning of the decline of its hegemonic position in Asia and around the world. In the following twenty years, the heroic Indo-Chinese people of Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos waged successful struggles of national liberation.

The loss of this territory to US imperialism created a large gap in the arch of strategic military bases it had established stretching from Alaska, through Japan and Korea, down to Taiwan and the Philippines. Now as the US attempts to consolidate its weakened position in the world, the strategic importance of Korea has grown.

It is therefore no surprise that much controversy has erupted in regards to the recent downing of a US helicopter over north Korean territory, the exposure of bribery of US politicians by the Korean Central Intelligence Agency (KCIA) and Carter's decision to withdraw 32,000 US ground troops from Korea.

POLITICAL CORRUPTION STAINS "HUMAN RIGHTS" CAMPAIGN

The guarded response of the US government to the helicopter shooting incident was partially due to the fact that the helicopter was clearly in violation of north Korean airspace. But more importantly, the government cannot follow up bellicose words with actions while the anti-war sentiment of the US masses still runs strong and while the majority of the third world countries are supportive of north Korea. Another factor is the political embarrassment current in Washington due to disclosure of bribes taken by over 100 congressmen from south Korean businessmen and secret police.

One of the more obvious stains on Carter's "human rights" campaign is the support given by the US government to the barbaric Pak regime. The Pak government is notorious world-wide for its political repression, its imprisonment and torture of democratic opposition and the widespread corruption and open bribery with which it negotiates political and economic deals. Now this stain has spread directly to Washington among high ranking senators and congressmen, such as the Speaker of the House and the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, who accepted "gifts" in exchange for political and economic favors to the Pak regime and south Korean businessmen, threatening another "Watergate" type scandal which affects the Democrats as well. The importance Carter places on maintaining a front of "moral imperialism" in the world influenced his decision to reduce US troop strength in Korea.

CONTROVERSY OVER WITHDRAWAL, BUT US IMPERIALISM WILL REMAIN IN KOREA

Controversy over Carter's decision to gradually withdraw 32,000 Army, Navy and Marine ground troops from south Korea over a five-year period was sparked when opposition to this plan was publicly voiced by Major General John K. Singlaub, third highest ranking officer in the US command in south Korea. Singlaub stated, "In my view the withdrawal of all American ground troops would raise the possibility of war in Korea." Carter's dismissal of Singlaub from his Korean post created considerable public debate, revealing differences among sectors of the bourgeoisie on this issue.

It must be understood however, that the differences reflect only different evaluations on the capabilities of the south Korean armed forces, with US air and naval support, to defend US imperialist interests in Korea; and different evaluations on US strategic policy in northeast Asia. There is complete agreement among the bourgeoisie on the continuing maintenance of US military presence in Korea which is in violation of the national sovereignty of Korea, and continuing maintenance of the "two-Korea" division which is in clear violation of the territorial integrity of Korea. The US proletariat must not be misled into believing that US imperialism has ceased to be an aggressive super-

power in the Asian area.

Harold Brown, US Secretary of Defense, stated US imperialism's intentions to remain a "major western Pacific-east Asian power" in a press conference on July 1. Brown continued to raise the false "threat of southward invasion" from north Korea, and threatened military response by the US. As commentary in the Korean newspaper "Rodong Sinmun" pointed out, it is the continuing plan of the US

"to keep hold of south Korea indefinitely as a colony and military base and, with it as a stronghold, realize the US strategic policy against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and other Asian socialist forces and national liberation movements."

Further indications are the Carter administration's request for \$275 million in military credits and an additional \$100 million in arm sales for south Korea in this fiscal year. This backs up the US commitment made in August, 1975 by then Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger to a 5-year \$5 billion arms program to the Seoul government. Continued support is further reflected in the June 23 defeat of an amendment raised in the House to cancel south Korea's \$45 million aid program for this year on the basis of violations of "human rights". There was also the strongly-worded joint-statement made between Carter and Premier Fukuda of Japan on March 22 which emphasized "the continuing importance of the maintenance of peace and stability on Korean Peninsula for the security of Japan and east Asia as a whole."

In fact, Carter's planned withdrawal of troops which is to be accompanied with increased build-up of the south Korean armed forces and US air support is consistent with the "Nixon Doctrine" of letting "Asians fight Asians". The Nixon administration itself withdrew 20,000 ground troops from south Korea in 1971 and at the same time launched a \$1.5 billion modernization program of the military forces in south Korea. The removal of troops from Korea also gives the government greater flexibility in placing them in other areas of the world, such as Europe.

US AND JAPAN

An important aspect of US strategic evaluation in east Asia is the relationship of the US to Japan. The troop reduction has the effect of shifting more responsibility for imperialist "defense" of Asia onto Japan.

Following World War II, the US has kept Japan as its main ally in Asia. Directly after the war, to counter-act a threatening rise in the strength of left-wing political forces in Japan stemming from a severe economic crisis, the US imperialists subsidized economic development in Japan, while preventing any major development of Japanese offensive military capabilities.

Partly due to the fact that only 1% of its Gross National Product (GNP) was spent on military and defense needs, Japan has risen from a small economic power in the 1950's, producing for export principally labor-intensive low technology goods, to the third largest economy in the world behind the US and USSR. Since the 1950's Japan has doubled its GNP nearly every seven years.

Since 1972 the economic stake of the US in east Asia has increased more rapidly than in any other area. US trade in east Asia since 1972 exceeded that with the European Economic Community and stands above \$50 billion annually. US investment there is over \$12 billion and growing at a rate of over \$1 billion a year. Nearly all of the US natural rubber, tin, coconut oil and about 8% of its petroleum imports comes from this area.

US AND JAPAN IN SOUTH KOREA

Both the US and Japan's interests are closely tied in with south Korea's. Together they buy over 75% of south Korea's exports and sell over 60% of its imports. From 1959 to 1975 the US public and commercial loans to Korea totalled \$2.5 billion. There are over 1,700 US imperialist corporations operating in south Korea and US-south Korean trade increased over 60% between 1975 and 1976.

Japan has played a major role in the economic development of

south Korea since normalization of relations in 1965. At that time the Japanese government agreed to provide \$500 million and the private sector pledged another \$300 million in low interest loans. Over the past decade Japan provided nearly 60% of the direct foreign investment into south Korea and today is south Korea's main trading partner with approximately 40% of both imports and exports to and from Japan.

These facts demonstrate the well-developed economic interaction between south Korea, Japan and the US. But as with all relations among capitalist countries, there is also contention. The rise of Japan as an economic power has given rise to growing export of its capital and manufactured goods, leading to increased competition with the US. The huge expenditures by the US for military equipment and forces has put it at a disadvantage to Japan which continues to spend only 1% of its GNP for defense. The US is gradually pressuring Japan to accept more of the military burden, though it does this with reservations, for the US imperialists do not want to have to face a fully militarized Japan with nuclear capabilities. However, the US realizes that present political sentiment of the Japanese masses does not make full militarization of Japan, with nuclear armaments, a real possibility in the near future.

GAP BETWEEN ECONOMIC POWER AND MILITARY WEAKNESS WILL NOT REMAIN

However, under the laws of capitalist development, increased militarization is inevitable. The enormous discrepancy between Japan's economic power and its lack of military power cannot continue indefinitely. Japan needs expanded military strength to accompany its expansion as a world capitalist power. It's complete reliance on the US for strategic military security comes into contradiction with its increased competition with the US over markets. As part of this development, Japan will take on more of the responsibility for the maintenance of south Korea as a strategic outpost defending Japan's imperialist interests. JAPAN VIOLATES CHINA'S TERRITORIAL SOVEREIGNTY

One sign of Japan's increasing aggressiveness was the recent formal approval by the Japanese Diet of the joint Japan-south Korea "Agreement on Joint Development of the Continental Shelf" which had been sitting in limbo since January 30, 1974. This move by Japan to mark off areas of the East China Sea continental shelf for joint-development with south Korea was in direct violation of the territorial sovereignty of the People's Republic of China, from whose territory the continental shelf extends. A principle of international law maintains that the continental shelf is the natural extension of the continental territory. Despite this, without any consultation with the People's Republic of China and south Korea went ahead with their agreement. This behind-the-scenes move brought sharp criticism and warning from the Chinese government.

IMPERIALIST PRESENCE ONLY OBSTACLE TO PEACEFUL REUNIFICATION OF KOREA

The military support for the south Korean regime has been historically based on the imperialist myth of an invasion by the north. This goes against the fact that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, under the leadership of Kim Il Sung, has consistently and determinedly supported the peaceful reunification of Korea and has taken great initiative in linking up with democratic elements in the south to pursue this goal.

It is the imperialists, particularly US imperialism, which prevents the peaceful reunification from taking place.

The effort by the DPRK for peaceful reunification has a long history. First, in April, 1948, a Joint Conference of Political Parties and Public Organizations of North and South Korea, involving 43 political, social and religious organizations including right-wing parties, proposed establishment of a unified government through simultaneous withdrawal of all foreign troops from the north and the south and a

general national election. But this was blocked by the US imperialists and the Syngman Rhee puppet regime, who instead started armed provocation along the 38th Parallel. A similar proposal was made, and rejected, in 1949.

There was a pause due to the war, but yearly proposals were made again beginning in 1954. In August, 1960, following the popular overthrow of the Syngman Rhee regime, Kim Il Sung presented a plan to implement a North-South Confederation as a transitional step to the complete unification of the country. This was a compromise offered in case the south Korean government could not agree to a free north-south election. It also proposed to realize economic and cultural exchange, exchange of postal services and mutual visits. The seven points were:

- 1) to peacefully unify the country by expelling the US army from south Korea in order to save south Korea from a grave crisis and to solve the Korean question finally;
- 2) to hold a general election throughout North and South Korea on a democratic principle without any foreign interference;
- 3) to institute a national committee as a provisional measure, composed of representatives from the north and south, while retaining the present political systems and independent activities of the two governments;
- 4) to set up an economic commission for the exchange of goods and mutual assistance in economic construction;
- 5) to allow mutual visits of cultural missions and exchange in all fields of science, culture, art and sports;
- 6) to reduce the two armies to 100,000 or less each;
- 7) to arrange a meeting of representatives to negotiate these issues.

It can be seen from the nature of these points that only the imperialists who are faced with the loss of a colony, or those Korean forces that did not genuinely want reunification and self-determination for Korea, could not agree to these points. Again the US imperialists and their subservient Korean puppets sabotaged this proposal.

In May of 1972, President Kim Il Sung put forward the Three Principles of National Reunification of independence, peaceful reunification and great national unity which resulted in July, 1972 in a historic North-South Joint Statement. But the Pak regime, goaded by the US imperialists, has not lived up to the principles of this statement. Instead it has intensified political persecution of all democratic opposition, waged terroristic "anti-communist" campaigns, put forward reactionary proposals to the UN for the permanent admittance of "2-Koreas" and continued military provocations at the border.

The Korean nation is historically an extremely compact and homogeneous social unit - over 99% of the residents of Korea are of Korean nationality, and with respect to language, dialect variations are minimal and insignificant. The majority of Korean families have relatives on the other side of the partition. The people as a whole desire unity - it is only a small section of the undemocratic elements - the comprador bourgeoisie, the semi-feudal landlord class and the reactionary bureaucrats in the government, army, police and intelligence agencies - which oppose it. And most centrally, there are the imperialists, the US imperialists in particular, who remain the bulwark of these undemocratic forces and the only real obstacle to reunification.

It is our proletarian internationalist duty to oppose Carter's partial withdrawal of troops as completely inadequate. The only just demand is for the complete and immediate withdrawal of all US military personnel, equipment and aid, and the annulment of the treaties of "mutual defense" forced on the Korean people by the US imperialists. We must wholeheartedly support and defend the efforts of the Korean people to reunify as one people and one nation and to assure their national independence and sovereignty from all foreign interference.

Brach Strike

WILDCAT DEFIES TEAMSTER BUREAUCRATS' TREACHERY

On Friday morning, July 15, over a thousand workers at E.J. Brach Candy Company, on Chicago's west side filled Kilpatrick Street spilling onto the parking lot next to it, chanting "STRIKE" in Spanish, Greek, Italian and English. Down the middle of the street came two workers with a small hand-written sign, "Brach workers are on strike", and a thousand angry voices cheered.

Already mobilized in their riot gear, police attacked, injuring several of the strikers. One Mexican worker, attempting to explain to a cop why they were on strike was viciously slapped in the face. The workers responded, and within minutes these proletarians learned once again which class the police serve and whose property the police protect. This unwarranted attack only strengthened the spirit of the 2,700 strikers. With little organization, facing the treacherous collaboration of the capitalists, the state and the Teamster bureaucrats, they stayed on the streets for ten days in their struggle to improve their wages and benefits.

E.J. Brach Candy Co. is run by the monopoly capitalist owners of American Home Products (AHP), a large imperialist corporation. In 1966 Brach, one of the world's largest candy factories, was absorbed by the larger AHP. This was an example of monopoly capitalist domination of a smaller capitalist, which is a law of imperialism. The greater power of these monopoly capitalists brings greater oppression to the workers, bringing them into greater contradiction with capital.

With the help of their Brach holdings, AHP has become the 88th largest US corporation, with over \$2.5 billion sales in 1976. Making more than \$5,800 profit off each of its 48,000 workers, AHP made \$280 million in profits last year, a 10% increase over the year before, ranking it 44th in the US in net profits. From the sweat and blood of workers in its plants around the world, AHP has increased its profits and sales each of the last 23 years!

Up against these moneybags, the workers organized to protect themselves. In 1968, they voted in Local 738 of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters (IBT) to defend themselves from further impoverishment. In fact, the opposite has happened. With each three year contract, the real wages and benefits the workers receive for their labor have gone down. This process has intensified since the outbreak of the latest capitalist crisis.

NARCISO AND PEREZ from page 1

ately before the arrests, could have been injected into the bags before they were even hooked up to the patients; both the Rocky Mountain Poison Lab and the Federal Drug Administration could find no traces of the drug in the bile or blood samples of Joseph Brown, who the nurses were accused of poisoning.

5) a note from Betty Jakim, night supervisor in the ICU, written before her suicide, confessed to the poisonings. The psychiatric hospital where she was confined before her death refused to release this information on the basis of "patient confidentiality". The FBI, while knowing of Jakim, had dropped the investigation into her possible connection to the deaths. 6) the testimony of William Loesch, a patient the nurses were convicted of poisoning, that he saw a "man in a green scrub suit" right before his arrest, which was collaborated by the testimony of other witnesses, was never followed up by the FBI. Mr. Loesch remains convinced of the nurses' innocence and works actively in their defense.

On the basis of the contradictory evidence, the irregularities and tampering with evidence by the FBI and prosecution, the openly chauvinist statements by "witnesses" and the biased focus of the investigation from the very outset, the indictment of the nurses should never have occurred.

While some of the charges were dropped before the trial, and others during the trial, a motion for the dismissal of all charges was denied by the judge. The frame-up and conviction of Narciso and Perez is an indictment of the VA bureaucracy, the FBI, the government prosecution and the entire bourgeois judicial system. It dem-

In 1974, Secretary-Treasurer of the IBT, Raymond Domenic, whose salary and expense account comes to \$100,000 a year, agreed to cut the hours of work of the Brach workers from an official guaranteed 40 hours a week to 37.5, without a compensating wage increase. Before the IBT had come on the scene, most workers put in a 48-hour week, getting 8 hours of overtime. For the last three years, stated an old-time worker, "We actually produced more candy than we did working 10.5 hours more, and the lines are more dangerous".

This is a clear example of forced increased extraction of surplus value. Bitterly a candy-packer said, "Yeah, the Teamster leaders told us if we didn't agree to the 37.5 hours there would be big lay-offs". The trade union bureaucrats never mobilize the rank-and-file proletariat to fight against the intensification of labor, but rather they put forward the capitalist's lie that the only alternatives before the workers are loss of a job or passive acceptance of increased exploitation.

In the course of the last three years, the multi-national workforce at Brachs, made up of workers from Mexico, Greece, Italy, Palestine and Eastern Europe, decided to no longer accept these alternatives offered by the union bureaucrats. Many of these foreign born workers had directly experienced the effects of US imperialism in their countries, being forced off their land and driven to the US in hopes of a better life. Despite little language communication, the multi-national proletariat quickly learns to understand each other in their combined labor, and to understand the need for unity. This is underestimated by the trade union bureaucrats and the capitalists. "This strike won't last long," boasted Ray Domenic and the president of Brachs, "the workers can't understand each other." For ten days the proletariat proved them wrong.

In the last three years the IBT bureaucrats had done everything they could to weaken the organization workers, eliminating the democratic rights of the union members. The right to elect department stewards or grievance committee representatives was taken away. The health and safety committee didn't exist as far as most workers knew.

While providing no services, the bureaucrats still raised the union dues from \$6 to \$10 a month, with

onstrates how even the faintest semblance of justice is subordinated to the US capitalists' maintenance of national and class oppression.

The attack on the two Filipino nurses takes place in the context of continuing economic crisis and war preparations by the US imperialists; the capitalists are attempting to solidify their rule on the basis of great nation chauvinism which divides the work-class and oppressed nationalities whose united struggle challenges the imperialist system.

The efforts by the bourgeoisie can be seen in the increased round ups of Mexican immigrants, in the rise of police violence and murder directed at the oppressed nationalities, the infamous Bakke Decision the denial of abortions for women on public aid, the court dismissal of "de facto" segregation and the attempt to lay the blame for high unemployment on foreign workers.

Directly connected to the Narciso-Perez case is the present government campaign against foreign medical graduates. When cheap foreign labor was needed to staff US hospitals, programs were set up to induce nurses and doctors to come to the US. The continuing poverty and underdevelopment of third world countries under imperialist rule also forced many of these professionals to the US. But now that the economic crisis has stopped hospital expansion and meant cutbacks in social services, these foreign medical personnel are no longer needed. To justify their dismissal, the government has started a vicious campaign of slander against the qualifications and abilities of these once valued nurses and doctors, and has set-up discriminatory exams to block their entrance into the US while disqualifying those already here from further practice

another increase due in August. These labor traitors, social props of the bourgeoisie, whose hand-picked president makes an official salary of \$134,000 a year and much more on the side, had betrayed the workers in a strike 6 years before when after 3 weeks of hard struggle on the streets, the workers got only 5 cents more than the original company offer. To ensure another sell-out, they then took away the workers right to select members of the negotiating team by department.

12 days before the strike at a meeting organized by the rank-and-file, workers discussed and overwhelmingly rejected the first contract proposal which gave them a \$1.15 raise over three years rather than the \$1.75 ("75, 50, 50") the strikers chanted throughout the ten-day strike. The first proposal also failed to call for the guaranteed 40-hour week, full coverage insurance and paid sick days which the proletariat knew were essential.

When the union bureaucrats got wind of this, they met with the company to cook up a second, "better" proposal, an "absolutely final offer" which was essentially no different from the first. At the same time, the bureaucrats agreed behind the workers' backs to extend the old contract, which expired July 14, to July 22 while the ratification vote on the "better" proposal was going on.

When workers heard of this extension, they took action. Led by the third shift mechanics, the wildcat strike began late Thursday night, July 14. As the workers poured into the streets the next morning, the brunt of their anger was directed at the IBT bureaucrats. "Sell-outs is all they are," declared a leader of the strike.

The strike continued through the week and as the days rolled on the bureaucrats tried more and more to divert the progressive and determined militancy of the workers. They told the workers that the contract had been approved by mail by a 58% majority on Thursday and that if they didn't get back to work by Monday they would all be fired. "Fraud" shouted the workers in response to the fake mail vote. The angry strikers then proceeded to have their greatest show of power, with over 500 incensed picketers making sure no one would get in the plant that night.

Despite this show of strength, in the next three days the workers' efforts were diverted into signing a petition calling on the NLRB to recognize their strike as legal and to recount the votes.

The frame-up of Narciso and Perez served this shameful campaign. The atmosphere of fear and prejudice it created has already caused some patients to refuse medication from nurses of Asian background.

Strong and widespread public protest to counter the malice and distortion of the government's campaign has already begun. In Ann Arbor 1,500 people demonstrated to overturn the conviction and free the nurses. On July 27 a series of nation-wide rallies were held. Support committees have been set up across the country. Comrades should join in this work, building for national demonstrations in late August or early September when the nurses face sentencing.

The fight for the freedom of Narciso and Perez is a fight against US imperialism and its present campaign of great nation chauvinism. One of the first colonies seized through armed force by US imperialism in the 1800's was the Philippines. US military and economic domination of the Philippines continues today, providing the material basis for the oppression suffered by the Filipino national minority here in the US today. The struggle against the frame-up and fraudulent conviction of the two innocent nurses is linked to the struggle against US imperialism in the Philippines and around the world, and the continuing political tyranny of the capitalist class here in the US.

On Sunday the company and union bureaucrats called a meeting at a suburban motel where they were able to consolidate over 100 scabs to cross the picket line Monday morning. Without well-organized leadership this caused some strikers to vacillate. Traitor Ray Domenic appeared at the strike for the first time to wave workers back into the plant. Outraged, strikers called for a confrontation. But at this crucial time the strike committee had been tricked by a police agent posing as a reporter who promised them an immediate meeting with the "big bosses of the company". Marching past Domenic into the plant, the committee was told by company representatives that "All we can do is abide by the contract vote. If you're dissatisfied with the vote, then go down to the NLRB". So down town they went, where the NLRB, literally waiting for them, told the committee that a recount would take at least two weeks and would mean hiring a lawyer at \$50 a hour.

The call raised by the advanced to confront the union bureaucrats and demand an immediate re-vote by ballot box could not be consolidated among the majority of workers.

So the staunch Brach strikers made an orderly retreat into the plant - SPIRITS STILL HIGH. As one striker summed it up, "They tricked us; the government, police, owners and union leaders are all like that" as he rubbed his fingers together. "But next time we will be prepared and we will be organized."

The class consciousness of the most active strikers had grown considerably throughout the strike. One of these workers stated:

"What we began to learn this time is that we are all one class of workers against our enemy class. In the next three years I hope we can organize the Brach workers not just to prepare to win another strike here, but to go wherever workers are on strike and people are struggling. And particularly to chase these union leaders all over the city. It is they who must be confronted and eliminated if our class is to win."

AN ANALYSIS OF THE LESSONS GAINED FROM POLITICAL WORK DURING THE BRACH STRIKE WILL BE IN A FORTHCOMING ISSUE OF THE COMMUNIST.

NY OUTBREAK from page 1

of the blackout to force out those small shop owners who are inconvenient to them and increase their stranglehold on those who remain. This is an inevitable tendency of capitalist production.

In addition, by withholding loans and other funds for community development as well as insurance, the New York events will become an excuse for the further deterioration of the conditions of life of the masses. We must conduct widespread communist education on all these points.

The blackout and the outbreak speak to the inability of the capitalists to prevent the intensification of the crisis, and the intensified resistance of the masses. This situation faces us with our tasks. Foremost is the need to bring political class consciousness to the thinking and actions of the masses, so that their struggle will have more political focus and effectiveness. The magnitude of the spontaneous outburst in New York must propel us forward in our party building efforts, to take even more seriously the struggle for ideological and theoretical clarity, to oppose even more sharply small-group mentality and sectarianism, to push forward wherever possible our ideological and organizational unity. For the leadership of a vanguard Marxist-Leninist party is essential for the transformation of spontaneous outbreaks into organized class struggle leading to the socialist revolution here in the US.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES TO THE COMMUNIST ARE \$4.25 PER YEAR. PLEASE MAKE CHECKS OR MONEY ORDERS PAYABLE TO: WORKERS CONGRESS

The Workers Congress (ML) can be contacted at :

Workers Congress
POB 1297 Chicago, Ill.
60690

or at

Workers Congress
POB 11713 Los Angeles, Ca.
90111

A DISTORTION OF OUR HISTORY

In this article a correspondent demonstrates how the OL's failure to recognize the leading role of theory and ideological struggle in our movement today led to their failure to recognize it in the history of the communist movement. In doing so, the comrade provides us with both an excellent exposure of the shaky foundation on which the CP (ML) has been built and an invaluable history lesson about an important struggle against right opportunism that took place within the Communist International in 1928.

The recent consolidation of the October League and some 10 or 11 local collectives and independent Marxist-Leninists into the Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist) makes a careful study of the Party Program and recent publications such as "Building Class Struggle Trade Unions--A Communist View" very important.

The past period has seen OL change some of their policies on a number of key questions. Among these previously held positions was that ultra-leftism is the main danger within the communist movement. Following OL's third Congress, this was changed to the view that right opportunism is the main danger. This was accompanied by articles and resolutions which talked about "winning the advanced", "welding a core" and "building factory nuclei", and "propaganda as the chief form of activity". In the past OL had attacked such formulations as reflecting the ultra-left line, and accused organizations and individuals who advanced such formulations of party-building in isolation, being removed from the mass movement, etc

Another important policy change was in relation to trade union work. OL rejected its earlier line of "move the trade unions to the left" in favor of the line of revolutionizing the trade unions, ie, exposing and isolating the trade union bureaucrats "liberal or otherwise" in order to win revolutionary leadership of the trade unions.

Many Marxist-Leninist organizations and individuals had criticized OL's rightist trade union policy, particularly its support of Arnold Miller in the UMW and Sadowski in steel.

At the time these criticisms were firmly rejected by OL and treated as another example of ultra-left errors which would isolate communists.

While many of those who had criticized OL welcomed the changes and saw it as an advance, they were concerned about the lack of thorough criticism regarding the source of the previous errors. This lack of comprehensive self-criticism made many of the changes seem shallow and appear as superficial changes rather than anything fundamental.

Recently OL published a pamphlet "Building Class Struggle Trade Unions--A Communist View" (May, 1977). This pamphlet is basically a reprint of six CALL articles. Its purpose, according to the OL, is to restate the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism concerning trade unions and to sum up the main features of the American labor movement, analyzing the strengths and weaknesses of the CPUSA when it was a revolutionary vanguard party. And thirdly, the pamphlet draws important lessons from experiences of OL and other Marxist-Leninists.

The pamphlet says it will take a close and self-critical look at OL's experience and work over the last few years. Thus it provides a basis for analyzing OL's attitude towards its past mistakes as well as determining the soundness of the foundation on which the new CP(ML) has been built.

One of the great difficulties which severely hampers the communist movement today and which must be overcome in order to build a vanguard Party, is an understanding and analysis of the revisionist betrayal of the CPUSA.

An entire generation was cut off from its past, left with little or no knowledge of the rich revolutionary history of the American working class and of the important ideological battles fought to Bolshevize its vanguard party.

On page 15 of the pamphlet the authors state: "To deepen the struggle against revisionism today, the lessons from the '30's must be summed up and applied. What was correct and what erroneous in the CP's trade union work?"

They then proceed to present a sum up of these lessons that is both superficial and incorrect and which consistently downplays the central role of ideological struggle and political line within the Party.

First, we are told that "the Party developed its program for the trade unions in the course of the struggle against dual unionism and syndicalism", that communists such as Foster "who earlier had been a founding member of the Syndicalist League, learned through their own experiences the danger of "left" sectarianism, a deviation clearly criticized by Lenin in the early days of the Third International." Based on this experience the Party directed its members to work inside AFL unions and fight to transform the character of these unions. It was during this period, particularly during a special campaign from 1925-1929, that the Party "developed its factory networks and an expanded system of shop organizations and shop newspapers in the course of union drives, strikes and day to day work in the plants."

It was thus on the basis of "this strong base in major industry" that the party was able to gain the leadership of the tremendous upsurge of working class struggle in the late 20's and most particularly in the 30's.

This summary is incorrect. The authors have failed to mention the very sharp ideological struggle that took place at the 6th Convention of the Communist International in 1928. Many communists today are familiar with or have at least some knowledge of the importance of this convention in relationship to the development of a revolutionary position on the Negro Question. It was at this congress that the theory of the oppression of Black people as a national question, a question of an oppressed nation in the Black Belt South was first advanced.

However, what is not as well understood is that the struggle and debate on the Negro question took place within the context of a broader ideological struggle. The main slogan of the convention was "Fight the Right Danger - Turn to the Left."

At the heart of the struggle was an estimation of the international situation. The right wing in the CPSU united with their counterparts in other Parties (the Lovestone faction in the CPUSA) and advanced the line that the relative capitalist stabilization which took place during the 1920's would continue. They argued that the communist activity should be focused on legal and parliamentary work in line with this relative stability and prosperity which would extend for a considerable time.

This line was staunchly opposed by Stalin and the CPSU majority. They pointed out that the period of capitalist stabilization was coming to an end. And that the key task of Communist Parties was to revolutionize their ranks and prepare for a coming storm of revolutionary struggle which would be precipitated by the rapidly maturing capitalist crisis.

For the American Party this two line struggle focused in on the Negro National Question, on the question of factionalism and unprincipled struggle which had undermined the morale and unity of the party and on the question of building new industrial trade unions and organizing the unorganized. This was a pivotal question. The party's trade union work had been mainly within the

AFL but now with a rapidly changing international situation, with capitalist crisis on the horizon, it was imperative that the Party launch vigorous efforts to organize the large concentrations of proletarians in basic industry. The limitations imposed by the narrow AFL craft-unions and their reformist leadership had to be broken--the new industrial trade unions had to be built.. This did not mean ceasing work in the AFL or abandoning the struggle in existing unions. It did however mean a dramatic shift in focus and in points of concentration.

The struggle at the 6th Congress was very sharp and protracted. It was only after considerable debate that the delegates of the American Party were united and won to the correct line.

It is this point which the "Summary" simply ignores. The summary implies that it was the struggle to work within the AFL which helped prepare the party for the upsurge in the 1930's. The opposite was in fact the truth. But more importantly the summary implies it was the "day to day" work in the plants, "in the course of union drives and strikes" that laid the basis of strong party work.

This is fundamentally incorrect. It was the ideological struggle to rid the Party of opportunism (like Lovestone's ideology) and factionalism, to develop a revolutionary position on the Negro National question, and on building the red trade unions that provided the foundation on which the Party Bolshevized its ranks and prepared for the revolutionary storm which followed. Without this thorough all-sided ideological struggle none of the day-to-day activity in the plants and mines would have developed along revolutionary lines. The party would have been at the tail end of the mass upsurge, unprepared and unable to lead it.

The fact that the party was able to gain the leadership of the mass upsurge is a great lesson for all of us pointing to the decisive role of revolutionary theory and ideological struggle..

The next section summarizing the CIO drives and development of Browderism suffers in the same way. The article says, "This period of the building of the CIO was one of great upsurge in the mass movement, which greatly increased the dangers of rightism, of getting swept up by these mass struggles, overestimating the consciousness of the masses and underestimating the decisive importance of independent communist work."

The authors give a description of the errors "cultivated and then consolidated" by Browder, "downplaying communist education and training of cadre, as well as communist aims and independence..", "spreading illusions about CIO, reformist and Roosevelt New-Dealers, praising them as saviors and heroes of the working class."

While these points are generally correct, how can Marxist-Leninists make an analysis of the period and not even mention the United Front against Fascism! The authors ignore entirely the world situation at the time and the political line which served as the cornerstone of communist activity-- not only in the US but throughout the world.

Is it possible to learn from the strengths and weaknesses of the CPUSA by only describing the errors that were made? Isn't it crucial to focus on the ideological and theoretical struggle that took place and the political line that emerged from these struggles? Isn't this the meaning of "class struggle is key" and "political line determines everything"?

It is important to examine the errors made in this part of the pamphlet from another angle. These articles are intended to be propaganda directed at the advanced. As such they must serve as examples to teach and train cadre in correct methods of study, in summing up historical experience, and in general in applying the science of Marxism-Leninism to concrete problems.

The effect of the serious shortcomings of this article can be clearly seen in the last part of the pamphlet in the section, "Summary of OL Work", pages 42 to 49. On pp. 45-46, the authors describe the "strong rightist deviation which developed. But they claim it developed despite a generally sound approach. This "right deviation" took the form of "tailing sections of reformist union leadership", "preached gradualism as opposed to revolutionizing the trade union" and "mistakenly underestimated the great danger of liberal reformists in the trade unions".

This most certainly describes serious right errors, but the same ignoring or dismissing of ideological and theoretical struggle that was evident in the earlier summary is evident here. This description leaves out entirely any analysis or discussion of the larger ideological struggle that existed at the time and which provided the framework in which specific policies--in this case on trade unions--were developed. The overall ideological struggle which was waged at that time--and continues today--most specifically whether ultra-leftism or right opportunism in the form of economism represents the main source of revisionism and opportunism within our ranks, is simply not mentioned. The specific examples cited in the pamphlet of the errors made during the building of the Brotherhood Caucus at the GM plant in Fremont, California, brings out this point more directly.

The errors are summed up as "propaganda work was much too limited", "the task of building strong communist organization in the plant was not always taken up and "we did not struggle as we should within the United Front".

It was exactly these errors which were (and are today) at the center of this larger ideological struggle. Were not these errors criticized at the time as logical developments of the tendency to underestimate the importance of propaganda (i.e. fail to make propaganda the chief form of activity) and to plunge into "leading" the mass spontaneous movement without winning over the advanced, without building strong factory nuclei and thus becoming submerged in--and by-- trade union reformism? And isn't it true that these criticisms were rejected as being ultra left and sectarian?

Now OL is making the very same criticisms-- except that the relationship between OL's line that ultra-leftism represented the main danger and the rightist errors in its trade union work is completely ignored. This is done in exactly the same way that the crucial ideological struggles that provided the basis for the CPUSA's revolutionary activity in the 1930's are passed over.

It is clear that underlying both "summations" is the well entrenched tendency to underestimate the importance of revolutionary theory. Just as the authors cannot possibly develop a thorough understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of the CPUSA without digging into the underlying ideological struggle, neither can they develop a sound foundation for correcting their own past errors by such superficial summing up.

And more importantly they are actually fostering and nurturing--despite their intentions--the domination of bourgeois ideology within our ranks by failing to root out and make a complete and conscious break with the source of these errors.

For at the heart of these errors is bourgeois ideology in the form of economism, reflected in bowing to the spontaneous character of the mass movement; belittling the role of revolutionary theory; and failing to take as our primary task winning advanced workers to Marxism-Leninism, and the welding of a core of the most militant and class conscious workers to form a communist party worthy of its revolutionary heritage and capable of fulfilling its historical tasks.