

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

VOL. III no. 7

WORKERS CONGRESS (M-L)

POB 1297 CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60690

MARCH 29, 1977

15¢

UNION BUREAUCRATS PROMOTE CHAUVINIST CAMPAIGN

US-JAPAN TRADE CONFLICT

On Saturday, March 19, Premier Takeo Fukuda of Japan met with Jimmy Carter for a series of joint summit talks. Carter and Fukuda first met in 1975, when Carter visited Tokyo as a member of the Tri-lateral Commission. On the agenda for discussion between the two capitalist political leaders were the issues of US military strategy and foreign trade. During the talks, Fukuda requested a renewed commitment on the part of the part of the US to maintain its military presence in Korea and the western Pacific area, while Carter asked for a reduction of Japanese imports to the US and a lowering of barriers for US businesses in Japan. Beneath the facade of friendly discussion lies increasing tension between dominant US imperialism and Japanese imperialism brought on by the continuing crisis of international capitalism and the uneven development of capitalist countries which gives rise to constantly changing alliances and relationships.

Behind Carter's "request" for improved trade status for US business is a growing protectionist movement in the US. At the core of this movement are those US capitalist who face increasing competition for profits from foreign imports. Recently the US International Trade Commission (ITC) said that color TV imports from Japan were hurting the domestic US electronics industry and recommended that US duties on imported color TV sets be raised from 5 to 25% for the next two years. The ITC findings were based on the fact that during the first months of 1976, imports of Japanese TV sets rose 190%. The Japanese share of the total US television market is 29%, compared with 11% last year. In the area of color television, where US industry gets 80% of its revenue, the Japanese now have 31% of the market, up from 12% a year ago. Because the Japanese sets were priced 15% and more below comparable US models, Sears

Roebuck, Wards and other large merchants began shifting their buying from US to Japanese merchandise.

The ITC also recommended quotas on imports of shoes and sugar. The ITC recommendations need presidential approval. The ITC proposal of tariffs on imported television sets followed a suit by Zenith and other US corporations charging Japanese manufacturers with dumping TV sets on the American markets at below cost prices. This charge is hotly being denied by the Japanese manufacturers.

Also joining in the hue and cry against Japanese imports are the trade union bureaucrats who head the unions in the electronic industry. These labor aristocrats formed the Committee to Preserve American Color Television (COMPACT). Like dogs following their masters, these bankrupt sell-out misleaders have embarked on a campaign of great nation chauvinism with the slogan 'America First', calling for the strict tariffs against Japanese imports. One of the unions foremost in this campaign is the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW), whose leaders are well known by the rank and file to be more on the side of the companies than the workers. In the February issue of the IBEW Local 1031 News, there was a particularly virulent and jingoist call to the workers to abandon their independent class interests and join the side of the US capitalists in their present competition with Japanese business. Using pro-imperialist scare tactics like the slogan 'America First, before there is no America', the trade union bureaucrats serve their capitalist bosses well. First, they try to draw the US proletariat's attention away from the fact that it is the contradictions inherent in capitalism itself and the intensification of labor through speed-up, forced overtime, job combinations, etc. that lead to unemployment and instead

place the blame on "foreigners". Secondly, they try to spread the ridiculous notion that the US is not in fact one of the two superpowers in the world, but instead a weak and vulnerable country at the mercy of others. They paint over the exploitation and thievery that US imperialism perpetrates through violent means on the countries of the world with the picture of the US as "a club for foreign nations...that has tried as a country to be all things to all people, and very few of these things to our own people". Through this they spread the imperialist illusion that the increased misery and hardships of the US working class is not brought on by the US imperialists, but by the generosity of the US towards other countries. In this way they try to stand reality on its head, and prepare for acceptance of imperialist war. Third, the bureaucrats try to shift the blame for the workers' worsened conditions from their own corrupt mis-leadership and class collaborationist policies to foreign competition.

In its address to the ITC, Dick Deason, the present "God-father" in the IBEW local 1031 mafia, stated, "Our union and its co-petitioners are pledged to the survival of the American TV industry." But what this bureaucrat is covering up in the interests of his capitalist masters is the fact that all the large corporations in the electronics industry have branches overseas, where they have fled in search of cheap labor and maximum profits. For example, in 1975, the majority of profits made by IBM, which totaled \$1.3 billion, were made in operations outside the US. Rockwell International Corporation, at whose Admiral Division many IBEW workers are employed, has divisions in Canada, Mexico and Taiwan. Zenith Corporation, whose president has been most vocal about "foreign competition" has plants in Canada, Mexico, Switzerland and Taiwan.

As a matter of fact, RCA Taiwan was Taiwan's largest exporter in 1975, while the subsidiaries in Taiwan of Texas Instruments, Admiral, General Instrument and Zenith Radio, all US companies, were among the top ten exporters in 1975. The bulk of RCA production in Taiwan is in the area of black and white TV manufacturing.

Items imported by US companies will have a definite advantage over their competitors if tariffs are put into effect. This is due to an escape clause under Section 807 of the 1974 Trade Act. This section stipulates that if US component parts are shipped overseas and then assembled into finished products, for example complete TV sets, the final product can then be re-imported to the US subject only to duty on the value added by the foreign operations.

US companies have been going overseas to exploit the cheap labor of workers in other countries for many years. They have also tried to use the threat of "runaway shops" in an attempt to keep the wages of US workers down - and the trade union bureaucrats who now yell so loud have never done anything about it. In May of 1975, when 1,800 electrical workers were 3 months into a 4 1/2 month long strike at a Stackpole Carbor Co. plant, Douglas Dobson, the company's president made the claim that prices of Japanese industry "are so low we can't afford to offer more to our hourly wages and stay competitive". The present outcry against Japanese industry serves the purpose of preparing for company refusals to meet workers demands for wage hikes in upcoming contract negotiations - and the bureaucrats will chime in that it is the "patriotic duty" of the workers to accept these attacks. But it must be understood that when Dobson said "stay competitive" he was

CONTINUED ON PAGE 2

INDIA: GANDHI OUT, MASS STRUGGLE CONTINUES

After 20 months of savage repression under the State of Emergency proclaimed to preserve her regime, Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister of India, was decisively defeated in parliamentary elections which began March 17. The Congress Party, which she headed, and which had been in power ever since India won independence in 1947, was also badly beaten by a coalition of forces opposed to the Gandhi dictatorship. Gandhi's defeat is a good step forward for the democratic and anti-imperialist struggle in India.

Emergency rule was a device used in 1975 by the Gandhi regime to consolidate its power just two weeks after Mrs. Gandhi was convicted by the Indian Supreme Court of corrupt election practices, and only two days after the Court had suspended her from her seat in the Indian parliament. But while the immediate cause of the State of Emergency was the Court ruling challenging her parliamentary seat, the true causes run deeper. Throughout 1974 and 1975, there were food riots in Gujarat and Bihar, and there was also a strike of 2 million railway workers broken only by the arrest of tens of thousands of trade unionists and the treachery of the revisionist party, "Communist" Party of India. In June of 1975, the month the State of Emergency was declared, famine broke out in Rajasthan

and eight other states. In Rajasthan, especially hard hit, almost 50% of the population was directly involved. Here was the "grave emergency" to the security of India, the "threatened internal disturbances". Famine caused by the pitiless exploitation of the Indian masses, popular resistance and brutal repression - these were the causes behind the State of Emergency. For 5 years prior to the Emergency, police expenditures had increased by 500%. Military expenditures outran government expenditures for agriculture by 10 to 1. Additional money was spent on paramilitary forces built up under the Gandhi regime such as the Central Reserve Police and the Border Security Police, used to crush popular uprisings, and the Industrial Security Force used for strike breaking. Non-productive spending on the state apparatus of violence required heavy tax increases and foreign borrowing. In hook to US imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, the government promoted an extortion of agricultural products from the Indian peasantry on an unprecedented scale. Resistance was met with a tradition of ferocious brutality. A former president of India admitted that during the first 13 years of independence - under the rule of the Congress Party - the number of incidents in which po-

lice fired on popular demonstrations surpassed the number during the entire period of British rule. During the first 3 years, police opened fire on 1,900 occasions killing almost 4,000 people. From 1964 to 1969, police opened fire on unarmed peaceful demonstrations 900 times, resulting in 500 deaths. During the Naxalbari uprisings in India's countryside, 12,000 revolutionaries were murdered. In 1972, police forces killed 200 youth and students protesting local corruption in Moga. In 1974, 80 people were killed during the peoples' uprisings in Gujarat. Such was the "discipline" institutionalized by Gandhi's State of Emergency.

Indira Gandhi made the mistake of attacking not only her popular but also her bourgeois opposition. With the declaration of the State of Emergency, she threw hundreds of opposition politicians into jail including members of parliament such as Mr. Desai, leader of the Janata Party and new Prime Minister. She imposed censorship on the bourgeois press which became permanent with the law of January 1976, and abolished the immunity of parliamentary proceedings. Though Parliament was supposed to have ended in March of 1976, she extended the term of office of the members of parliament in 1978 by decree.

Above all, she stepped up the oppression of the popular masses. 26 political parties were outlawed, including India's Marxist Leninist organizations - but the revisionist "Communist" Party of India, which, following the Soviet Union's lead, supported the State of Emergency, was not outlawed. She imposed a campaign of forced sterilization as a means of population control in a vain attempt to terrorize the Indian masses. She also began a demagogic campaign to groom her son Sanjay to share her political power.

Gandhi thought she could use the facade of parliamentary elections to further consolidate her rule. Choosing a time of good harvests, she thought she could prepare the ground for deepening her terrorist dictatorship by claiming a popular mandate and therefore called for elections. Few bourgeois candidates doubted she would win. However, bourgeois cynicism led to an arrogant miscalculation of the political consciousness of the popular masses. The Indian people voted decisively against the State of Emergency against forced sterilization, and against the restrictions on political and party activity imposed by the Gandhi regime.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 2

In addition, the Indian people voted against the efforts of the Soviet Union to make India a satellite state and the capitulation of the Congress Party in the face of Soviet designs. This was also clearly demonstrated by the revisionist "Communist" Party of India which lost 16 of its 23 seats in parliament.

It was the Janata Party that reaped the fruits of victory. This is a coalition of several bourgeois parliamentary groups united only in their opposition to Gandhi's regime. In a victory statement, the Janata Party proclaimed that it would immediately release political detainees (estimated at up to 30,000), lift censorship, restore parliamentary immunity, and take other measures to restore civil liberties. However, Janata did not say that it would nullify the fascist Maintenance of Internal Security Act; they did not say they would permit free party political activity, including the activity of Marxist Leninist revolutionaries. The Janata Party inherits the bourgeois state apparatus and its institutions of repression. Janata has promised nothing to bring economic and social democracy to the poor and landless peasants that make up 80% of the Indian country side. They have not promised to liquidate the special police forces built up to suppress the popular democratic resistance to bourgeois rule.

Nor are Mrs. Gandhi and the Congress Party to be forgotten. The underlying causes that justified the State of Emergency for India's ruling class still exist. Gandhi offered imperialists and social-imperialists as well as the landlords and comprador bourgeoisie order in the face of "threatened internal disturbances". As the democratic and anti-imperialist struggle of the popular masses intensifies, these forces could once again resort to the Gandhi dictatorship, imposed on the Indian people by any means necessary.

For the US imperialists, Gandhi's defeat is a good opportunity to recover lost ground and they are well pleased. Under Gandhi's regime US imperialism had lost the initiative to Soviet

social-imperialism as the Russians penetrated more and more into substantial sectors of major Indian industry. In 1971, a joint defense pact was signed between India and the Soviet Union. The defeat of Mrs. Gandhi and the Congress Party is a new opening for US and western imperialism in India to defend longstanding interests there and recapture what they have lost to Soviet encroachment. This is what is behind the hullabaloo in every bourgeois newspaper about the return of "the world's largest democracy" to the "democratic" fold. This is demagoguery pure and simple. There is little popular democracy in India and no genuine democracy for the broad masses of Indian peasants who live in feudal and semi-feudal conditions and are required to give 50 to 90% of their harvest to the rich few who own virtually all cultivatable land. The proclamation by apologists for US imperialism that "democracy" is alive and well in India is nothing but an expression of the aim of US imperialism to step up its expansion and control on the Indian sub-continent. This is exactly comparable to the Russian's imperialist chatter about the Indian path to "socialism".

Feudalism and semi-feudalism persist in the country side in India for 80% of the rural population because they are supported by imperialism and social-imperialism. In order to wage the struggle for democracy the Indian people must first of all take up the struggle against the expansionist strivings of both superpowers. The defeat of Indira Gandhi and the Congress Party provides some momentum for an upsurge in the anti-imperialist and national democratic struggle of the Indian masses.

But leadership in that struggle must be taken from the bourgeoisie. Stalin teaches that the bourgeoisie has thrown the banner of national independence overboard, selling the rights and independence of the nation for dollars. It is the communist and democratic parties representing the working masses alone who can raise the banner of democracy and independence. The defeat of Indira Gandhi restores democracy for India's bourgeois politicians. Only an arduous

struggle for a new democracy can capture genuine democracy for the broad masses of the Indian population. Only a revolutionary democratic struggle, not a parliamentary one, can abolish feudal relations in the countryside and raise the slogan "Land to the Tiller"! Only such a struggle can abolish the caste system in fact and in law, confiscate enterprises belonging to the comprador bourgeoisie, including those controlled by social imperialism, bring an end to sex and religious discrimination and ensure an eight-hour day, unemployment compensation and other measures protecting the security and wellbeing of the working masses of India.

A national democratic struggle of this sort, which alone can bring democracy to the oppressed masses of India, is a new democratic revolution and a component part of the world-wide socialist revolution. "Such a revolution" Mao says, "attacks imperialism at its very roots, and is there-

fore not tolerated but opposed by imperialism." While it clears a path for the development of national capitalism, it clears a still wider path for the development of socialism. For these reasons, the democratic struggle of the Indian masses must be guided by the science of Marxism-Leninism Mao Tsetung Thought.

The defeat of Indira Gandhi and the State of Emergency is an important victory for the Indian people. But it is a limited victory. Its most important consequence will be the impetus it gives to the broad democratic struggle of the popular masses going well beyond the limitations posed by the bourgeois democratic parties. The national democratic struggle of the Indian people is a component part of the world wide united front against imperialism and social imperialism and a force for world revolution. It is the duty of every US revolutionary to give wholehearted support to that struggle.

PALESTINE WILL WIN!

"Just folks" millionaire politician Jimmy Carter recently gained a good deal of publicity by attending a town meeting in Clinton, Massachusetts and calling for a homeland for the Palestinian people. Recent reports, without the publicity, show that he cannot talk without using both sides of his mouth. This new chief executive of US imperialism - who wants to bring "morality" to US foreign policy - is ready to sanction criminal Zionist occupation of Arab territories, illegally invaded and conquered by Israeli armies, under the guise that the "1967 borders are dead". In other words - what we knew all along - for an imperialist, aggression is the only morality. Carter thinks Israeli security requires that Israel retain territory in Sinai, on the West Bank and on the Golan Heights. And his idea of a Palestinian homeland, we find out, is under Jordanian control.

Neither Carter's phony "moral" imperialism nor the Soviet Union's phony "socialist" imperialism can extinguish the Arab revolution and the struggle of the Palestinian people for self-determination and national liberation.

Since January 1, 1965, the Palestinian people have waged armed

struggle against Zionist aggression under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization. During that time they have been tempered in bitter struggle. Time and again they have defied reactionary violence aimed at liquidating their resistance. They have persevered in struggle, overcame countless difficulties and grow strong in a just cause. Today, they are in the vanguard of the struggle of the people of the Third World against imperialism and hegemonism, and in the vanguard of world revolution. Their struggle for national liberation and independence is closely tied to the struggle of the people of the Third World and all revolutionary peoples against the counter-revolutionary ambitions of the two superpowers and against Zionist expansionism. All the Arab people, the people of the Third World and all revolutionary people of the whole world support the Palestinian cause. We staunchly affirm our total support for Palestinian self-determination, for the goal of a secular state in all of Palestine, and for the courageous armed struggle of the Palestinian people under the leadership of the PLO.

not just referring to profits, but to maximum profits. This was admitted inadvertently by a lawyer for the National Semi-conductor Corporation when he testified at hearings in June of 1976 and explained why his company was moving to Malaysia and Singapore. The US based plant, he testified, "is not losing, but the profit that it might be making is not there".

It is the search for maximum profits that drives US businesses overseas and that also motivates some US companies to push for higher tariffs. The IBEW News claimed that present free trade is "permitting the Japanese to attempt a monopoly in the US." This pretends that monopolization in the US industry has not already taken place. In fact, it is to continue the artificially high prices that the US monopolies have been able to get for their products that they are demanding tariffs against Japanese imports that are forcing prices down. In 1950, 100 US domestic and foreign firms were selling television products. This number was reduced to 38 by 1960 and to 20 at the present time. Zenith Radio, along with RCA, accounted for nearly half of all color TV sales and 40% for the black and white market. If the tariff measures go through, a US Senate subcommittee estimated that it would add \$56 to the cost of each set. And of course it is primarily the working class that would have to pay this additional cost. The corporate profits in the electronics industry, while suffering in the present crisis, have been maintaining their own. From the first to the third quarter of 1976, profits in industries connected to electrical equipment and supplies rose from \$1.8 billion to \$2.6 billion, a gain of 42%. In the first quarter of 1976, the return on capital investment in Zenith Radio was 12.3%, which was somewhat above the industry wide average of 11.5%.

There is no clear indication that the tariff measures will get presidential approval. If they do, it will be modified from the ITC recommendations.

The US government serves the interest of the entire US monopoly capitalist class - in particular its most powerful and dominant sector. It will not rush to answer the demands of one particular section when the interests of others is jeopardized. In the arena of trade, powerful capitalists oppose strong tariffs at this time for a number of reasons. First, tariffs in one sector lead to a trade war with resulting tariffs in all sectors. Monopoly capitalists who now invest and trade heavily in Europe and Japan would not like to see this happen yet. They need to get their products on these same markets. Secondly, the entire international capitalist system is still enmeshed in deep crisis. Many allies of US imperialism suffer trade deficits due to skyrocketing payment for petroleum which the US still does not face to a great extent. Limiting the imports from these countries could drive them into ruin, or into increased trade with the Third World both of these alternatives mean a radicalization and shift in the world political balance that is not in the favor of US imperialism. So they are hesitant to go along with a strong protectionist movement at this time. If the US would institute tariffs now, it would have a detrimental effect on the present attempt by the US to push for an international lowering of trade barriers at the talks going on in Geneva under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. It would also adversely effect the US bargaining position in May when the US will meet with the leaders of seven major industrial nations in London where the issue of trade will be at the top of the agenda.

The US is a dominant superpower and will attempt to bully its capitalist allies (who are also its competitors) into compliance with its policies. The present campaign of great nation chauvinism spread by US capitalists and the trade union bureaucrats is meant to build support among the American people for US imperialism's hegemonic ambitions in the midst of growing contention and competition. Support for the US capitalist in a "peaceful" trade war for markets will now lead to future support for US imperialism

in a military war for hegemony over these same world markets.

It is our duty as communists and class conscious workers to firmly oppose this campaign of great nation chauvinism. We must set forth the independent class policy of the proletariat and expose and isolate the trade union bureaucrats and their class collaborationist policies from the rank ranks of the working class movement.

In the present controversy over tariffs on Japanese imports, we must oppose these tariffs for it is in the interests of the working class for increased competition with the US monopoly capitalist class to develop through free trade. At the same time, we must fight the attempts of the US capitalist to shift the burden of the present crisis onto the backs of the US working class. But our stand is not in support

Black Worker Beaten By Police

Recently, in a glaring example of national and class oppression, a Black worker at a large International Harvester plant in the Chicago suburb of Melrose Park was nearly beaten to death by the local police. Bennie Lenard, the victim, left work at the end of 3rd shift where he works as a tractor repairman. The day was bitter cold; he had car trouble. Shortly after noon-time, with his car fixed, he became involved in a traffic accident. When the police arrived, the other driver, a white woman, accused Bennie Lenard of assaulting her. The police let the woman go and handcuffed Bennie. Bennie is 41 years old and the father of 11 children.

Bennie was thrown into the police car handcuffed, and amid racist epithets including "nigger", he was savagely beaten into unconsciousness. He was then taken to the police station where he was stripped naked and thrown into a cell. The police then opened the windows in his cell and poured cold water over his body. When his wife was finally called she found his face so swollen he could not see; he could hardly walk. Besides broken facial bones and a battered body, Bennie Lenard, according to his own doctor who examined him later, had almost frozen to death. Weeks later

of Japanese imperialism. We must oppose the efforts of US imperialism and their Japanese allies to maintain military presence in Korea and throughout the Pacific. We must build solid ties with the revolutionary working class in Japan so that our common struggle against US imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism, and all reaction can be coordinated on the principles of proletarian internationalism.

In regards to the Third World, "free trade" between imperialism and the oppressed nations is a sham. Therefore we support all trade barriers set up by the Third World countries that will guarantee their sovereignty over their national resources and lead to economic independence from superpower hegemony.

he still lies seriously injured in the hospital.

FELLOW WORKERS RESPOND

Within a couple of days a militant workers' group at the plant circulated a leaflet describing what had happened to Bennie and put forward a list of demands including the dropping of all charges and the indictment of the police for attempted murder. This caused a wave of outrage and support for Bennie Lenard to sweep the plant. At the next union meeting hundreds of workers showed up, overturned the official agenda, and passed a resolution to establish an official union defense committee for Bennie Lenard with broad powers.

Currently the Local 6 Bennie Lenard Defense Committee is attempting to rally the support of workers at other plants, other unions, groups in the Black community and revolutionary groups. This brutal attack on a fellow worker must be met with a determined and militant response. Bennie Lenard must go free and his attackers brought to justice!

Contributions are very much needed and can be sent to:

Bennie Lenard Defense Fund
c/o Seaway National Bank
645 E. 87th St.
Chicago, Illinois

BAKKE DECISION: Attack on Democratic Rights

As the capitalist class sinks deeper in the mire of its self-wrought crisis, it seeks to escape from its difficulties by intensifying its exploitation of the oppressed masses. It initiates a wave of political reaction against the working class, against women and the oppressed nationalities. On this present offensive against our democratic rights, the bourgeoisie attempts to reverse and take away many of the gains won in the past by the bitter struggles of working and oppressed people. We must be vigilant and quick to counter-attack these attempts by the bourgeoisie to squeeze out more profits through increased exploitation--in these attempts they try to use the worsened conditions they inflict on the masses to drive a wedge between the different nationalities that make up the multi-national working class, to weaken our combined strength. A good example of this focused offensive against the oppressed nationalities can be seen in the recent California Supreme Court decision on "reverse discrimination". "Reverse discrimination" is the by-line developed by the bourgeoisie where they claim laws and practices set up to counter discrimination against national minorities and women supposedly discriminate instead against white people and men. The bourgeoisie uses this argument of "reverse discrimination" to take away the hard won gains of national minorities and women and to deepen the divisions in the multi-national working class brought on by rising unemployment and cutbacks in all areas of social service and education.

THE BAKKE DECISION

On September 16, 1976, the California Supreme Court ruled that a special admissions program for minorities at the University of California's Davis Medical School was unconstitutional. This program, which was a reform born out of the mass upsurge of Blacks and students in the 1960's, allowed for 16 minority students out of a class of 100. But in response to a suit filed by Allan Bakke, a white male student who applied but was not admitted to the medical school in 1972 and 1973, the California Supreme Court ruled that this token program discriminated against white students with relatively better academic ratings. In essence, the Court ruled "... that the program, as administered by the university, violates the constitutional rights of non-minority applicants because it affords preference on the basis of race to persons who, by the University's own standards, are not as qualified for the study of medicine as non-minority applicants denied admissions."

This reactionary decision by the political servants of the capitalist class that sit on the Supreme Court of California totally ignored the past practice of the Medical School which like most universities around the country, had discriminated against minority students. In 1968, the year the medical school opened, there were no Black or Chicano medical students and the following year only one Chicano and two Blacks. Now, as the US Supreme Court has agreed to hear the case, the return to these blatant and openly discriminatory practices is threatened on a nation-wide basis.

The source of the recent attack must not be seen as the isolated court suit of an individual. The source lies in the present economic and political crisis facing the US capitalist class. The bourgeoisie and its political leaders and media heads attempt to create widespread sentiments of great nation chauvinism by belittling the severe discrimination and lack of democratic rights that the bourgeoisie perpetuates against the national minorities, as well as the national oppression against the

Black Nation in the Black-belt south. The government attempts this vicious campaign despite the evidence in its own "Report of the National Advisory Committee on Civil Disorders", published in 1968, which showed that the Black median income was 58% of the White median income, that the unemployment rate was double, and that minority school children had achievement levels three or four years behind those of whites. Now the bourgeoisie seeks, on a national basis, to attack reform quota programs that guaranteed minimal minority student access to higher education as well as access to more highly skilled jobs. In California, the directors of the University, many of whom are capitalists themselves, are willing partners in this backward drive. Even though they "fought" the case on the surface, they were in reality most cooperative. First, an admissions official at the school encouraged Bakke to file the suit and gave him access to the academic records of the minority students who were admitted. Secondly, once the case was filed, the university denied past discriminatory practices and only made the most feeble gestures to defend the program.

Reformists played a negative role. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), the National Conference of Black Lawyers (NCBL) and the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) opposed the appeal to the US Supreme Court on the grounds that the reactionary US Supreme Court would rule in favor of the decision and therefore special minority programs would be struck down all over the country, not just in California. It is correct not to promote reliance on or recourse to the courts. The Court system is one of the chief instruments of the bourgeois state apparatus which also includes the legislature, police forces, the military, prisons, etc. This apparatus is used by the capitalist class to maintain and reinforce its rule over the working class and the oppressed nationalities. The members of the Supreme Court are chosen by the chief executive of the state and approved by the Senate. The men who sit on the Court establish "law" that defends the class interests of the bourgeoisie. While it is correct not to rely on the courts for "justice", it is cowardly and illusory to fail to state the national scope of this present attack and not call for a national response. Attempting to hide this reactionary ruling in one corner of the country won't prevent the bourgeoisie from extending its attack nationwide.

In clear opposition to this gutless and liberal stand, thousands of students and revolutionary-minded people have taken up the struggle in a militant fashion. On January 15, 1977, over 400 students at UC Berkeley met to plan demonstrations and actions against the Bakke decision. The demands they agreed upon were: overturning the Bakke decision and establishing proportional admission and hiring of minorities; acknowledgement by the University of California of past and present discrimination; a reversal of the present cutbacks by increasing funds to minority students in all schools; that control over their programs by minority students themselves be strengthened; an increase in the number of women students and faculty and that this increase in funds for programs for women does not mean taking away funds from minority programs. On February 25, at the same time as demonstrations were held at other college campuses, over 2,000 people at UC Berkeley gathered to show their clear determination to get these demands answered in full. This struggle must be extended beyond California to the entire country.

NATIONAL, SEX AND CLASS DISCRIMINATION IN MEDICINE

The social inequalities spawned by the capitalist system based on the private ownership of the means of production are glaringly evident in the area of health care. In the US today, despite the fact that over \$100 billion dollars a year, close to 10% of the Gross National Product, is spent on health care nationally, actual health care delivery is criminally negligent. There is a tremendous concentration of health care for the wealthy, while for the working class and oppressed nationalities there is a tremendous lack. There is a much greater concentration of doctors and medical services in neighborhoods where the bourgeoisie and petit-bourgeoisie reside than in the ghettos, barrios and working class neighborhoods; more in the suburbs than the inner cities; more in the cities than in rural areas. A study was done that revealed the greater allocation of doctors in more affluent states as compared to poorer southern states, (where the direct oppression of the Black Belt Nation is a factor.) (The states used in the study with a higher average per capita income are California, Connecticut, Illinois, New Jersey, New York, and Massachusetts as compared to Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Tennessee and South Carolina.) The more affluent states average 160 practicing physicians per 100,000 people or almost double the 87 physicians per 100,000 people in the southern states. The difference in the number of doctors in hospital-based practice is even greater -- 46 per 100,000 as compared to 18 in the south.

Medical care in the US is based on profit, not the needs of the people. One of the results of the profit-orientation of medicine in the US is discrimination against minority and women students. Women, who make up 51% of the population, made up 6% of all medical students in 1961 and 16% in 1973. Blacks, representing approximately 12% of the national population, made up 2% of all medical students in 1961 and 6% in 1973. Also, in 1968, a study showed that while only 17% of doctors were children of craftsmen or skilled and unskilled workers, more than 31% were the children of professionals. From 1961 to 1973, the percentage of medical students from families earning the median family income (more than 50% of the population) remained at 12% - a percentage that has remained constant since 1920. The attack on education for women and minority students is part and parcel of an attack on the education of working class youth as a whole. (For example, see THE COMMUNIST Vol. II, no. 7, p.4, for an article on the scrapping of the open admissions program to City University of New York.)

The bourgeoisie's talk about "rights" in the Bakke case is a sham and a fraud. What the Supreme Court of

California focused on was the opportunity of non-minority individuals to get into medical school. What they ignored, and what must be the concern of the proletariat, is the need of minority and working class communities for medical care. Bakke will not practice in the ghettos and barrios of California. Medical students like him may be academically qualified, but don't for example, speak Spanish.

EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM SERVES CAPITALISTS

Not all minority doctors, of course, that emerge from the universities return to their communities. Higher education of any sort and especially professional education serves the interests of the capitalist state. The education that students receive has a class character that promotes the ideology of the bourgeoisie. The result is a doctor that practices where he can earn the most money. While minority admission programs do not prevent this, they do provide more favorable conditions for health care delivery in areas of the greatest need. The bourgeoisie opposed the quota systems for they would prefer students to enter as individuals purely on the basis of "academic excellence" because then they are easier to co-opt.

High grades and good test scores do not guarantee a trained professional who is dedicated to serving the interest of the oppressed. Desire to "serve the people" is certainly not an established criteria for medical school, but it should be. Working class and minority students who do not have high test scores - often due to the tracking system and other discriminatory practices in education - but who are dedicated to working hard to develop their skills and then work hard to use their skills for the benefit of the working class and oppressed nationalities will end up bringing better health care than the most "brilliant" Ivy-leaguer who is only out for his own gain.

As we fight for reforms in the educational system today and oppose the present attack on gains won in the past, we must win people to see that as long as the bourgeoisie controls state power, their corrupt and degenerate outlook will continue to dictate the character of the education our sons and daughters receive.

Only by the forceful overthrow of this class of parasites and the establishment of working class rule can we guarantee the final abolition of the present social inequalities and lack of democratic rights that are inflicted upon the working class and oppressed national minorities. Only under socialism will the slogan, "Free and quality health care is a right", be truly realized.

Subscribe To THE COMMUNIST

The WORKERS CONGRESS (MARXIST-LENINIST) is a multi-national communist organization which takes Marxism-Leninism Mao Tse tung Thought as the theoretical basis guiding its thinking.

Consistent with the plan of the Workers Congress (M-L) to fight for an ISKRA-type newspaper for the Leninist trend as the main link in the fight to prepare the conditions for a new Communist party, we call on all comrades and friends to send in topical exposures, polemics, letters, criticism and reports on their work and their use of THE COMMUNIST. Every comrade should strive particularly to develop worker correspondents as an essential means to link the newspaper with the working masses.



Subscription rates are \$4.25 per year. Please make checks and money orders payable to: Workers Congress.

The WCML can be contacted at: WC
POB 1297
Chicago, Ill.
60690

or at: WCML
POB 11713
LA, Ca. 90111

Two Line Struggle In The Trade Union Movement

As we look at the condition of the broadest organizations of the working class, the trade unions, we see two trends. On the one hand there is a general apathy widely spread among the proletariat. Capitalist countries around the world show a drop in union membership while the actual number of workers has grown ever since World War II. In the U.S. not more than 25% of all workers are organized and the figure drops to roughly 10% in the Black Belt South and less than that in the Southwest. The average for all capitalist countries is 30-40%.

We know from our daily contact with the masses in the shops, factories, hospitals, etc. that this apathy goes hand in hand with cynicism about trade unions. This is no accident. It results from the activity and stand of the reformists and revisionists that have dominated the working class movement in the U.S. and other capitalist countries. These leaders, the trade union bureaucrats and labor aristocrats, are the chief social props of the bourgeoisie within the working class. This means that they are the main obstacle toward bringing proletarian ideology to the trade unions and making the trade unions fighting organizations of the working class. Therefore, within the working class movement our main blow must be directed at these opportunists.

Amidst this apathy and cynicism there is a second and rising trend of the working class -- the trend of denunciation, exposure, and active opposition to the class collaborationist policies of the Abels, Woodcocks, Meany, Fitzsimmons, Millers, etc. which lead the trade unions. Yet this trend of opposition is still in a primitive state in the U.S. The main reason for its lack of success has been the spontaneous trend of opposition to the trade union opportunists has not been led by a Marxist Leninist line. There has been a lack of Communist work in the trade union movement by Marxist Leninists and the trade union work that has been done has been held back by the persistence of economism within our movement and our failure to take up fully a struggle against all forms of bowing to spontaneity.

We have not firmly put Communist politics in command of our trade union work and overcome the spontaneous tendencies to tail trade union politics. As we have said, a struggle against economism has begun, but it has not been fully or adequately carried out. The Sadlowski-McBride steelworker campaign is an example. Both in opposing or supporting Sadlowski, overall, the Marxist-Leninist press tended to belittle a communist view of the campaign and to fail to put out a line which would rally the advanced, unfolding propaganda and agitation that would enable us to build communist nuclei at the workplace as the primary focus of our activity at this time. (See "Debate on Sadlowski", THE COMMUNIST, Vol. III, #2 - January 27, 1977.)

If we are to get rid of capitalist exploitation once and for all, communists must step up the struggle for control of the trade unions, for we cannot win the working class to our side without winning over the trade unions. Lenin emphasizes that without the science of Marxism-Leninism the working class develops only trade union consciousness. This is the conviction that it is necessary to fight the employers, but without taking this fight beyond the boundaries of capitalism and without calling into question the political power of the bourgeoisie.

Therefore, it is fundamental that we get a firm grasp of the historical two line struggle between Marxism-Leninism and reformism and revisionism within the trade union movement. For that purpose we intend to present a series of articles reviewing TWO OPPOSING LINES IN THE WORLD TRADE UNION MOVEMENT. This book, written by Filip Kota and published by the Albanian Labor Party in 1974 makes an important contribution to our understanding of trade union work. Kota writes that the working class "can score ultimate victory over the bourgeoisie only if it is guided by a Marxist-Leninist revolutionary party which expresses the interests and aspirations of the working class and can give it working class political awareness and the force of organization to prevent it from slipping into reformism, economism and spontaneity."

The organization of workers into unions is a great victory for THE COMMUNIST/page 4

the working class. The proletariat, which came into existence with the development of capitalist production, was set in motion by the bourgeoisie to fight the forces of feudal opposition to capitalism: the landowning aristocracy, the absolute monarchy, etc. But under the guise of preventing feudal trade associations like guilds and pretending to promote the freedom of labor, any kind of union or association among workers was declared illegal. Ruthless exploitation and the denial of the most elementary rights nonetheless compelled workers to join together and fight for an improvement in their situation. As early as 1720 in England tailor apprentices let the British House of Commons know they had formed an association to demand better wages and working conditions.

But many early actions of the proletariat were isolated acts of rebellion or were misdirected. For example, workers first sought to keep machines out of production or engaged in machine-smashing, thinking that the machines were the cause of their misery. But eventually their own experience taught them its source was in the capitalists' lust for profit and in capitalist relations of production.

Initially workers' associations were a consequence of the spontaneous resistance of workers in particular trades and protected the narrow economic interests of that trade or group. Gradually they were transformed into "organs of resistance" of the working class against the bourgeoisie, with not only economic, but also political demands. Marx wrote: "The trade unions should convince the whole world that they are not fighting to further their narrow personal interests, but to free millions of oppressed people." (How does Meany measure up against that standard?)

From the outset the bourgeoisie saw that trade unions were organized centers of the working class and a menace to bourgeois social order. Therefore the capitalist class used the power of the state and all other means at its disposal to unfold a ruthless campaign of persecution and terror against the trade unions. From Rockefeller's Ludlow massacre to GM's private army to Henry Ford's goons to the attacks on the Farah strikers and the Farmworkers, the US bourgeoisie has always attempted to prevent the organization of the working class through brutal suppression. Daily experience teaches that it has not given up this tactic.

But the bourgeoisie also resorts to demagoguery and corruption. When tactics of harassment and violence fail to stop unionizing the capitalists attempt to weaken the trade union struggle by "concessions" or "reforms". Kota gives the example of Bismarck in Germany in the late 19th century. For 12 years Bismarck killed and slaughtered as many trade unionists and trade union leaders as he could. But when he realized that he could not root out their ideas without liquidating the entire working class--which was the class that produced the wealth that he and the parasites he served lived on--he changed his policies and issued laws recognizing unions, authorizing benefits like workmen's compensation and social insurance, etc. The same effort to pacify class struggle through reforms is an important activity of opportunists in our unions today like Miller, Chavez, Leon Davis, etc. who foster class collaborationist policies in the trade unions. Too often communists have tailed the reformism of these misleaders helping to divert the working class from proletarian revolutionary TRENDS AND FEATURES OF UNION DEVELOPMENT

In the last quarter of the 19th century three different forms of trade unions developed, particularly in England, France and Germany, which have influenced the trade union movement world-wide.

First, trade unions developed in England from illegal and semi-legal organizations in textiles and mining. Through growth of militant struggle laws were finally passed allowing trade union organization. In 1868 a single trade union center was set up, the Trade Union Congress (TUC), formed especially from organizations of skilled workers. Because of the economic and political power of the British ruling class gained from the intense exploitation of British workers and colonial exploitation throughout the world, the British bourgeoisie was able

to bribe leaders of the working class and privileged sectors of the workers who together formed the ranks of a labor aristocracy. As they gained control of British unions, the trade unions confined their activity to economic demands and left politics to the bourgeois liberals of the Labor Party which, Kota says, was nothing but a product of the bourgeoisified trade union movement. This relationship between the TUC and the Labor Party still exists today. Samuel Gompers, the treacherous founder of the American Federation of Labor, was born in London and brought this "pure and simple trade unionism" to the US.

The labor movement in France received a tremendous boost from the Paris Commune of 1871 where for the first time workers seized power from the bourgeoisie and tried to set up a working class dictatorship. By 1884 over 100,000 workers in France were organized. However the rate of capitalist development in France was slow, especially because the French bourgeoisie exported capital to secure maximum profits rather than invest it in France, and small scale ownership and petty production remained important. At the turn of the century the average shop in France had only 4 wage laborers and 90% of the French proletariat worked in shops of less than 10 workers. The ruined petty bourgeoisie was constantly forced into the ranks of the proletariat and brought with it the influence of petty bourgeois ideology. This was the social basis and favorable ground for anarcho-syndicalism.

Anarcho-syndicalism--which also developed in response to disillusion with reformist trade unionism--views the general strike as the highest and most radical form of struggle and thinks it can overthrow capitalism by the general strike. Anarcho-syndicalists are opposed to any form of state power, regardless of its class nature, and they put forward that the trade union can be the center of production and distribution and the basis of social reorganization: "the workshop would replace the government." The appeal of these policies is dangerous because it is based on action: strikes, sabotage, etc--all actions except the armed uprising of the working class and the establishment of the state power of the proletariat. Like the reformists, the anarcho-syndicalists deny the necessity for the political struggle of the working class and particularly of the leading role of the political party of the working class. Therefore, Lenin said, anarcho-syndicalism is the "twin brother" of reformism, its brother on the "left".

In Germany the trend of trade union pluralism developed out of the fragmentation of the trade union movement into several different currents. There were the English type of reformist trade unions and also the Christian trade unions based on religious principles and founded by the clergy in order to preach class harmony. Lasalle, an opportunist adversary of Marx, set up trade unions which neglected the economic struggle entirely and sought to work through parliament as well as to make deals with Bismarck. There were also Social Democratic trade unions that originally took a Marxist position and called for the abolition of capitalism and the use of all methods for this purpose, but these formed an alliance with the Lasallean trade unions and the merger was done at the expense of the proletarian line. These unions fell under the domination of right wing social democracy and developed a huge trade union bureaucracy rather than militant class struggle.

TWO ANTAGONISTIC LINES

In the course of the development of the trade union movement, two distinct lines have emerged: a reformist and opportunist line and a proletarian line of class struggle.

Reformism arose on the basis of a number of historical conditions which continue to play a role today. First of all, a rapid and relatively "peaceful" development of capitalism and a temporary improvement in the living conditions of the working class as shorter hours and higher wages fostered reformist illusions about the capitalist system.

Secondly, large scale capitalist production squeezed out small

producers and these were driven into the ranks of the proletariat bringing to the working class their spirit of disorganization, anarchy and vacillation as well as reformist views and illusions.

Third, the bourgeoisie bribed the privileged strata of the workers and promoted the development of a working class aristocracy. This is the social basis and main support of the bourgeoisie in the workers' movement.

Finally, the conditions of legality and the electoral successes of some "worker" parties made class collaboration the basic principle of trade union opportunists. Trade union leaders came to look on parliament as the principal arena of struggle.

The essential elements of a proletarian line were first set down by Marx and Engels. First, the goal of the trade union movement must be the final emancipation of the working class from capitalist exploitation. Marx writes:

"Trade unions work well as centers of resistance against the encroachment of capital. They fail partially from an injudicious use of their power. They fail generally from limiting themselves to a guerilla war against the effects of the present system, instead of simultaneously trying to change it, instead of using their organized forces as a lever for the final emancipation of the working class, that is to say, the ultimate abolition of the wage system." (WAGES, PRICE AND PROFITS pp.78-79, Foreign Languages Press, Peking). This means that trade unions should become organizational centers of the struggle of the working class. They should back every revolutionary movement and keep always in view the fight for complete emancipation.

A second principle of a proletarian line on trade union work is that the economic struggle of the working class must be neither exaggerated nor belittled. To exaggerate the economic struggle is to adopt a narrow trade unionist and economist view that abandons the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat. In all its work the working class must grasp that its primary struggle is the political struggle for state power and the dictatorship of the proletariat. No amount of economic gains that come about can accomplish that goal. On the other hand, to abandon the fight for the everyday economic interests of the proletariat, for the defense of the working class against the encroachments of capital is, as Marx says, to disqualify oneself for the task of leadership of the larger and more complex struggle for state power.

A third principle is the repudiation of the opportunist tenet of "trade union neutrality". This is the view which says that unions should not take up political issues, should stay out of politics and should not be under the leadership of the independent political party of the working class. It is the classical view of reformist trade union leaders like Gompers and is always spread by opportunists. But Lenin points out that no social organization is above politics. Each serves a particular class and reflects the ideology, organization and politics of a particular class. What these opportunists really mean when they say that the trade unions should remain neutral and stay above politics, is that there should be no communist ideology in the trade unions, only bourgeois ideology, and no politics of class struggle, only the politics of class collaboration. They certainly don't mean that they want to stay aloof from bourgeois parties which they grovel to support.

This leads to a fourth principle of a proletarian line on the trade unions. It is not the trade unions, but the political party of the proletariat, its communist party, that is the highest form of organization of the working class. Trade union organizations should be subordinate to the leadership of the party and function as a means to link the party with the working masses. From this it follows that the primary form of class organization at the workplace is not the trade union or the rank and file caucus, but the party cell or factory nuclei.

TO BE CONTINUED