

political affairs

JOURNAL OF MARXIST THOUGHT

SEPTEMBER 1978

\$1.00

**Communist Party: A Product of
History** **Gus Hall**

Time for a Shorter Work Day
Hy Climber

West Coast Longshore Pact
Albert J. Lima & Archie Brown

**World Trade Union Unity—the
Long March** **D. Donati**

**CPUSA and the Anti-nuclear
Movement** **Gary Small**



political affairs

Theoretical Journal of the Communist Party, USA

Volume LVII, No. 9 September 1978

EDITORIAL COMMENT

Gus Hall

The Communist Party: A Product of History 1

Editorial Comment

Twenty Years of *World Marxist Review* 4

ARTICLES

Hy Climber

Time for a Shorter Work Day 5

Albert J. Lima and Archie Brown

West Coast Longshore Agreement 10

D. Donati

World Trade Union Unity—the Long March 17

Gary Small

The Communist Party and the Anti-nuclear Movement 22

Herbert Aptheker

Imperialism's Intelligence 27

William Pomeroy

Independence and Destabilization in the Philippines 30

COMMUNICATIONS

Paul J. Nyden

On the Coal Strike 39

Claus Weber

A Note on Lenin's Letter to American Workers 39

BOOK REVIEWS

Ben Levine 40

Political Affairs is published monthly by Political Affairs Publishers, Inc. at 235 West 23 Street, New York, New York 10011, to whom all orders, subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be addressed. Subscription rates: \$10 for one year; \$5 for six months; foreign subscriptions, including Canada, \$11 for one year; single issues, \$1. Second class postage paid at the post office in New York, New York. Phone (212) 620-3020.

From the Editors to You

As we go to press with the September issue we are receiving most encouraging reports on the circulation of our August steel issue (printing: 13,000).

The 8,000 additional copies over our normal circulation have gone into the major steel centers. Together with that, 15,000 copies of a special leaflet addressed to steel workers announcing the steel issue are being distributed at the mills in towns in all regions of the country.

By now over 700 steel workers have received sample copies of this issue by mail, sent by fellow steel workers and neighbors who are already regular subscribers and supporters of PA.

Over 2,000 delegates to the USWA convention to be held in Atlantic City will get a sample copy of this issue when entering the convention hall on Sept. 17.

Many of our supporters in steel towns have raised money and arranged to advertise this issue in widely-read local newspapers. Just this morning we received word that such an ad will appear in the *Simoni Beaver County Times*, which covers an area encompassing Aliquippa (10,000 workers), Crucible Steel (5,000), American Bridge (2,000) and numerous other plants. Similarly in Western Pennsylvania, an ad will appear in the *McKeesport Daily News*.

From Cleveland, Ohio, the Communist Party reports that PA readers in a number of steel towns have signed contracts for advertising the special steel issue, including in the *Youngstown Vindicator*, the *Warren Tribune*, *Lorain Journal*, *Cleveland Call and Post* (a Black newspaper). The personal column of the *Cleveland Plain Dealer* also ran an announcement of the issue for five days.

We extend our heartfelt thanks to all of the friends whose efforts and financial contributions have so dramatically aided in putting before many thousands of workers searching for fundamental explanations and effective means of struggle this message of class struggle, unity, the fruitfulness of Marxist-Leninist thinking.

We would welcome hearing from other readers who in similar or original ways can help to reach new circles of workers.

EDITORIAL BOARD

Gus Hall, *Editor*

Barry Cohen, *Associate Editor*

Joseph Brandt, *Managing Editor*

James E. Jackson

Daniel Mason

Daniel Rubin

Betty Smith

The Communist Party: A Product of History

EDITORIAL COMMENT
GUS HALL

The turn of the twentieth century marked more than the elapse of another hundred years. It was above all else the beginning of a stormy, explosive century of revolutionary change. History had prepared the soil, molded the forces and set the direction for the historic changes. The changes and the events that have taken place since the turn of the century are truly monumental. But they are in keeping with Karl Marx's observation that mankind sets for itself only those tasks that it can fulfill.

In past centuries wars ended in the redistribution of territory and markets. The results of the First World War were different because history had matured a new force, the working class, whose class interests were not served by wars of conquest.

Before the turn of the century the idea of taking political power had not yet become a serious mass concept in the ranks of the working class. Because of this, history gave rise to socialist-oriented parties that toyed with the ideas of working-class political power. When the world moved towards the inevitable war to redivide the loot among the imperialist powers these parties did not meet the test of time. History had prepared the soil for revolutionary changes and they were not revolutionary parties. They were parties only for reform. The explosive elements associated with the transition from a world of capitalism to a world of socialism were building up steam. Sooner or later something had to give way. History posed the question of working-class political power for resolution.

The end product of the First World War was different because history had given birth to and raised to maturity a new force, the working class, and assigned it the task of leading the forces of transition. So the new century brought forth the "ten days that shook the world." The transition had begun. The working class in Russia, in alliance with other forces, took political power. They named their new state the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Gus Hall is general secretary of the Communist Party, USA.

With the turn of the century history had set into motion a worldwide revolutionary process in which the transition to socialism was the pivot. From the very beginning the class struggle and the working class forces in the capitalist countries became a primary force within this historic process. An inevitable feature of the revolutionary process is the worldwide struggle against colonialism and for the liberation of all nations. On the waves of the three currents propelling the world revolutionary process ride the fortunes of human progress. Because racism and chauvinism have been an ideological pillar in the oppression of nations the struggle against racism and chauvinism emerged in the very center of the revolutionary process. The struggles that accompany the process cut down many of the weeds of racism, but only the transition to socialism destroys its economic, political and ideological roots.

No revolutionary class in this epoch can come to power or fulfill its role in history without a political party that understands the historic tasks assigned it. So inevitably as the working class grew in size, as it cut its ideological wisdom teeth, it faced the tasks of organizing, of giving birth to political parties that would meet the test of leadership for the period of the revolutionary transition. There was also a need for a body of thought, a science that would probe and explain the laws, the inner workings and the forces involved in the transition. It is in this basic sense that the science called Marxism-Leninism and the working-class revolutionary parties (most of which include the word "Communist" in their names), are products of history. They are a response to the unique tasks set for this period of revolutionary change.

The world revolutionary process and history in general have a definite progressive direction. But as is the case with all processes it does not move with the same speed or in the identical way in all the countries of the world. However, no country is exempt from the process itself.

Because of a number of objective factors capitalism in the United States has had the benefit of favorable circumstances. This has been a factor influencing many developments, including the growth and maturing of the working-class movement. But the U.S. is not immune from the basic laws of capitalist development, including the laws of its general decay.

In the United States the new century gave rise to the growth of mass production and the giant corporations. This was accompanied by brutal exploitation—a 12-hour day, total disregard for the health of workers, child labor and inhuman speedup paced by the production belt line. It soon turned into the century of high corporate profits, escalating rates of exploitation, dehumanization and alienation. This gave rise to the organization and legalization of trade unions. William Z. Foster, who was later to become a leader in the Communist Party, was a key personality in these early drives to build the trade unions.

The objective developments continued to give rise to many different kinds of radical and socialist-oriented groups. The frustrations led some to establish communes. They tried to get away from the evils of capitalism in isolated enclaves. They were crushed by the capitalist surroundings. This rebellion led some to anarchist and syndicalist organizations. They took their anger out on a one-to-one basis.

There were a number of socialist organizations which did not see socialism as a practical alternative in the United States. So for many it remained a beautiful idealistic dream.

These formations did not meet the challenges history was preparing. The struggles for the resolution of the problems the working class faced needed a different kind of political party. Of necessity, it had to be a party that understood and accepted the task of working with and guiding the spontaneous mass movements which objective developments were giving rise to. It had to be a party that accepted the class struggle as its primary point of reference, but also understood how it is related to the problems and struggles of all sections of the people. It had to be a party that would be in the very forefront of all the struggles for reforms, but would reject reformism as a way of political life.

It had to be a party that understood that the struggle against racism was a special task for a working-class party, but that it also had to be a part of all struggles, especially the struggles related to the class struggle. It had to be a party that took a principled stand against imperialism, and accepted as its acid test the struggle against U.S. imperialism.

It had to be a party that understood the dialectical relationship between fighting for a better life under capitalism and the advocacy and the struggle for the transition to socialism. It had to be a party that did not opportunistically succumb to the ideological pressures of big business, a party that saw slander of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries as basically a slander of the working class and of socialism in general.

It had to be a party that understood and accepted the science of Marxism-Leninism and that continued to develop it as a guide and a methodology for its work. It had to be a party that was democratic, but with a structure through which it could come to policy and tactical conclusions.

Fifty-nine years ago a group of men and women who had participated in most of the radical and Left organizations, who had studied the experiences of world revolutionary developments, got together and gave birth to just such a party.

The Communist Party, USA, and the men and women who participated in its founding, were products of the same history, the same worldwide revolutionary process, that had given rise to working class revolutionary parties the world over. It is in this sense that the founding of the Communist Party, USA, is the finest achievement of the U.S. working class.

The rise and the disappearance of "Left" and "radical" sects continues apace. Many of these groups attach themselves to such words as "Communist" and "Marxist-Leninist." But such groups come and go because they do not meet the test of history or reality. There is an opportunist streak that runs through most of them. They try to maneuver with and go around the main political and ideological attacks of the class enemy. They join with reaction by being anti-Communist. The special Trotskyite accommodation with anti-Communism is to say they are for socialism in general, but to attack it wherever it is a reality. Anti-Sovietism is a

special opportunistic hiding place for most of these groups.

Most of them maneuver with and accommodate to racism. The latest maneuver is to say: "The basic struggle against racism has been won." Therefore, the conclusion that there is no need to ever raise the issue. For some these groups provide a place to express their individualistic, middle class anger. Many are honest but misled. In many cases they are lost to the revolutionary movement. These sects do not meet the test of history because they do not accept or understand the laws of capitalist development, the class struggles and the role of the working class. Their anti-Communism, anti-Sovietism and their playing with super-radical phrases make them an easy mark for penetration by the FBI and other enemy agents. Some of these groups are used by the FBI to disrupt broader mass movements.

The science of Marxism-Leninism provides the Communist Party with an understanding of the laws, the forces and the direction of this period of history.

The Communist Party, USA, grows and matures, but it never gets old because it continues to reflect and work with the forces of a changing reality. It makes contributions, takes part in and helps to guide the spontaneous movements which the changing objective developments give rise to.

The Communist Party can be proud of its 59 years of contributions. It has been a major factor in the building of our trade unions. It was the main force in the organization of the mass production unions. It was the spark plug in the struggles for social security, for unemployment insurance. It has a 59 year record in the struggle against racism. It has been a leading force in the struggle for equality of women. It has continued to provide the anti-imperialist content to all struggles for world peace. It has an honorable record in the struggles of family farmers. It has provided leadership in the struggle for democratic rights and against the ultra-Right and fascism. It survived the years of McCarthyite,

anti-Communist hysteria.

The Communist Party has not only survived, but continues to influence events because it is a product of and is sustained by the working class and the people's struggles in the U.S. The objective developments gave it life and they sustain it. The need for it grows, and because of this the Communist Party grows. There are serious unsolved problems, but there has been more bread, more justice, more democratic and civil rights, better working conditions, higher wages, more housing, social security and unemployment insurance because of the contributions of the Communist Party.

The primary factor that influences everything in a capitalist society is the class struggle. On the world scene this factor is reflected in the contest between the two systems—capitalism and socialism. These forces of history do not permit any real neutrality. Even political passivity becomes a factor on the scales between the two basic class forces. The Communist Party, USA, accepts that challenge. It does not evade or capitulate; it carries out its responsibilities proudly and honorably.

The historic transition has basically changed the world relationship of forces. World imperialism is not now the unchallenged master. Because of this many new avenues and possibilities along which the transition can proceed have opened up. Wars of conquest are not now inevitable. New paths to socialism have become possible. Colonialism can now be destroyed for all time. Human progress can now take even bigger steps.

To make these possibilities a reality it is necessary to fight for the unity of the forces propelling the world revolutionary process. The struggle for world peace and detente must get top billing, the highest priority. The Communist Party, USA, accepts this challenge.

The Communist Party begins its 60th year confident that because it is a product of the rising forces of history it will continue to make history.

Twenty Years of World Marxist Review

This September the magazine *World Marxist Review* (Problems of Peace and Socialism) celebrates its twentieth anniversary. Two decades is a brief historical span, but in this period *WMR* has made a unique contribution to the development of the most decisive movement of our time: the Communist and working-class movement.

WMR's special character begins with its absolutely unprecedented method of production. As the theoretical and information journal of the world's Communist and Workers' Parties, it embodies in its staff, writers, collaborators and distributors the lofty internationalist ideals of Marxism-Leninism. Over the past twenty years the number of fraternal Parties represented on the Editorial Council (the governing body) has grown from 20 to 57. Twenty additional Parties maintain close ties in other forms with the journal. The number of national editions has grown from 27 to 57. The journal is now translated into 34 languages and is read in 145 countries.

The CPUSA has supported and participated in the work of *WMR* from its inception. We at *Political Affairs* especially appreciate the possibilities of cooperation in our common tasks. Many of our authors are also published in *WMR*, and our readers will appreciate that it in turn is an invaluable source of information on the activities and views of the revolutionary forces on every continent.

WMR has an extensive program of writing on the most topical problems: forms and means of the transition to socialism; the construction of a mature socialist society and the tasks of building communism; safeguarding peace strengthening detente; problems of the national liberation movement; the consolidation of a broad alliance against imperialism and monopoly; the strengthening of democracy.

Contributors include prominent leaders of the Communist movement, other progressive personali-

ties, leaders of broad organizations and social scientists.

WMR sponsors the activities of research groups and teams, makes on-the-spot investigations of various problems, conducts international symposiums, conferences and roundtables. Results of all such activities enrich the contents of its pages.

It publishes, in addition, a regular *Information Bulletin* which reprints important documents from the fraternal parties congresses, meetings and press.

WMR must be considered, therefore, to make an invaluable contribution to popularizing, developing and defending the ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin. Specially noteworthy is its role in the struggle against the influences of bourgeois ideology. Many of the activities held under the aegis of *WMR* have studied contemporary anti-Communist and reactionary ideology; its means of dissemination, its content, and its stepped up use by imperialism as part of the intensification of the ideological struggle between the two world systems. Not only the people of different countries, the Communist Parties themselves are the objects of such hostile activities. This is only one of the many ways in which the journal promotes the cohesion of the international Communist and workers' movement.

From the time of the publication of the *Communist Manifesto*, 130 years ago, scientific socialism has developed by drawing on the experience of the workers' movement in various countries. As Marxism-Leninism takes firm root in ever more countries, guides the construction of socialism in additional states, broadens its influence among the working class and people, the role of a journal such as *WMR* in facilitating exchange of experiences, elaborating solutions to common problems and knitting closer ideological unity can be expected to grow sharply.

Time for a Shorter Work Day

HY CLIMBER

The creation of a normal working day, is, therefore, the product of a protracted civil war, more or less dissembled, between the capitalist class and the working-class.

—Karl Marx, *Capital*. Vol. I

On May 18, 1882, Peter J. McGuire, the socialist general secretary of the Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, introduced a resolution in the Central Labor Union of New York City recommending that the first Monday of September “be set aside as a festive day (for) a parade through the streets of the city.” His proposal was accepted and 30,000 marched in the first Labor Day parade in New York City on September 5, 1882.

The second Labor Day was celebrated in New York in 1883 and by September 1, 1884, workers in a number of cities in several states responded to the call of the New York Central Labor Union to celebrate Labor Day as a “universal holiday for workingmen.”

The first national organization to call for a day to be set aside for a national celebration by labor was the Federation of Organized Trades and Labor Unions, the forerunner of the AFL. Their resolution, adopted in convention in 1884 (this was the same convention that set May 1, 1886, as the day of “a universal strike for a working day of 8 (or 9) hours”) demanded “That the first Monday in September of each year be set apart as labor’s national holiday” and resulted in the first national—although as yet, unofficial—observance of Labor Day on September 7, 1885. In 1894, Amos Cummings, a New York Congressman who was also a member of Typographical Union No. 6, introduced a bill in Congress to establish the first Monday in September as Labor Day. It was adopted on June 28, 1894 and signed by President Cleveland on the same day.

From the beginning the central theme of Labor Day celebrations was the call for the 8-hour day. Although May 1 has since become more closely identified with the 8-hour struggle, Labor Day has, none the less, an important place in the history of the movement for shorter hours.

Hy Climber is an active rank and file trade unionist.

Labor Day 1978 comes at a time when technological unemployment continues its upward pressure and when a renewed movement aimed at reducing the hours of labor is developing throughout the capitalist world.

In April the question of shorter hours was at the center of a day of coordinated strikes and demonstrations as workers throughout Western Europe took action to back up their demand for jobs. Less than a week later, the First National All Unions Conference to Shorten the Work Week convened in Dearborn, Michigan. At about the same time, the Canadian Congress of Labor put the 32-hour week at the top of that organization’s list of social and economic demands. More recently, Belgian steel workers struck for a list of demands that included an immediate reduction in the work week to 38 hours with a 36-hour week to follow within two years. Clearly, new battles are underway in Marx’s “protracted civil war.”

By the early 1940’s collective bargaining had established the now standard 40-hour week and 8-hour day. After that the movement petered out and, the campaign for shorter hours has lain dormant for 40 years.

Communists have been active participants in campaigns to reduce the hours of labor since the earliest days of the First International. This struggle lies at the very heart of class-struggle trade unionism, a fact underscored by a declaration of the International Working Men’s Association that “the limitation of the working day is a preliminary condition without which all further attempts at improvement and emancipation must prove abortive.” Nor has the situation changed. To give leadership to this struggle today, to help initiate and organize campaigns and to help build movements and organizations to renew the battle for shorter hours are important challenges to Communists and progressives today.

The recent formation of the All Unions Committee to Shorten the Work Week marks an important step in the campaign to renew the movement for shorter hours. The success or failure of this effort will influence the course of events in the U.S. labor movement on many fronts.

By any standard, the First National All Unions Conference to Shorten the Work Week was an outstanding success. Initiated by the All Unions Committee and endorsed by 70-plus local unions and labor organizations, the Conference was attended by more than 750 delegates from more than 200 local unions. Delegates came from 24 states and the District of Columbia and represented nearly a million members of 24 national and international unions.

Nearly half of the locals and slightly more than half of the delegates came from the United Automobile Workers, in part explained by the fact the All Unions Committee to Shorten the Work Week is headed by Frank Runnels, who is also president of a large UAW local. (Runnels, five-times president of the 12,000 member Cadillac Local, has built a substantial following within UAW ranks as a leader of the UAW Shorter Work Week Committee.) Another factor contributing to the large UAW contingent was the well-advertised fact that UAW President Douglas Fraser would be one of the speakers.

However, the Conference was broadly based and was representative of the key unions in basic mass-production industry. A quick count shows 24 locals from the United Steel Workers, which, together with a number of locals from the United Electrical Workers, accounts for the three largest groups of participating locals. Delegates from the Retail Clerks; the Amalgamated Meat Cutters; the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers; the International Association of Machinists; the Communication Workers; the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union; the International Longshoremen's Association; and from the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees round out the list of important unions attending the Conference. About a quarter of the delegates were Black, a bare handful were Spanish surnamed and about 10 per cent were women. (The rules of the Conference stipulated that those

who attended had to be certified by an "official labor organization" and required payment of a registration fee of \$25.00 per delegate.)

Besides Runnels and Fraser, speakers included Albert Fitzgerald, general president of the United Electrical Workers; William Marshall, president of the Michigan State AFL-CIO and two district directors from the United Steel Workers: James Balanoff from District 31, based in the Chicago-Gary area and Charles G. Younglove from District 29 in Detroit.

John Conyers, Jr., representative from the first Congressional District of Michigan was special guest speaker and he used the podium at the conference to announce that he had introduced HR-11784, a series of amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act that outlaw forced overtime and establish a 35-hour week in the course of four years by increasing the penalty for overtime to double time and applying that new rate first to those hours in excess of 37-1/2 hours per week and then, two years later, to all hours in excess of 35 hours per week.

The Conference adopted a plan of action, established a minimum structure and elected a leadership, including 25 members of a 50-member National Steering Committee to implement the decisions agreed to at the Conference.

Several factors account for the success of the All Unions Conference and attest to the correctness of last summer's decision by a number of local union leaders to launch the campaign to reduce the hours of labor:

- 1) In industry after industry and in union after union there is a growing resentment at forced overtime and a consequent willingness to struggle on this question.
- 2) The adverse impact of high levels of unemployment on all other trade union problems has brought with it a renewed interest and understanding of the potential of a shorter work week as the best way to protect and create jobs and reduce unemployment.
- 3) There is a growing recognition on the part of an increasing number of lower-level union leaders that no significant process toward reducing the work week can or will take place unless an independent movement is built.

4) The recent emergence of Center forces in the ranks of the top labor leadership has served to open the doors to this question and to the possibility of independent initiatives.

Despite the existence of a number of problems including time, inexperience and lack of staff, conference organizers succeeded in making important contributions by raising the question of shorter hours in official circles of the labor movement. More than that, their initiative made it possible for others to help.

- 1) Four international unions—the United Automobile Workers, the United Electrical Workers, the Retail Clerks and the International Association of Machinists—made some effort to promote the conference among their own locals. Key members of the international executive boards of the Steel Workers and the Meat Cutters also helped.
- 2) In the weeks before the April Conference, Runnels was the featured speaker at specially arranged meetings in New York, Philadelphia and Jacksonville, Fla.
- 3) The executive officers of every international union were mailed copies of the Call as were the officers of all 50 State AFL-CIO Councils and 150 major city/county central labor bodies.

The All Unions Committee to Shorten the Work Week was founded last October. Its leadership, reaffirmed and broadened at Dearborn in April, is made up of local union officers who are, in the main, leaders of large locals in key unions representing workers in basic industrial unions and holding contracts with some of the largest corporations. Three of the members of the Executive Committee (consisting of the named officers and operating as the functional leadership of the national steering committee) are Black, two are women and one is of Spanish descent. William Andrews, the only Black to head a basic steel local and president of the 17,000-member Inland Steel Local 1010, is Executive Vice President of the Committee. Other officers come from the Meat Cutters, the United Electrical Workers, the International Association of Machinists, the Retail Clerks, the United Paper Workers, the National Union of Hospital Workers and the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees.

In its Statement of Principles, the Committee says that its purpose is to:

Help initiate, develop and coordinate in every local union, a national movement to create jobs by reducing the hours of labor through the processes of education . . . legislation and collective bargaining.

In other material issued prior to the Dearborn Conference and reiterated by Runnels in his keynote speech, the Committee says that:

It is not our intention to tell any union how their program [to win a shorter work week] should work—nor is it our intention for this movement to become involved in inner-union politics.

The need for an independent organization, *based in the formal structure of the labor movement and led by established leaders who are willing to act independently on the basis of the issue of shorter hours*, is affirmed by history and re-affirmed by today's reality. Few can disagree with Runnels when he told the April 11 Conference:

The very nature of our labor movement makes an independent organization necessary.

No single union can concentrate its energy exclusively on the issue of shorter hours. No single union can coordinate the effort to build a national movement. No single union can win a reduction of hours for all workers. No single union can win legislation to extend a reduction of hours to the unorganized workers of our country.

All of these problems are multiplied by virtue of the fact that there is no single trade union center in the United States today.

Therefore, a new organization is required in order to fire the imagination and unleash the strength of the entire labor movement and to lead the next round in the struggle for shorter hours.

The All Unions Committee is not, it can not be, it will not be the only organization that will come into existence as the shorter hour movement grows. But neither the All Unions Committee nor the broader movement, with its other organized centers, will be built by ill-advised attempts "to hasten the process" that outflank the Committee, either by

going over the heads or behind the backs of its leadership.

The need to strengthen the All Unions Committee in ways that will enable it to become an umbrella over a much broader movement is one of the pressing immediate political tasks of the shorter hours movement. The need to consolidate its leadership (and to help give that leadership confidence), the need to broaden the organized base of the Committee and to help it take other initiatives to expand its mass following will be a complicated, often time-consuming, sometimes frustrating and *absolutely necessary* process in the politics of re-building a new movement for shorter hours.

To think that it will be (or could be) otherwise is to fly in the face of reality. It is to ignore the tragedy of a quarter-century in the history of the U.S. labor movement that saw the policies of class-collaborationism hold almost unchallenged sway. It is to forget that, with but notable exception, no major Left-Center initiative has been undertaken in the labor movement for at least a generation and that those who have launched the All Unions Committee to Shorten the Work Week will be forced to relearn a number of things.

As Communists and other progressives become even more deeply involved in the campaign for shorter hours, it would be well that they remind themselves of Comrade Hall's report to the June 1977 meeting of the National Council/Central Committee. In arguing that a coalition of Left and Center forces was an absolute precondition to any successful struggle to turn back Corporate America's offensive against the working class, Comrade Hall defined the Center as being represented by "those who have broken with the worst features of class-collaborationism." And both he and Comrade Meyers warned of the need for patience and consistency in the work of building a Left-Center coalition.

True, the All Unions Conference represented a certain level of independence and was made possible by a measure of Left-Center unity and initiative. But few in the leadership of the All Unions Committee to Shorten the Work Week and an even smaller percentage of those who attended the Conference are prepared to move very far beyond re-

affirming the stated position of their international unions. When it comes to ongoing activity, when it comes to something more than attending a conference, then even fewer local union leaders are going to move in directions that run counter to the positions of those who lead their unions. And make no mistake: few in the ranks of the top leadership of the U.S. labor movement are going to encourage independent mobilization of the rank and file, even on an issue as central to resolving today's problems as is the question of shorter hours. Therefore the challenge to Communists and others on the Left: To carefully and patiently build the movement for shorter hours at every level of the labor movement.

In practice, this means that all who would build the movement for shorter hours should help bring into being one or another kind of city-based committee that can become a center of operations for developing specific campaigns in support of the program of the All Unions Committee. Although these city-wide committees may or may not become "affiliates" of the All Unions Committee, it is certainly possible—and even desirable—that they coordinate their activities with the All Unions Committee.

Eventually, the shorter hours campaign will be conducted on both the legislative and collective bargaining fronts. However, at this stage of the game most trade unionists will find it easier to plug into the campaign to support HR-11784. This legislation can well become the issue that will focus attention on shorter hours at all levels of the labor movement. Although it was slow in getting started, a petition campaign to support HR-11784 is underway in a number of local unions that participated in the April 11 Conference. Additional petitions are available from the All Unions Committee, 4800 Michigan Avenue, Detroit, 48210.

A well-thought out approach to building a shorter hours campaign in a given city will consider a number of possibilities. Congressman Conyers' office (Rayburn Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20225) will gladly provide copies of HR-11784, thus making it rather easy to begin the process of getting a local union on record in support of the legislation. From there a number of options come to mind: endorsement by a central labor council (as has been

done in the Alameda County Council and in the Greater New York Council), endorsement by a state federation convention (as has been done in Indiana, Iowa and California), or by an international convention (District No. 31, Steel Workers, is an example) or other labor gatherings can endorse the legislation (as was done at the Memphis Convention of the Coalition of Black Trade Unionists). To the extent that these actions can be publicized and coordinated by the All Unions Committee, to that extent will the formation of city-wide committees be hastened and the general movement built.

Other activities on the shorter hours front include organizing delegations of trade unionists from local unions to meet with members of Congress in an effort to get additional sponsors for HR-11784. That 1978 is an election year should not be overlooked in the search for ways to generate new support for shorter hours legislation.

The campaign for shorter hours should not be limited solely to legislation at the national level, although revision of the Fair Labor Standards Act is a must for the campaign to bear full fruit. Already six states have considered or are considering legislation that would impose limits on compulsory overtime. Although the legislation has failed everywhere that it has been introduced—Washington, Oregon, California, Rhode Island, Pennsylvania and Michigan—the recent struggle around the Bates Bill in California shows the magnitude of the struggle that the movement for shorter hours must eventually develop.

In addition to bans on or limits to compulsory overtime, legislation reducing hours of labor have been introduced in both the Illinois and the New York general assemblies. As introduced, the Illinois legislation would impose a 32-hour work week for all employees and in New York, the proposed legislation would set a 35-hour week for most employees, with an increase in the overtime penalty to double time for these same workers.

Any organization that attempts to chart new ground will be tugged in many directions and attacked from every direction. Some will try to destroy the organizations and stamp out the movement, others will attempt to co-opt and mislead it and already, in its brief history, the All Unions Committee has been subjected to all of this.

From the beginning, most in the ranks of the labor leadership ignored it. Lloyd McBride, despite many pleas, refused to participate and later, at a meeting of staffers in Denver, attacked the Committee and the April 11 Conference as being “unrepresentative” and suggested Hawkins-Humphrey as the legislative approach to government.

Although all of the “Left” sects claimed to have supported the April 11 Conference and while, by and large, their reports of the Conference tended to be rather “straight up” and factual, the *National Guardian* has continued its role as the FBI on the “Left” with an article saying that “only the revisionist Communist Party USA has any influence in the leadership of the All Unions Committee” adding that several of the officers have a long history of co-operation with the Party and its causes.

So far, none in the leadership of the Committee have retreated in the face of this attack although we can expect the campaign of red-baiting and slander to pick up as the work develops.

Thus, the two-sided law of struggle, with its difficulties and its new opportunities, operates in the shorter hours movement. And, in that situation, Communists must do more than help solve the many tactical problems that arise and will arise in the course of building the movement, important as that is. We must gear ourselves to the new opportunities that involvement in this work will present as larger sections of the working class and trade union movement are drawn into a struggle that, as it succeeds, will deny absolute surplus value to Corporate America.

These battles, be they the fight within a given union to ban forced overtime or a co-ordinated effort by several local unions to force a labor-backed member of Congress to become a sponsor of HR-11784, are bound to create new opportunities for rank-and-file initiative; they are bound to provide new opportunities for greater Left influence; they are bound to require a higher level of Left-Center unity.

Most importantly, the campaign for shorter hours opens up new opportunities to develop affirmative action programs and requires special attention in helping the All Unions Committee

West Coast Longshore Agreement

ARCHIE BROWN and ALBERT J. LIMA

In a startling and most satisfying development, the White House and the State Department announced last spring that a shipment of armaments to fascist Chile was being cancelled and that all arms "in the pipeline" would be held up pending review.

Many factors contributed to this development, including the Letelier-Moffatt murders by fascist DINA agents operating in the U.S. and the deteriorating economic situation in Chile which has cast doubt on private bank loan repayments to U.S. financiers. But the trigger for the cancellation of the arms shipment was the adamant refusal by San Francisco longshoremen to load war materials—a refusal backed up by the International union. James Herman, newly elected ILWU President, said at the time: "We wanted to demonstrate our unwillingness to be a party to the shipment of goods which will be used, directly or indirectly, to strengthen a regime responsible for the death, imprisonment, or disappearance of many thousands of its own citizens, including many workers and trade union leaders. We also want to show our support for the Chilean labor movement, which was once among the most vital and progressive in the world, and which has been cut to shreds by the junta."

Support for the ILWU action came from the AFL-CIO, the National Maritime Union and the International Longshoremen's Association (ILA), plus a large number of churches, people's groups of all kinds and elected officials including Sens. Edward Kennedy and Alan Cranston and Reps. Ron Dellums, Phillip Burton, John Burton and others. A follow-up "Conference on the Future of U.S.-Chile Relations" in July was supported by such union leaders as Thomas Gleason, ILA President; Charles Perlik, President of the Newspaper Guild; and William Wimpisinger, President of the International Association of Machinists.

This action takes place in the context of rapidly growing support, at all levels of the trade union

movement, for such positive programs as the Transfer Amendment and the Shorter Work Week campaign. These steps form the basis for united work with Center (and even right of Center) forces in secondary and top leadership along with the rank and file and the Left, including the Communists. Such united work is part of the building of Left-Center unity.

Yet around questions of the unions' economic demands, especially as contracts expire and negotiations and possible strike action become the order of the day, a falling out occurs, in varying degrees, between these Center forces and large sections of the rank and file who, together with the Left, work for a more advanced economic program. Although it is not always spelled out, the crucial difference has to do with how to meet the onslaught of the employers, who increasingly use automation, mechanization, and speedup—as well as political and legislative measures—to "capture," weaken or destroy the unions. This article will examine how the recent ILWU Longshore Division negotiations reflect these important differences.

On August 1, 1978, the ILWU announced that the membership of the Longshore Division up and down the West Coast had ratified the new proposed contract by a majority of some 69 per cent. This exceeded the two thirds majority required, under the ILWU's advanced democratic procedures, to override a "veto" which any major port can exercise by rejecting a proposed contract. Thus, although Local 10 in San Francisco voted the proposal down, coastwide it was accepted nevertheless.

The membership and officers of Local 10, as well as the officers of Local 13 (Wilmington-San Pedro—the largest longshore local) and the Executive Board of Local 19 (Seattle) by a 15-6 majority, had urged rejection of the contract, as did some smaller locals. Yet when the Negotiating Committee submitted the proposal to the Coast Caucus—official delegated body representing all locals on a weighted-vote basis—that Caucus voted 65-32 in favor of acceptance by the membership, though the

Albert J. Lima is district organizer, northern California CPUSA.
Archie Brown is a rank and file activist in Local 10, ILWU.

San Francisco Caucus delegates voted 7-4 against, San Pedro 7-3 against, and Seattle's delegates only 3-2 in favor.

In the course of this process, a significant difference developed between the leadership of the International Union, on the one hand, and the Left and all those who opposed the contract, on the other. To understand these differences it is necessary to review some of the ILWU's recent history.

Accommodation or Class Struggle?

The 1977 Convention of the International Longshoremen's and Warehouseman's Union was marked by the election of new leadership. Harry Bridges, Louis Goldblatt, and William Chester, who all retired, were replaced by James Herman as President, Curtis McClain as Secretary-Treasurer, and Rudy Rubio as First Vice-President respectively. (Second Vice-President George Martin was re-elected.) The election of McClain guaranteed the presence of one Black International officer, despite Chester's retirement, and Rubio's election added a Chicano to the top leadership group for the first time.

The Convention carried on the progressive tradition of the ILWU which has been consistently outstanding on economic, political, and social questions. This was demonstrated in the stands taken in support of detente and national liberation movements and the position in favor of united labor action. In other areas the convention reflected weaknesses, moving closer to the positions of the general labor movement. Thus, for example, resolutions calling for the six-hour day and for a union affirmative action policy were defeated. However, convention delegates overwhelmingly passed a resolution calling on all the union's sections to raise as a contract demand the right to refuse to handle goods shipped to or from South Africa and Zimbabwe. (The main opposition to this far-reaching position came from the small group of "super-lefts" who claimed such a boycott would "hurt" Black workers in Southern Africa!)

In general, despite unevenness, the Convention actions and the election of new leadership gave rise to an air of new expectations throughout the union. This feeling came about because the question of the

union's future course was largely resolved in a positive direction. Some in the leadership had raised again the plan of merging or affiliating the ILWU with the ILA or the Teamsters—in effect, a plan to dismember the union, merging the longshore division with ILA and the warehouse division with the IBT. (What was to become of the ILWU in Hawaii—actually a majority of the total membership—was left vague.)

But this plan was decisively rejected by the Convention, which mandated that the leadership drop the merger scheme while continuing to develop joint action with other unions. Northern California Teamster and ILWU warehouse sections have maintained joint relations for some 20 years, bringing their members the best conditions anywhere in warehousing. And in 1977, ILWU longshoremen supported striking ILA dockworkers on the East and Gulf Coasts, refusing to handle diverted cargo or ships calling at struck ports until a federal court order forced a halt to the sympathy boycott. As can be seen, the basis for joint action exists, though it has not been pursued in shaping the new contract. At issue was the basic question of the ILWU's future ability to remain independent, to continue playing its traditionally progressive role. But something else was also at stake: a strategy to meet the employer drive for automation and mechanization.

Generally speaking, two approaches to solving this problem can be seen. One yields to the employers' profit drive, accommodating the employers' "need" to reduce the work force and speed up the work process; in exchange, money concessions are won which may be temporary and are in any case limited to the existing work force. Jobs are eliminated by "attrition," and work rules, protective conditions, etc. drastically reduced or wiped out entirely.

The other is the class struggle approach, which while in no way trying to block the introduction of machinery, fights to limit speedup and reduce the employers' surplus value, making available at least part of the new values created for the workers' benefit. A class struggle approach in longshore calls for maintaining job scales; reducing hours and eliminating overtime; big gains in wages and benefits; training workers to use new machinery; and extended union control over hiring, affirmative action

goals, job conditions and grievance handling. It also calls for making common cause with the unemployed by demanding maintenance of the existing work force by hiring new workers to replace those who retire on a one-for-one basis—thus placing on the employers the obligation to provide work or wages.

The “accommodation” approach—exemplified by the no-strike Experimental Negotiating Agreement in steel—was expressed in longshore by the 1961 Mechanization & Modernization Agreement (M&M) between the Pacific Maritime Association, for the employers, and the ILWU. The M&M contract was hailed at the time by the leadership (and is still praised by union President Herman) as a “historic agreement” beneficial to both employers and workers.

The 1961 and 1966 M&M contracts provided increased pensions, retirement at 62 with any Social Security loss made whole, improved medical coverage and wage gains, a “wage guarantee” which became a “bonus” at the end of five years, and the “clinchier,” a \$7500 bonus to each worker retiring after 1961. This amount was raised to \$13,000 after 1966 but was discontinued after 1971. When the union proposed to extend it, the employers stated that they had “already bought out.” Neither the 2-year contract signed in 1972 nor the 3-year 1975-1978 agreement made a change in the policy of M&M accommodation; work opportunity and conditions continued to decline and employer control over hiring and conditions grew. It should be noted that the 1975 agreement was twice rejected by membership vote and was only passed under heavy employer threats to suspend payment of the Pay Guarantee Plan (PGP).

In exchange for all this, the employers won a free hand to introduce new machinery, reduce gang sizes and evade long established hiring hall rules. Work traditionally performed on the docks was shifted to non-waterfront work places, usually unorganized. Key development has been containerization—what one ILA official called “the longshoreman’s coffin.” The container—essentially a big box, 8 by 20 or 8 by 40 feet—arrives at the dock already packed and ready to be mechanically loaded aboard specially built container ships. The dramatic growth in containerized cargo has eliminated much of the

traditional longshore work of piece-by-piece loading and unloading.

Another step in the accommodation process was the adoption of the “steady man” system (usually referred to as “9.43” from the contract clause number). 9.43 permits individual employers to select permanent skilled workers for power equipment, bypassing the hiring hall and thus creating a split in the union. 9.43 men typically owe greater allegiance to their specific employer than to the union and earn up to double the wages of workers dispatched in rotation from the hiring hall—thus wrecking the union’s long-treasured power to equalize work opportunities, and creating a pro-company bloc in a vital section (skilled power machine operators) of the union’s ranks.

The price of M&M was the loss of control over much of the workers’ conditions—conditions characterized in the past by William Z. Foster as among the finest union conditions ever achieved by American workers. The outcome of the “historic agreement” was described by ILWU President Herman in the union’s paper, the *Dispatcher*, as follows: “Since the mid-1960’s total tonnage has about doubled while longshore man-hours have been cut in half; longshore productivity has spiraled upward.” In fact, only about 11,000 longshoremen remain on the entire West Coast.

That these accommodation policies were not put over without opposition is clear from remarks made by Bridges in January 1978, as quoted in the *New York Times*: “In classical Marxist terms, by the way, it (M&M agreement) could be called a sellout. There is no class struggle in it. I know that. It did lead to certain strains with the Communist Party. In ideological terms of course they are right. But the union is more practical.” According to the *Times*, Bridges went on to call the contract “a beautiful piece of class collaboration.” This “piece of class collaboration” led to a net of \$250 million over and above “normal” profits to Pacific Maritime Ass’n employers—at a cost to them of only about \$30 million in retirement bonuses. Under the circumstances, the employers had much to gain by extending the “partnership,” as we will see.

But as the results of the accommodation policy began to reveal themselves, in the form of reduced work opportunity, worsening conditions, and

growing employer invasions of hiring hall rights, the membership became restive. Their anger exploded into the 1971-72 strike—the first in 23 years—which lasted 135 days, interrupted by an 80-day Taft-Hartley injunction. When the injunction expired, on Christmas Day, 1971, some 200 ships were in port. But the strike was not resumed until Jan. 17, 1972—by which time all the ships had left port, leaving the strikers to picket virtually empty docks. This self-defeating strike strategy—in part aimed at “showing” the workers the futility of the strike—was a product of the same accommodation policy that had given birth to M&M and 9.43. The strike ended about a month later with many demands not won.

Yet the strike made veterans of those workers—probably a majority—who had no previous strike experience; trade union consciousness grew dramatically; and a new Pay Guarantee Plan (PGP) was won, which was to guarantee each worker at least 36 hours’ pay a week. (A cap on the total PGP, however, meant that workers found the promised 36-hour guarantee reduced by varying amounts from week to week, up to 47 per cent in San Francisco. The goal of “work or wages,” in other words, remained to be achieved.) The years since 1972 have seen continuing struggles, protests, and even work stoppages over the 9.43 issue and inadequacies in the PGP.

The 1978 Contract

Employer goals for the 1978 contract were clarified when Matson Lines President Robert Pfeiffer, speaking last September to the National Defense Transportation Association, said: “Our hope in the maritime industry is for more labor and management leaders with integrity and intelligence to carry on in the same tradition. The time has come for *another* technological leap ahead in maritime transport and throughout our industrial system—the old ‘us against them’ approach has got to go. The new look must come from leaders of both sides.” Against this ominous background the union began to prepare for the 1978 contract struggle.

Under the ILWU Constitution, longshore demands are framed by a delegated body known as the Coast Caucus, which also elects the Negotiating Committee. Union structure also provides for a

Coast Committee for the maritime section, consisting of the International president and two other elected officials.

The change in top leadership and the worsening conditions on the job had brought new hope and militancy to the longshoremen, and in local and area caucuses they developed a set of demands, centered around job security, which pointed a new course away from accommodation and toward class struggle. An active San Francisco rank-and-file group issued periodic leaflets discussing the demands. The Communist Party waterfront club also issued statements dealing with the waterfront situation, analyzing the class collaboration policy in the West Coast Maritime industry and taking on the demagoguery of the ultra-“lefts,” which only aids the employers. A series of *People’s World* articles on the waterfront situation was also well received by many workers.

But a rift appeared when the caucus convened on April 10 between the recommendations of the Coast Committee and the program advanced by caucus delegates. A resolution calling for a shorter work day without a pay cut was defeated, partly under leadership pressure but partly also because delegates felt the members wanted, not the same pay for fewer hours, but higher take-home pay to fight raging inflation. (Clearly, Left and progressive forces need to do much more education on this subject among rank-and-file workers.) Another resolution, calling for maintaining existing workforce levels by replacement hiring, was defeated when leadership spokespeople labeled it “pie in the sky.” And a proposal that the new contract be timed to expire simultaneous with the ILA’s East and Gulf Coast contract—to facilitate joint action—was killed by the leadership with the argument that ILA “port autonomy” would undermine joint action by the two unions. Unofficially, opponents of the joint action proposal also raised the specter of massive federal intervention in the event of a nationwide strike of waterfront workers. Despite the Mine Workers’ splendid example in defying Taft-Hartley coercion, it would seem there is much work to be done among leadership and rank and file—on both coasts—regarding laws and their effects on union strategy.

By 1978, the effects of the 9.43 steady man

system—critical in San Francisco—were beginning to appear in other ports as well. Yet the Coast Committee proposed only to modify 9.43 by rotating steady men periodically to give wider access to skilled-equipment training. Under this proposal, the steady man system would be preserved and even strengthened. But, by a vote of 91 to 4, with 5 abstentions, the Caucus voted to reject this proposal and instead demanded the 9.43 system be eliminated. Years of experience, struggle, and education led to this striking demonstration of unity and militancy.

The Coast Committee's manning proposal—6 longshoremen and one clerk, in addition to skilled men, on each crane—was beefed up by caucus delegates to a demand for 8 workers per crane on discharge work and 10 workers per crane on loading work. The Committee also adopted a major demand to transform the Pay Guarantee—in effect a supplemental unemployment benefit without provision for actual paid vacations, disability and pension credits, etc.—to a true Wage Guarantee. They also raised the demand that the present blackmail setup under which PGP can be denied to an entire port in case of even a limited work stoppage be amended so that penalties would apply only to those workers actually involved in the stoppage.

The Coast Committee proposal on containerization included an employer-paid "royalty" tax, based on container tonnage. Background to this demand is growing support in the union to base employer fringe payments on tonnage, rather than on shrinking man-hours. But the proposed container royalty, aimed at raising the cost of further mechanization, could be used by employers to offset their existing fringe payment obligations. The struggle to tie fringe payments to tonnage—that is, to productivity—must continue if a crisis brought on by declining hours is to be averted.

Direct wages, though important, were not a major issue in these negotiations. Longshoremen currently (under the old contract) work an 8-hour shift made up of 6 hours straight time and 2 hours overtime, for a daily total wage of \$75.33. The demand raised was to convert to "8 straight," thus adjusting the hourly rate from \$8.37 to \$9.415, and add 80¢ per hour for a total hourly rate of \$10.215. The 80¢ demand amounts to only about 8 per cent

and as there is no Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA), is quite modest in face of current inflation rates.

The caucus also carried out the 1977 convention mandate to make the right to refuse work on cargo to or from South Africa or Zimbabwe a contract demand.

In general, then, it can be seen that the demands as framed by the caucus went beyond the proposals brought in by the Coast Committee, particularly on the steady man issue. Yet in May, shortly after the Caucus met, ILWU President Herman and PMA President Ed Flynn gave a press conference which the *Seattle Post-Intelligencer* reported this way: "The new ILWU President and the man who has headed PMA for nine years exchanged congratulations on enlightened union and management cooperation like the automation agreement of 1961. Herman called this 'one of the most sophisticated demonstrations of adaptability to changing conditions by any labor group.' . . . That agreement, Flynn and Herman agreed, gave the employers the right to modernize dockwork and assure economic progress in exchange for job security, high wages, and cradle-to-grave protection." During the period between the caucus meeting and the opening of negotiations, both Flynn and Herman repeatedly assured the press that a strike was highly unlikely.

As stated at the beginning of this article, the reconvened Coast Caucus, meeting on July 16 to consider the Negotiating Committee's proposed settlement, recommended acceptance by the membership. This despite the fact that the demands on manning scales, Pay Guarantee improvements, and container royalties were entirely dropped and the demand of the caucus to eliminate 9.43 was also dropped. Instead of eliminating 9.43, the proposed contract creates 3 different formulas for different ports, effectively doubling the number of steady men in San Francisco in order to provide limited rotation through these jobs. Said one delegate: "All that does is give each steady man a partner and almost guarantees that the rest of us will get none of the skilled work." In short, there was almost no progress toward reversing the accommodation policy and regaining some of the union's lost control. How then did the contract win a 69 per cent majority of the workers' votes?

The Yes votes were influenced by the economic package—85¢ per hour each year over the next three years, significantly better than some recent wage settlements in other industries. Penalty and skill rates were also increased across the board. Pensions were raised from \$450 to \$500 per month for current retirees and future pensions for active workers were also increased, from \$500 to \$550. And improvements were made in vacations, welfare, and other contract areas.

The ratification vote shows that better than two-thirds of the workers accepted the leadership's argument that these important economic gains outweighed the failure to reverse the decline in working conditions, union control and job security. And while the 9.43 modifications fall far short of the original caucus demand that 9.43 be eliminated outright, some members have voiced the feeling—and the leadership has stressed—that the modifications do represent a first breach in the steady man system which previous contracts had left intact. In this way the setback on the steady man issue can be presented by the leadership in the light of a partial victory holding out the hope of further progress in future negotiations. Despite this, however, the rejection vote in San Francisco—the port hardest hit by the steady man problem—makes clear that significant rank-and-file forces, along with the Left and the Communists, don't accept these arguments.

Some opposition in San Francisco Local 10 was softened by a last-minute "clarification" of the San Francisco steady man formula. While some workers resented the back-door presentation of this proposal, and others took it as a sign the employers were prepared to make further concessions, the lack of time for discussion and the apparent gain in this area undoubtedly swayed some members to vote for acceptance. Coast Committee supporters "worked the hall" heavily during contract balloting, using the "clarification" of the San Francisco steady man formula. While some workers resented the back-door presentation of this proposal, and others took it as a sign the employers were prepared to make further concessions, the lack of time for discussion and the apparent gain in this area undoubtedly swayed some members to vote for acceptance. Coast Committee supporters "worked the hall" heavily during contract balloting, using the "clarifi-

cation" document as their main support for a Yes vote.

Conclusion

This article has attempted to analyze the background and estimate the forces involved in the most recent (and continuing) struggles of ILWU Longshoremen on the West Coast. It has not been possible to deal with other sections of the ILWU, such as the large Hawaiian division (representing over half the union's total membership) or the growing Warehouse Division. It should be noted, however, that the Warehouse Division in Northern California has been in the forefront of a number of social and political struggles, including its key role in organizing the very successful June Trade Union Conference on Southern Africa. Warehouse has made a serious commitment to organize aggressively among the more than 50,000 unorganized workers in warehousing, wholesale and retail sales on the West Coast. Warehouse Division militancy and progressive traditions have had a healthy effect on Northern California Teamster warehouse locals as well. Meantime, Hawaiian ILWU last year successfully fended off a powerful employer drive to transfer sugar and pineapple growing and processing to the Philippines and Formosa and other low-wage Pacific nations.

Nor can we do more than touch briefly on the ILWU's role in labor political action. The comparative loss in political independence—once one of the ILWU's hallmarks—can be attributed to several factors, not excluding a serious lack of attention to this problem by the Left forces. At present, and with some notable exceptions, the ILWU's political stance approximates that of the more progressive wing of the AFL-CIO. Real independent political action has been diverted. While there is no reactionary trend either among the members or in the policies of the union's political action bodies, nevertheless the wornout line of supporting "labor's friends"—usually, of course, in the Democratic Party—is still followed. The most advanced Democratic politicians get full ILWU support, and from time to time the union campaigns around certain social or trade union issues that do not have official Democratic Party blessing, but independence seldom if ever exceeds these narrow limits. Much re-

mains to be done to reawaken the potential strength of this union as a progressive force in political life.

Finally, what are the perspectives now that the contract has been ratified? The building of support for class struggle policies must and will continue, with the active participation and leadership of Communists and other progressives. And progressive union policies will continue to form the basis for alliances between Left and Center forces up to and including the International leadership level.

These tasks will encounter the same obstacles common to similar struggles in other unions and industries, especially in the coming period of sharp monopoly offensives. But the rank and file and the Left forces in the ILWU have an important asset in the union's militant traditions, its democratic procedures, the growing class consciousness of many members, and the comparatively large number of secondary leadership forces who are taking not only Center but Left positions.

Continued from page 9

develop their position on this question.

In the Call to the First National Conference and again in Runnels' keynote speech, the Committee has taken pains to point out the disproportionate, racist impact of unemployment on Blacks, Latins and other racial and national minorities. But ways must be found to go beyond the position taken by Runnels when he said:

We must do more than take note of this fact [of high unemployment in the Black and Latin community]. We must do more than pay lip service—we must create the jobs that are needed to give every person in this country who desires to work a job where they, too, can draw a paycheck and live in dignity like you and I.

After these jobs are created, we must insure that they are available to all people on a fair and affirmative basis.

Historically, no demand of the working class has

met with more resistance than has the demand for a reduction in the hours of labor and there is no reason to believe that the battles will be less fierce this time out. Therefore the need for maximum unity in the ranks of the working class; therefore the need to take special steps to overcome racist division within the ranks of the class. It follows, therefore, that the struggle for affirmative action—and to place the All Unions Committee and the movement for shorter hours on the side of that struggle—must be placed in the center of the work of all Communists involved in the shorter hours campaign.

The productive capacity of industry in the U.S. long ago made the question of a reduced work week with no cut in pay a practical possibility. Today's level of unemployment, to say nothing of the continued increases in productivity and a general slowing of economic growth, makes it an absolute necessity. Without the full mobilization of the Party to participate on all fronts in this struggle today's historic opportunity will be missed.

**political
affairs**

*Forums and lectures on issues of the
day. Third Friday of every month.
Jointly sponsored by Political Affairs
and the People's School for
Marxist Studies.*

**PEOPLE'S
SCHOOL
FOR MARXIST STUDIES**

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 20, 7 PM 235 W 23 STREET

Topic: "The Sinking Dollar and What It Costs You" Lecturer: Edward Boorstein (noted economist of USA, Chile, Cuba) \$1.00

World Trade Union Unity

—The Long March

D. DONATI

The World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU) is established in nations covering the entire range of social, economic and political development. It has become synonymous with trade union democracy, aggressive struggle to defend and advance the interests of workers for social progress, liberty, independence and peace. Though it has often had to work in difficult conditions, the WFTU has never left the side of the workers and peoples struggling against aggression, oppression, apartheid and discrimination against women and minorities.

Motivated by a desire to promote trade union unity, the WFTU operates in a completely open and democratic fashion. All trade union organizations, affiliated or not, have access to congresses organized by the WFTU. They are not limited to merely presenting greetings, but may take part in debate, and participate in policy and decision making in the commissions and plenary sessions. Nonaffiliated organizations are completely involved in drawing up the basic preparatory congress documents.

The 9th World Trade Union Congress (Prague, April 16-22, 1978) must be viewed with the context of the great structural changes taking place in the relationship of forces in a world shifting sharply to the Left. It recorded considerable progress in the long march of the world trade union movement towards unity of purpose and action.

Nine hundred ninety six delegates, observers and guests representing 303 trade union organizations were accredited. This included international and regional organizations with a membership of 230 million organized workers from 126 countries. Of these 517 delegates represented organizations with 190 million members affiliated to the WFTU and its trade union internationals (TUI's). This was a growth of 20 million members and 30 countries since the last congress.

Ninety eight observers came from organizations affiliated the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) and its International Trade Secretariats (ITS). Five observers represented one organization affiliated with the World Confedera-

tion of Labor (WCL) and two represented the Secretariat of the WCL. Three regional organizations, the Organization of African Trade Union Unity (OATUU), the International Confederation of Arab Trade Unions (ICATU) and the Permanent Conference of Trade Unions of Latin American Workers (CPUSTAL) were each represented by three observers.

Despite considerable internal pressures to send official observers to the 9th Congress, the ICFTU refused to do so.

The U.S. was represented by 38 observers from 19 unions in 18 industries. They were mainly elected local and regional officials from 15 AFL-CIO unions, four independent unions, the Coalition of Labor Union Women and Trade Unionists for Action and Democracy.

The 9th World Trade Union Congress was by far the largest, most comprehensive and representative trade union gathering ever convened. The scope, diversity, varying levels of development, degrees of unity, the pace in the Leftward trend and the sharpening struggles engendered by the prolonged crisis in the capitalist world provided for lively reports, debates and discussion.

The opening report, presented by the outgoing General Secretary of the WFTU Pierre Gensous, states, "Since questions relating to socialism also interest the trade union movement throughout the world, it is not surprising that reflections, discussions, differences and even divergences of opinion are arising and continuing within it."

There were differences of opinion on the best way to achieve unity of action but no differences on the need for common action against imperialism and racism, for higher living standards, world peace, and a new international economic order.

Developments in Europe

The largest group of delegates and observers (318) came from Europe. This reflected a strong trend toward unity and growing awareness of the need for closer cooperation among trade unions of

various trends.

Contrary to opinions voiced in the *New York Times*, class collaboration is waning and antagonism between labor and capital is sharper than ever in all the capitalist countries of Europe. The united resistance and increasing strike struggles emanate from the grass roots of the working class which organizes and leads these struggles even over the opposition of some trade union officials who are inclined to compromise away the workers' demands. As more workers participate in these struggles, they are expressing a growing desire to also participate in the formulation and control of the policies of their trade unions. This desire for more democracy is irrepressible.

In West Germany several hundred thousand metal workers this spring struck for better wages, guaranteed employment, and against the consequences of plant shut-downs and the rationalization of enterprises which cause lay-offs, transfers and downgrading with wage cuts. After three weeks of a general strike and lock out, the workers forced the employers to negotiate.

It should be noted in passing that in the Federal Republic of Germany (West) half of the members of the supervisory board of directors by law must represent workers. In practice, 70 per cent of the workers' half comes from the trade unions. The remaining 30 per cent represent unorganized, office, technical and scientific workers. The chairman of the board is always a representative of the owners. In the event of even division on the board, the chairman casts the deciding vote. Obviously, worker representation with power on the company's board of directors is a window dressing hoax.

This is the widely reported co-determination championed by the Social Democrats. It is a delusion that suggests that union representation on the board of directors eliminates class antagonisms. When workers, who through their representatives are "partners" under the guise of codetermination, are compelled to strike just to get the companies to negotiate it should be obvious that codetermination is the same old class collaboration in fancy dress. It isn't working and won't work because the exploitation of the working class continues and at an accelerated pace.

In January 1974 the International Labor Organi-

zation (ILO), an agency of the United Nations, convened the first European Regional Conference in Geneva. It was the first time since the cold war split of the WFTU that trade union organizations of East and West Europe met together. This and subsequent European Regional Conferences held by the ILO in 1975 and 1977 were bitterly opposed by the AFL-CIO and the CIA-spawned French Force Ouvriere, which did not attend any of the sessions.

These conferences and Meany's obstinate resistance to legislative structural reforms, at the national and international level, that would implement the programs and conventions (treaties) adopted by the ILO are the basis for the AFL-CIO's claims that the ILO was being politicized.

Two months after the first ILO conference, some trade unions of Western Europe formed a regional organization—the European Trade Union Confederation. In 1975, the General Confederation of Italian Labor (CGIL) and the French Confederation Generale Du Travail (CGT), the dominant Left-led trade unions of their respective countries and both founding members of the WFTU, filed applications for membership in the ETUC, which includes all the national trade union centers affiliated to the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU, mainly social democratic), the World Confederation of Labor (WCL, mainly Christian) and the unaffiliated Irish Congress of Trade Unions.

The CGIL's application was approved when it changed its relationship to the WFTU from affiliated membership to associate status.

The CGT, however, declined to alter its relationship to the WFTU. Its applications for membership in the ETUC in 1975 and 1976 were neither accepted nor rejected. The CGT stated that as a member of the ETUC it would respect its decisions and that it would treat and seek to be treated by other ETUC entities on a basis of equality. Furthermore, the CGT is not asking other ETUC members to leave their international trade union centers.

The Spanish Workers' Commissions (SWC) and the Portuguese Intersindical (PI) also the largest trade union centers in their respective countries, with Left and Communist leadership have not affiliated to the WFTU with which, however, they too have an associated status. Neither the SWC nor

the PI have applied for membership in the ETUC.

All four of these trade union centers—the CGIL, CGT, SWC and PI—were represented by important delegations at the 9th World Trade Union Congress.

Fifty-six national trade union organizations from Europe, East and West, participated in the 9th World Congress. Of these, 19 are affiliated to the WFTU, 37 are affiliates of the ICFTU, WCL or unaffiliated. This reflects the growing influence of the WFTU in the European trade union movement and the very strong trend toward unity of action and cooperation to protect and promote the interests of all workers regardless of their affiliations to trade union internationals. Despite this obvious desire for unity, the ETUC did not send any observers to the World Congress of Trade Unions.

Nevertheless, qualitatively new, higher levels of demands, forms of struggle and trade union unity are taking place on a national and regional scale. The struggles conducted by the workers for peace, detente, and mutually beneficial trade with the socialist countries and the fight for the reduction of non-productive state expenditures which benefit only the military-industrial complex are unifying and strengthening the trade unions and winning new allies in the middle classes.

There is also an awareness of the similarity of the aggressive tactics of the employers to depress the wages, conditions of employment and living standards of the workers directed by the transnational corporations (TNC's) and the governments they influence and control.

In evaluating the working class of the southern tier of European states and their political outlook, some consideration should be given to their experiences under fascism and Nazi occupation. The conditions differed, but without exception their heroic resistance to fascism, their defense of the interests of the people and the nation, won the respect of all the other sections of the population who also opposed fascist tyranny. The ties and relationships developed in those years survive. These historic relationships are renewed and fortified by the bankruptcies, plant closings and the redundancy of workers, managerial and executive personnel as the process of concentration, internationalization and flight of capital to relatively more stable coun-

tries proceeds. This is the solid foundation on which they are uniting not only the working class but also a broad patriotic front to save their countries and to protect the interests of their people from the deprivations of a disintegrating capitalist social order.

As these developments mature, NATO will be less able to pursue aggressive policies. The conditions for stable peace and irreversible detente in that cockpit of two world wars are unfolding. Far from retreating in Europe, the working class is demonstrating extraordinary discipline, militancy, tenacity, and innovative zeal as it fights against reaction and fascism while uniting all the truly democratic forces for fundamental transformations leading to a transition of power from the transnational monopolies to the people.

The New International Economic Order

The less developed countries (LDCs) of Africa, Asia and Latin America comprise a majority of the world's peoples and two-thirds of all the nations. Though politically independent, the LDCs are in varying degrees the victims of exploitation of the transnational corporations (TNCs). In their frantic scramble for maximum profits, the TNCs occupy the high ground in the economic, financial, technological, trade and diplomatic warfare now being waged to exploit the resources and labor of the LDCs.

These advantages, however, are crumbling because of the fierce rivalries among the imperialist powers, the growing resistance of the people, and the burgeoning influence, prestige and support of the socialist countries led by the Soviet Union.

The terms of trade—inflated prices for the manufactured goods they buy and depressed prices for the raw materials and agricultural products they sell—have impoverished and bankrupted most of the LDCs. To redress the balance in the terms of trade by indexation of the prices of goods bought and sold, the transfer of modern technology, large scale grants as indemnification for past pillage, a moratorium on debts and large-scale, long-term, low interest loans to develop their economies, the LDC's with the help of the socialist bloc adopted a UN resolution for a New International Economic Order.

The imperialist powers, euphemistically referred

to in the media as market economies, aside from a few token hand-outs and lofty rhetoric have become more rapacious than ever. Many of the LDCs are on the verge of defaulting on their loans. It is estimated that the annual interest of the LDCs is more than \$25 billion on accumulated national debts of over \$200 billion.

The trade union organizations of the LDCs and the workers generally do not have to be told that they are being exploited. The harsh conditions of life resulting from the austerity imposed by the International Monetary Fund as a condition for granting new loans makes it as clear as the food vanishing from their tables who is doing the exploiting. Whether operating openly, semi-legally or underground there are workers, organizations everywhere. They have needs and desires that can only be realized by organization and struggle. Leaders may be killed, exiled or imprisoned but the working class can not be destroyed.

The trade unions in the LDCs are organized in various national centers affiliated to or influenced by the WFTU, ICFTU, WCL or the regionals, OATUU, ICATU and CPUSTAL. In addition, there are CIA-corporative organizations to which the AFL-CIO lends its name, such as the American Institute for Free Labor Development (AIFLD), and the African-American Labor Center.

The Inter-American Regional Labor Organization (ORIT) of the ICFTU operates in Latin America. However, ORIT seems to have come under the control of AIFLD which recently signed an agreement with ORIT for joint sponsorship of trade union programs. The International Affairs Department of the AFL-CIO, directed by George Meany's son-in-law, Ernest Lee, publishes ORIT's monthly publication, "Inter-American Labor Bulletin."

Tried and tested in countless struggles, despite shortcomings, occasional mistakes, and a few "Benedict Arnolds," the outstanding characteristic of the rising wave of strikes all over the world is the higher level of unity of all sections of the trade union movement. The increased willingness of the workers to fight is reflected in the size, duration and number of strikes and the spread and increased frequency of general strikes.

The bloody events in Southern Africa are tolling

the bell on the last bastions of colonialisms. The leadership given in the struggles against apartheid by the South African Congress of Trade Unions (SACTU) resulted in world-wide acts of solidarity by the OATUU, WFTU, ICFTU and the WCL.

U.S. Developments

Check-mated abroad, the imperialist forces led by the TNCs based in the United States have become frantic. At the same time that 149 countries convened in New York for a Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament, President Carter met in Washington with the heads of the NATO countries exhorting them to increase their war expenditures. These preparations for war that threaten the lives of hundreds of millions of people were conducted under a highly orchestrated media barrage of alleged concern for what President Carter labelled "a small group of dissidents" in the Soviet Union.

At the same time, a task force established by the Business Roundtable, the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has been engaged in open warfare against the interests and welfare of the working class. The Roundtable is made up of the top executives of the transnational corporations. The dragon they seek to slay is the general welfare of the people and the trade unions in particular.

This task force arrogantly announced its objective was to take back the concessions the TNCs were forced to make to the workers. This was no idle threat.

The humiliating legislative defeats (from "friends of labor" no less), adverse Supreme Court decisions, biased administrative rulings, pro-company arbitration awards, double digit inflation coupled with regressive wage settlements, union busting, strike breaking, racism and discrimination are tearing apart the key institution of class collaboration, the quasi-government Labor-Management Group coordinated by former Secretary of Labor John Dunlop and co-chaired by George Meany and Reginald Jones, chairman of the board of the General Electric Co.

The role of this Group is an adaptation on a national scale of co-determination. The monopolists lay down the minimum terms on wages,

conditions, labor and social legislation. It would be an unacceptable impertinence for Meany to suggest restraints on the TNCs. His role is to appease the monopolists and to exhibit his "leadership" qualities by selling the terms imposed by them. At the same time, the TNCs give their task force a free hand to undercut the minimums. A classical illustration of the "social compact" in operation.

Douglas Fraser, the president of the United Auto Workers, the last to be added to this group, is also the first to resign from it. His resignation is a very significant development. It reflects the dismay and disenchantment with the crassness of collaboration that shackles the workers while they are being impoverished. Yet, this is but the visible tip of a colossal iceberg of seething discontent in labor's ranks.

The Right-wing reactionaries, with their lemming syndrome for self-destruction, believe their own propaganda that this country and its people are moving to the Right. Guided by this self-deception they are capable of great harm. It indicates their determination to regain the irretrievable—the vigor of their youth when capitalism was young and expanding.

Fraser in his resignation statement talked about reestablishing the coalition of progressive forces that once marched to the tune of the people's needs. Such a coalition is timely and necessary. Whether it will develop into a labor party will depend upon the initiatives made, the policies advanced and the composition of the coalition.

Of the 173 conventions adopted by the ILO only seven have been ratified by the U.S., none since 1946. Throughout this period, the AFL-CIO U.S. delegates participated in the formulation of policies on labor for the rest of the world, but made no effort to adopt them at home. This failure to fight for ratification when conditions were favorable has made a mockery of current operations to get watered down legislative versions from a TNC dominated Congress.

Meany's reign on labor's parade is coming to an inglorious end. During World War II he opposed the formation of the WFTU. With CIA money and agents he engineered the split of the WFTU and the formation of the ICFTU. Later, unable to dominate the ICFTU, he led the AFL-CIO out of it. More recently, frustrated in his efforts to dictate to the ILO, he split again.

Every Meany move has been guided by the star to which he hitched his career and fortune, his unswerving loyalty to the basic interests of the U.S. corporations. He shadowboxed, but never fought them at home. He has thwarted all efforts to fight them abroad.

Led by his brilliant policies the AFL-CIO has retreated into isolation. It has lost prestige, members, credibility and sense of direction. The sounds of reveille may not penetrate Meany's cataleptic slumbers but the rank and file and much of the leadership is aroused. Harried by mountainous debts, staggered by taxes and bruised by employer offensives they are impatiently awaiting leadership and unity of action against their exploiters. They will wait in vain as long as Meany's policies prevail.

Awareness of the world shattering events taking place coincides with a heightened interest in their ethnic roots. U.S. workers have ties—family, national, cultural—with the rest of the world to a greater degree than the workers of any other country. Interest in struggles all over the world is reciprocated by their interest in struggles in the U.S. Because all are victims of the same TNC's, the flow of information, coordination and solidarity of action are indispensable to the strengthening and advancing of international trade union unity as the guarantee of victory in every country, all over the world.

Every act of unity and solidarity strengthens the working class and drives another nail in the coffin of imperialism. The hands and the minds that produce the wealth of the world are at work reshaping it.

The Communist Party and the Anti-Nuclear Movement

GARY SMALL

With the publication of this article we wish to initiate a discussion of the issue of nuclear energy. We urge readers to write in their views and comments. Additional contributions to the discussion will be published in future issues—Editors

The growth of a strong national movement against nuclear power during 1977 found many people on the Left initially skeptical, or even hostile. This was an understandable response, given the nature—or at least the media image—of the anti-nuclear movement. Its largely white middle class and counterculture orientation, “small-is-beautiful” and back-to-nature prejudices against technology, and an apparently elitist attitude toward working people and trade unions were bound to arouse the misgivings of a multinational working-class movement.

On the other hand, these same impressions, plus a certain defensiveness regarding nuclear power in socialist countries, may have caused hesitation in some quarters to take a firm stand on the nuclear issue. However, the dangers of continued nuclear power development, so persistently raised by the anti-nuclear movement, will not disappear if the question is ignored or side-stepped. The Communist Party, which shares the vital concerns of all working people over the health and environmental risks of nuclear power, must base its policy on two fundamental considerations:

First, nuclear power is a *mass* issue of importance to the entire population of the U.S. Even though the “No Nukes” movement has so far been dominated by middle class elements, the safety and environmental dangers of nuclear development are certainly not their exclusive concern. On the contrary, workers may face a double health hazard—on the job as well as at home in their communities. Recent reports of the high cancer rate among workers who serviced nuclear submarines at the Portsmouth, N.H., naval shipyard are a good illustration of this danger.

Second, whatever the long-term prospects of nuclear power under different social systems, each

nation has to make decisions about this technology based on its own particular circumstances. In the U.S., with abundant alternative sources of energy, the feasibility of much more efficient use of its existing generating capacity and, above all, with nuclear development in the hands of rapacious private monopolies, nuclear power can create more problems than it solves. As Gus Hall has written (*The Energy Rip-Off, Cause and Cure*, p. 36), profit-greedy companies which economize on safety precautions . . . do not worry about concealed long-term dangers in radioactive waste products, minimize sinister breakdowns in operating plants and threaten radioactive disaster.”

The commercial development of nuclear power in our country has been controlled by the same energy monopolies which regularly present us with petroleum spills, tanker disasters, oil-well blowouts and refinery accidents, and which consistently oppose any attempts at safety regulation as “government interference.” Can we trust the infinitely more complex and dangerous technology of nuclear energy in such hands? Merely to pose the question is to answer it. That is why the Communist Party has been against the construction of additional nuclear generating facilities in the U.S. so long as these plants would be under the control of private energy monopolies and run for profit.

But it is not enough to condemn the further development of nuclear power by monopoly capital, while remaining aloof from the very mass movement which has led the fight to expose this danger. Simply to characterize the anti-nuclear movement as “petit-bourgeois” and concentrate on its weaknesses alone is sectarian. Such an attitude retards the building of united action to curb the abuses of monopoly and advance the struggle for socialism. For despite the narrow focus of many

anti-nuclear activists, and their often confusing politics, the movement itself represents a part of the growing mass rebellion against monopoly control of our energy resources and policies.

In New England, the fight against the huge Seabrook nuclear power project, to be situated along New Hampshire's short 18-mile coast, has been organized by the Clamshell Alliance. The Alliance, a coalition of autonomous local and regional anti-nuclear groups, stated the central issue of the movement in its *Declaration of Nuclear Resistance* more than a year ago: "The supply of energy is a natural right and in all cases should be controlled by the people. Private monopoly must give way to public control." This assertion, despite its vagueness, goes to the heart of the struggle around nuclear power and all other questions of energy development. Unfortunately, the concept of public control has been largely suppressed in the movement's mass actions (presumably because it was considered politically "too advanced") and has been happily ignored by the corporate media in favor of the more "colorful" aspects of the anti-nuclear demonstrations. The same Clamshell document, moreover, proposed only the fuzzy notions of "decentralization," "local control," "alternative energy sources" and "conservation" as the cures for our monopoly-induced energy crisis. Still, growing numbers of anti-nuclear activists have begun to look beyond these catchwords toward a deeper understanding of the energy question and its relation to monopoly capitalism.

The 1977 Seabrook "occupation" and its aftermath were in themselves highly educational. Confronting the police power of the New England states assembled in defense of corporate rights, mass jailings for "criminal trespass" and harshly punitive court sentences could not fail to open many eyes to the nature of the struggle and the opposing forces involved. And in the national guard armories where the anti-nuclear demonstrators were held following their arrest, a certain number of radical and Marxist detainees helped the process along. Since then, the Clamshell Alliance has been trying to decide whether it should remain purely an environmental crusade or recognize that its aims can only be achieved through political means. The agreement to hold a "legal" rally at Seabrook on June 24, rather than the planned "occupation

restoration," was perhaps a turning point in the direction of politics.

Experience has also been teaching the movement that it must look for support beyond the narrow issue of nuclear power. During the past year the Alliance has taken tentative steps to unite with a broader constituency around the questions of electric rates, peace and disarmament, safe working conditions and support for trade unions.

Local struggles against electric rate increases and unfair rate structures have been actively supported, and sometimes led, by Clamshell Alliance members. In New Hampshire they were able to spark a vigorous mass campaign against a 23% rate hike proposed by the Public Service Co.—half of which is slated to finance construction of the Seabrook nuclear power station at consumer expense. One New Hampshire Clamshell affiliate has also helped to initiate the drive for a local publicly-owned electric utility in a series of towns adjoining a hydroelectric dam on the Connecticut River.

In other actions, the Clamshell Alliance Congress last November passed a series of resolutions designed to support the peace movement and strengthen its ties with working people. The Congress voted:—"To endorse the anti-war objectives of the Mobilization for Survival" (a loose-knit coalition which has increasingly taken the initiative in opposing nuclear weapons and also shown some willingness to cooperate with the Left); and—"Reconfirmed its commitment to the goal of nuclear disarmament."

A "labor solidarity" motion, worth quoting in full, resolved:

1. To express active solidarity with the struggles of other working people in their fight for full employment, socially responsible jobs, decent health and safety conditions, democratic unionism, workplace organization, organizing the unorganized and for an end to sexism and racism in the workplace and the labor movement.
2. To acknowledge that, as working people, we are concerned about nuclear power and other environmental issues, and that we bear the brunt of environmental hazards, both in our communities and in our workplaces.
3. To actively seek to increase participation of labor movement people in the anti-nuclear movement.

4. To work to assure socially responsible jobs for those affected by the end of nuclear power.
5. To acknowledge that community-controlled development of renewable energy sources will create thousands more safe and permanent jobs than nuclear power ever could.
6. To work closely with labor unions and especially with rank and file workers to realize the high job-producing potential of alternate energy production.
7. To acknowledge that nukes mean rate hikes, and that working people are forced to unjustly bear the financial burden of nuclear power construction and operation.
8. To understand the necessity of combining with the working people of this country to win the fight against nuclear power.

Along with this resolution, the Clamshell Alliance has taken some concrete steps in the direction of labor solidarity. It endorsed the Labor Law Reform Act and urged the New England Congressional delegation to support the bill (S. 2467, since defeated by a corporate lobbying *blitzkrieg*); it has backed the J.P. Stevens Boycott and actively worked on it with ACTWU staff in some areas; and the bi-monthly *Clamshell Alliance News* has lately begun to include regular features on labor, including a warm message of support to the striking UMWA coal miners.

The Alliance has also co-sponsored a workshop on jobs, energy and the environment with several health and conservation organizations and the New Hampshire State Labor Council (AFL-CIO). Most recently, the Labor Committee of the Boston Clamshell affiliate has worked closely with the Massachusetts Coalition for Full Employment and the Eastern Massachusetts Building Trades Council around energy-related job issues. Plans have been laid for a major conference on the economic and health aspects of energy development with the participation of construction, auto and sheet metal workers unions. The activity of a Washington-based group called "Environmentalists for Full Employment," which is closely associated with the anti-nuclear movement, illustrates the same trend.

For their part, many workers and rank-and-file trade union members, especially in New England where nuclear power is a strong local issue, have

begun to respond to the questions of safety, health and economics raised by the opponents of nuclear power. Some national labor leaders such as Douglas Fraser of the UAW and William Winpisinger of the IAM and others have also shown an interest in dialogue with the anti-nuclear and alternative energy movements.

These developments were underlined by the important labor participation at the June 24 Seabrook anti-nuclear rally. There, many of the estimated 20,000 demonstrators heard a Chicago steelworker report that the USWA District 31 convention had voted to oppose the construction of a nuclear power station at Bailly, Indiana; a staff member of the *United Mine Workers Journal* explained why his union believed that nuclear power meant *fewer* jobs; and a representative of the Amalgamated Meatcutters and Butcherworkers Union called for an alliance between labor and the anti-nuclear movement for safe power *and* jobs, and "for human rights over property rights."

Meanwhile, the dynamics of the nuclear power industry itself are helping this kind of unity to grow. Like other sectors of monopoly capital, it strives to place the financial as well as environmental burden of new construction on the working people, while it continues to derive the profits from existing generating facilities. In New Hampshire this led to a recent 23 per cent increase in electric rates, with an additional 8-10 per cent predicted for each year until the Seabrook project is completed. The public outcry over this prospect moved the normally conservative state legislature this year to ban utilities from charging for so-called "construction work in progress" (CWIP), although it was unable to override the Right-wing governor's veto of the measure.

Everywhere, private utilities have actively campaigned and lobbied to frustrate the people's demand for fair electric rates. Besides costly public relations efforts at the expense of the rate payer, it is known that utilities have routinely kept files on their "enemies" and engaged in Watergate-style dirty tricks. These have frequently involved the services of Right-wing detective agencies or consultants. In New Hampshire the Clamshell Alliance has recently charged the Public Service Co. with tapping its phones and other illegal forms of sur-

veillance. It should be remembered here that the source for the hysterical newspaper accounts predicting violence and terrorism at last year's Seabrook demonstration turned out to be the fascist NCLC/"U.S. Labor Party." This year the offer of a counter-demonstration from a paramilitary Right-wing New Hampshire group called "The Continental Line" was politely turned down by the Public Service Co., but only because it was planned for the same day as the Clamshell action.

As Watergate showed, the public is sensitive to such corporate attempts to undermine democracy. This should also be an issue of special concern to the Left, both in itself and as a means of exposing the hollowness of "human rights" under monopoly capitalism.

The effects these developments will have on mass consciousness could be decisive. Sky-rocketing electric rates can now be closely associated in the public mind not only with nuclear power, but also with the present organization and private ownership of the power industry; the political alliance of big business and the Right is being demonstrated; and for the first time people are being told *by the utilities themselves* that the public must always pay for the cost of building power plants—either during construction through CWIP, or afterwards with even larger rate increases. It is only natural for people to ask: "If we pay for it, why do they still own it?" In partial answer, it may be pointed out that *existing* publicly-owned utilities charge about one-third less for electricity even now.

The emerging links between the anti-nuclear activists, the peace movement and the trade unions point the way toward a viable coalition for unity against a common enemy—the monopolies which threaten us all with nuclear disaster. But for such an alliance to succeed, it will be necessary to oppose nuclear power as a part of the broad system of monopoly control which dominates our country. For the nuclear industry, though highly "visible" in itself, is only one arm of an energy network controlled by the giant monopolies in oil, gas and coal, together with the centers of finance capital that lie behind them.

In this light, the movement against nuclear power deserves the active support and participation of the Left, including the Communist Party. We should

make every effort to encourage the growing trend toward unity of the anti-nuclear activists with the broader people's movement for peace, jobs and against racism. Here are some points of a program that can achieve this unity:

1) The curtailment of current and projected nuclear power projects would be a severe blow to construction workers who are already hard-pressed by a slack industry. Jobs are the prime concern, not only of the building trades, but of workers in general, both organized and unorganized. Jobs will not be created by gestures, however well intended, to the interests of working people. A coalition that includes the Left, trade unions, peace and anti-nuclear forces could launch the fight for a vast program of new housing construction and renovation with an emphasis on up-grading energy efficiency. Mass transit and a long overdue rebuilding of the nation's deteriorated rail network should also be key elements of a plan to provide jobs at union scale, while contributing to the reduction of energy waste. Displaced construction workers and minority workers, especially youth, must have first access to the new jobs through a program of affirmative action. The Harrington Youth Employment Act (H.R. 927)—long bottled up in Congressional committee—has specific provision for projects in housing, public transportation and environmental improvement which could be the first step toward a more comprehensive program.

2) The connections between the "private" nuclear industry and the military aspects of nuclear arms development are clear. The neutron bomb, the dangers of nuclear weapons stockpiling, and radioactive waste from weapons manufacture, all derive from the same military-industrial complex which is backing nuclear power. In fact, radioactive wastes from military sources account for over 90 per cent of all such dangerous materials in the U.S. The struggle for peace and disarmament needs to be pressed much more vigorously by the anti-nuclear movement and its allies. And this does not have to be disarmament in the abstract, or as the unilateral moves of any one country. Negotiation of a new strategic arms limitation treaty (SALT II), which is being fiercely resisted by the most militaristic and Right-wing forces in the U.S., would provide a concrete basis for slowing down and then reversing the

arms race. A broad people's movement is the only way to guarantee such a treaty and to win the transfer of billions of dollars from the Pentagon to the kind of socially useful projects that can improve our lives, provide jobs and conserve energy resources.

3) The proposed non-nuclear alternative energy programs advocated by the Clamshell Alliance stress small-scale solar and wind power most suitable to rural needs. They relate only marginally to the problems of urban decay and poverty experienced most particularly by Black, Puerto Rican, Chicano and other minorities. This is certainly a factor in the lack of minority participation in the anti-nuclear movement. Furthermore, the availability of renewable energy sources on a large scale is a long way off. What is needed *now* is democratic control of the federal and state utility commissions, the establishment of an inexpensive "lifeline" rate for a basic monthly amount of electricity, a freeze on electric rates for consumers and small businesses and a corresponding increase in the rates charged the largest industrial and commercial users, who benefit from the current "promotional" rate structures. Such reforms would lighten the burden of increased energy costs on working people, the poor and the elderly, while encouraging conservation by the only sectors of the economy able to afford it—big business and the military.

4) The conversion of a significant portion of our energy use to renewable sources will be a long and difficult project. Decentralization and local control

of energy resources, though attractive and plausible in some circumstances (in the short run), can not answer these problems. Only public takeover and nationalization of the entire energy complex can begin to make possible the balanced development and centralized planning which are needed. There is no way to bring solar energy into being on a large scale as part of "the free enterprise system." Private interests, as usual, will develop only those technologies which are most profitable, not those which make the most sense. Nationalization of the energy industry under democratic control is an idea whose time has come. The public is ready to take the prospect seriously and the coalition of forces needed to press for a publicly-owned national energy industry can be built now.

These are some of the reforms which can be fought for immediately by a people's coalition. Each would help to ease somewhat the current energy crisis of our system and take some of its burden off the backs of our people, without the need for increased nuclear power. But it would be an illusion to suggest that these reforms can solve the problems, or that the irrationality of the nuclear industry, or even the whole energy complex, can be cured apart from the overall anarchy of capitalist production. For this, much deeper structural changes will be required. But the struggle for shorter term gains, well worth achieving in themselves, can also help to galvanize the kind of movement necessary for the advance toward socialism.

Continued from page 29

The point is, however, that an intelligence system mirrors the state which created it and which it serves; and that state is a manifestation of the social system which, in turn, created it and which it sustains.

The absolutely amoral quality of intelligence operations conducted by the government of the United States for the past thirty years reflects the fact that that government is the bastion of what remains of imperialism; that that government has sought and seeks to prevent the disintegration of colonialism, the extirpation of racism. That government seeks to undermine and destroy social-

ist states and to thwart all adherents of socialism. In this era that means opposition not only to Communists but to all who stand opposed to colonialism, racism, the grave threat of general war and to systematic impoverishment of much of humanity.

The ferocious activities of the CIA and the FBI reflect the anti-human essence of the imperialism both serve. Only a politics in the United States which favors people's welfare rather than Pentagon prosperity will ever cleanse Washington's intelligence apparatus. Imperialism seeks to "finish Hitler's work"; the need is to finish with Hitlerism once and for all.

Imperialism's Intelligence

HERBERT APTHEKER

Exposés of U.S. intelligence agencies have followed each other with regularity for the past five or six years. Repetition may even become "boring" or may induce a kind of cynicism which is one step removed from apathy. It is vital for Communists and all other democratic-minded people to keep up with this literature, digest it and convey its substance as widely as possible and to show why the proper response is not cynicism and certainly not apathy but, on the contrary, anger and an intensified determination to transform politics in this country.

A relevant recent volume is *The Armies of Ignorance: The Rise of an American Intelligence Empire* by William R. Corson (Dial Press, New York, 640 pp., \$12.95). The author is a retired Marine colonel whose military career has been spent in intelligence, not only for the United States but also for South Korea, Japan and great Britain. He remains an adviser in intelligence matters to the government of the United States. He dedicates this book to the President and Vice President of the United States and does so "respectfully."

Clearly, then, this book is not supposed to be an exposé but rather a history and, if anything, a rationalization for past activities. Much of the book treats earlier espionage activity going back to the Revolutionary War, but the heart of the volume is an account of intelligence activity on the international front—the FBI and other internal suppressive institutions are barely mentioned.

What does this "witness for the defendant" have to say on his behalf?

He notes with deep regret that when Gerald Ford became president he was "woefully unprepared" in the face of revelations concerning "intelligence abuses involving drug testing, political assassinations, wire-tapping, domestic surveillance, illegal break-ins, mail intercepts, etc." The point here is not the "revelations" but the President's unpreparedness—that is the problem. Hence, the solution

Herbert Aptheker is director of the American Institute for Marxist Studies and has recently completed *Early Years of the Republic*, the third in a series of volumes on American history.

lies in "making a new president a witting (or partially witting) accomplice to the ongoing questionable and illegal activities of the intelligence community."

Since the writer has years of high-level activity in his own background and since his book is based upon interviews and the contents of recently released documents, there are some nuggets of new data. I do not recall seeing before as starkly as in this volume the fact that President Eisenhower specifically threatened in the spring of 1953 to employ atomic weapons and to spread the fighting beyond the Korean peninsula if an armistice agreement were not quickly agreed to. In addition, one learns here that General Omar Bradley, when chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, testified in February 1953 before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: "We have discussed many times the use of the atomic bomb tactically" but it was decided not to use such weapons because suitable targets had not yet been found; in addition Bradley testified: "The Joint Chiefs have given great consideration to the possibility of bombing Manchurian airfields and rail and production centers elsewhere"—presumably those in power in Peking understand their friends in Washington!

In the mid-50s, the President of the United States appointed a committee, under the chairmanship of General James Doolittle, to examine intelligence activities and needs. Here is the central paragraph in the report of the Doolittle Committee, September 1954:

It is now clear that we are facing an implacable enemy whose avowed objective is world domination by whatever means and at whatever cost. There are no rules in such a game. Hitherto acceptable norms of human conduct do not apply. If the United States is to survive, long-standing American concepts of "fair-play" must be reconsidered. We must develop effective espionage and counterespionage services and must learn to subvert, sabotage and destroy our enemies by more clever, more sophisticated, and more effective methods than those used against us. It may

become necessary that the American people be made acquainted with, understand and support this fundamentally repugnant philosophy.

Historians would be hard put to find better documentary evidence of a ruling class's plotting the institution of fascism—"this fundamentally repugnant philosophy"—than the above instance; its equal, no doubt, is the Huston Plan of the Nixon Administration.

Colonel Corson, the author, comments on the Doolittle matter: "By accepting the Doolittle report Eisenhower not only embraced the idea that there was no Geneva convention to guide American conduct, but also communicated to the intelligence community from Akron to Afghanistan that he was amenable to a no-holds-barred approach on their part."

Less than a year later the Doolittle Report became formal U.S. policy through the adoption of National Security Council directive 5412/1, issued March 12, 1955. The essence of that directive lies in its six authorization paragraphs directed to the CIA; the latter was told to do the following (we are quoting):

- 1) Create and exploit problems for international communism
- 2) Discredit international communism, and reduce the strength of its parties and organization.
- 3) Reduce international communist control over any areas of the world.
- 4) Strengthen the orientation toward the United States of the nations of the free world . . . increase the capacity and will of such peoples and nations to resist international communism.
- 5) In accordance with established principles, and to the extent practicable in areas dominated or threatened by international communism, develop underground resistance and facilitate covert and guerrilla operations.
- 6) Specifically, such operations shall include any covert activities related to: propaganda, political action, economic warfare, preventive direct action, including sabotage, anti-sabotage, demolition, escape and evasion and evacuation measures; subversion against hostile states or groups including assistance to underground resistance movements, guerrillas and refugee liberation groups; support of indigenous and anti-

communist elements in threatened countries of the free world; deception plans and operations and all compatible activities necessary to accomplish the foregoing.

The fact is, writes the author, that the CIA wanted "to finish the job on the Soviet Union started by Hitler." Meanwhile, by CIA or Hitlerian methods, progressive governments were overthrown in Iraq and Guatemala and the Dominican Republic and Guyana, the invasion of Cuba was undertaken and since then programs like Mongoose have subsidized sabotage, murder and—the author tells us—at least eight different attempts to assassinate Fidel Castro. Other murder efforts, including one aimed at Chou En-Lai some twenty years ago, failed, while that against Lumumba succeeded.

The author suggests that it is possible some of these murder efforts were not known to the President but he is sure Rockefeller was in on the secrets. He suggests also that there is evidence that CIA operations have degenerated in terms of responsibility; he cites, for example: "President Carter's admission that he didn't know that King Hussein of Jordan was on his [the CIA's] personal payroll."

Beginning in 1948, the Colonel notes, "The CIA's Office of Policy Coordination and the Deputy Director for Plans had been engaged, without much success, in inserting agents provocateurs into Eastern European satellite countries for low-level espionage and sabotage purposes." By the 1950s these efforts had been sophisticated and developed into full-scale secret wars—code named Red Sox/Red Cap—having as their essential purpose the provocation of uprisings especially in Hungary, Poland and Czechoslovakia. In this period so-called defectors from these countries as well as from Rumania "were trained to become the CIA's entry into anti-Soviet struggles" with most of this training being done in West Germany.

Considerable detail—some of it new—is offered in this volume on the significant role of the CIA in the Hungarian events of 1956; the author makes explicit that the purpose at that time was the complete overthrow of the system of socialism and the restoration of the situation that prevailed prior to World War II. This will make instructive reading for those souls who insisted that the aim of that 1956 counter-revolutionary move was socialism's "purification."

After the failure in Hungary, writes Colonel Corson, the CIA "was pushing ahead to give the Red Sox/Red Cap tactic one more try, this time in Czechoslovakia." The failure in Hungary and then in Czechoslovakia and the energetic measures taken by the socialist community of nations in Europe, especially by the USSR, led to some sober second thoughts on the part of some—never named—in the government, for they began to suspect that this Red Sox/Red Cap tactic not only seemed to be failing but also "if pursued increased the prospect of a general war in Europe to an intolerable level."

This volume contains important material on the close ties of the CIA and certain influential banking

This volume contains important material on the close ties of the CIA and certain influential banking interests—especially the J. Henry Schroder Banking Corporation and the Schroder Trust Company. The Dulles brothers were tied to these corporations, as is ITT; important figures in the banking world of the United States, Britain and West Germany are involved in this Schroder operation. On the boards of Schroder, furthermore, have been U.S. government officials like Robert Patterson, once Secretary of War, Paul Nitze, a former deputy secretary of defense, and until 1976, Harold Brown, at present Carter's Secretary of Defense.

Corson documents the fact that for several years after the fiasco of the Bay of Pigs, U.S. intelligence agencies continued the effort "to orchestrate insurrection by committee" in Cuba. The members of this orchestra of murderers included McGeorge Bundy, Alexis Johnson and John McCone, all of whom continue their lives of distinction.

When, early in the 1970s, some revelations of the dastardly conduct of intelligence agencies began to appear, James Schlesinger was appointed, in 1973, the new head of the CIA. One of his early acts was to direct operatives to send to him personally and confidentially accounts of illegal activities. Colonel Corson reports: ". . . the overall responses indicated 693 examples of Agency activities which, if publicized, would have presented Schlesinger with a serious problem in trying to explain how and by what authority they had been undertaken in the first place." These never have been made public and within a few months Schlesinger was moved to other positions—at the moment in Carter's Cabinet

as his Secretary for Energy.

In 1975 President Ford, in an obvious effort to undercut any real inquiry, appointed his own committee to investigate intelligence activities. He placed in charge of this committee Nelson Rockefeller—which is exactly like placing a fox in charge of guarding a chicken coop. Even that committee in its June 1975 report—which tried to assure all and sundry of the high caliber of intelligence personnel—affirmed that the CIA and FBI for at least twenty years had been constantly engaged in illegal activities. The committee admitted that overseas mail had been regularly intercepted, that the CIA infiltrated organizations in the United States, that operation CHAOS was one vast provocateur effort, that files on 7,200 especially "subversive" Americans were kept for "the day," that the names of another 300,000 Americans were on "suspect" cards, that intelligence agencies had regularly wiretapped U.S. newsmen, that the CIA had held one defector in solitary confinement for three years, that it had "physically abused" another, that it had participated in a secret and altogether illegal drug-testing program that led to death and injury and that various intelligence agencies of the U.S. government had indexed information on SEVEN MILLION people.

It is noteworthy—though Corson does not note it—that the Rockefeller report said practically nothing about intelligence activities overseas. With the above going on inside the United States and aimed largely at American citizens, one can imagine perhaps what has been and is going on against democratic and Left organizations and movements in Western Europe, in the Mid-East, Latin America, Africa and Asia, not to speak of activities attempted within the socialist community and the USSR in particular.

* * *

We repeat a point already made in this essay: Corson is writing as one who held responsible positions in the intelligence apparatus of the United States and one who continues to advise top-level figures on such matters. Corson is a defender of the status quo, an officer for the maintenance of that status quo; he is concerned with some sloppiness in the functioning of the intelligence apparatus of that system.

Continued on page 26

Independence and Destabilization in the Philippines

WILLIAM POMEROY

Over the past six years President Ferdinand Marcos has become the target of an increasing campaign that has sought to portray him as a ruthless dictator, a destroyer of democracy, a violator of human rights, and an oppressor of the Filipino people, comparable to Pinochet in Chile and to the Shah of Iran. This theme has been voiced both by Right-wing quarters that raise the "human rights" issue, a standard hypocritical device to further imperialist aims, and by some Left groups that charge President Marcos and his regime with being a puppet of U.S. imperialism.

Obviously there is something peculiar about a campaign in which imperialist and anti-imperialist find common ground. The Marcos regime can not be both a thoroughgoing puppet of imperialism and at the same time the object of imperialist attack and intrigue. One of the images is inaccurate. There is evidence that what is occurring is a typical case of imperialist-directed destabilization and that some well-meaning progressive people in the U.S. are being carried along in a campaign that could adversely affect the interests of the Filipino people as a whole.

An indication of the real trends in the Philippines is the attitude of the Partido Komunista ng Pilipinas (PKP) over the past six years.

When President Marcos assumed supreme emergency powers through a declaration of martial law in September 1972, proclaiming a "New Society," his move was condemned by the PKP as the imposition of a "military-technocratic dictatorship" with the aim "to eliminate all political risks to, and provide all economic opportunities for, foreign monopoly capital in the Philippines." (See "Philippines under Martial Law," Jan. 1973 *PA*.)

In the early period of martial law the negative features of President Marcos's step were indeed

most noticeable—the suspension of existing democratic processes, the detention of opponents, the forbidding of the right to strike, and, in particular, the granting of very favorable concessions to foreign investors. The latter policy was part of a general tendency from the time Marcos was elected in 1965 to put heavy reliance on major imperialist countries for development capital. This gave credence to the charges that his martial law regime was created to serve imperialist interests through repression of popular avenues of struggle.

From the outset, however, other trends were to be observed in the martial law steps. These had to do with reforms issued as decrees. Among them were agrarian reform measures for the elimination of semi-feudal tenancy, an emphasis on stepped-up industrialization, the dismantling of the political system erected by U.S. imperialism when it held the Philippines as a colony, and forging relations with socialist countries for the first time.

The PKP took note of these changes but pointed out, in a political resolution adopted at its 6th Congress held in illegal conditions in February 1973, that "These reforms were instituted without the benefit of popular participation. Indeed, it is a mark of the reactionary character of the martial law government that it is ensuring the elimination of mass involvement in economic and political changes."

Although the PKP denounced the neo-colonial and dictatorial features of the "New Society," it adopted a degree of restraint toward the Marcos regime, refusing to be drawn into the adventurist armed struggle carried out by Maoists, Catholic radicals and Right-wing political opponents of Marcos.

The immediate tasks were seen as organizing the people in every way possible and working for the transformation and expansion of the existing reform measures into national democratic reforms for the overcoming of neo-colonialism. Unlike the

William Pomeroy is the author of numerous books on national liberation struggles, including *Apartheid Axis: United States and South Africa*.

curious combination of ultra-Left Maoists, anarchistic Catholic radicals and right-wing oligarchal opponents of President Marcos, who tend to see him as a static symbol of imperialist puppetry, the PKP has sought to view the Philippine situation in its dynamic aspects even under conditions of martial law.

By September 1974 these aspects had become sufficiently pronounced to convince the PKP of the feasibility of entering into a national unity agreement with the Marcos government, which itself initiated such a move early in that year. The agreement was consummated after several months of negotiation. This was a development of considerable significance in Philippine political life.

On the part of both the PKP and the Marcos government this was a conditional undertaking. In entering upon it, the PKP declared its support for positive reforms pursued by President Marcos, including land reform, intensified industrialization, the instituting of a parliamentary form of government and of organs of local government with potentially popular features, the restructuring of trade unions in a way contributing to greater workers' unity, and the establishment of diplomatic and trade relations with socialist countries. At the same time, the PKP pledged to struggle for the end of martial law and its curtailment of democratic processes, for the restoration of the right to strike, for the broadening of agrarian reform to serve in particular the interests of the poor peasants, and for higher wages and increased benefits for workers. For its part, the Marcos government released all PKP political prisoners, and permitted the PKP a considerable latitude of legal activity, including the building of mass organizations and unions of workers, peasants, women and youth. But it stopped short of extending recognition to the PKP as a fully legal political party, or of revoking the 1957 Anti-Subversion Law that had outlawed the PKP.

In the concessions made by the Marcos government the PKP saw the opening of forms of the people's participation in national development that it had demanded. Despite its limitations, the agreement with Marcos has been a working arrangement that has helped to further national unity around critical issues affecting the national interests of the Filipino people.

In July 1977 the PKP held its 7th Congress in Central Luzon. That this Congress was not held openly indicated the limitations on the Party's legality. However, the political resolution and program adopted by the Congress point to a broadening of the basis for national unity with the Marcos government, although the main attention of the Congress was devoted to the negative features of the "New Society" that continued to prevent its development aims from fully being realized or extending down to the masses of the people.

Delared the main political resolution:

In the hands of the present administration, martial law, while indeed succeeding in paving the way for the greater penetration of the economy by foreign monopoly capital, has also produced certain progressive developments. One of the strongest and most decisive Filipino presidents, President Marcos, has succeeded, through the martial law powers he has effectively and adroitly been wielding, in steering the country away from total dependence on imperialism, however limited this effort may be. This is clearly reflected in the radical reorientation of Philippine foreign policy, strengthening of the role of the national government in economic planning, the search for new indigenous political structures, diversification of trade, and the enhancement of Filipino culture.

Present Philippine foreign policy has ceased to be a mere extension of American foreign policy. The country has established diplomatic ties with socialist and Third World countries. There is now a more defined identification with the Third World and the group of non-aligned nations in the struggle against imperialism as well as toward the establishment of a New International Economic Order (NIEO). The Philippines has also come out in support of the idea of making South East Asia a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality. In the United Nations the Philippines no longer echoes whatever stand the United States makes but defines its position on various global issues on the basis of the country's objective interests.

In public administration there is a discernible effort to depart from Western-style political forms. The bogus two-party system erected by the postwar imperialist-landlord-comprador alliance was dismantled, and in its place was instituted new vehicles for popular participation in

the form of the *barangays* and the *Sangguniang Bayan**. The government, aside from attempting to streamline its operations, has also made headway in formulating and implementing national economic plans as well as in partially controlling certain important sectors, such as oil, transportation and sugar trading. This development naturally enhances the government's bargaining power vis-a-vis foreign economic interests.

In addition, said the resolution:

The government has launched other progressive measures which in the long run can only have greater positive rather than negative impact on the country's overall development.

The land reform program objectively dismantles the old feudal order, multiplies the number of workers who constitute the leading class in the revolutionary transformation of society, and raises the level of the productive forces for the development of the national economy.

Industrialization is also being promoted in a more systematic and comprehensive manner. Despite the fact that it is being undertaken under the aegis of foreign monopoly capital, it nevertheless expands the productive capacity of the country and can become the basis in the long run for the independent and self-reliant development of the economy.

This assessment of the situation in the Philippines is wholly different from the denunciation of the "New Society" by the anti-Marcos groups based in the United States, which attack the Marcos land reform, scorn the industrialization process, deny any trends toward independence and away from neo-colonialism, minimize the relations with socialist countries (depicted as a kind of sellout of the Filipino people by socialist countries), claim that no democracy but only repression exists in the Philippines, and pictures President Marcos as a despot depending on U.S. military assistance.

Since the 7th Congress the positive trends have become deeper, leading to the mounting by U.S. imperialism of an intensified campaign aimed at removing President Marcos from power.

*The *barangay* and *Sangguniang Bayan* are Marcos-instituted village and town councils with historical precedents in the semi-communal institutions in Philippine society prior to Spanish colonial conquest in the 16th century.

The forces at work in Philippine society, including through the very medium of martial law, have altered considerably, in some ways radically, the policies and attitudes of the Marcos regime. Together with these, the capitalist economic crisis has forced reassessments upon the Marcos government. These trends have been recognized by the PKP but have not been acknowledged by the anti-Marcos groups in the United States and the Philippines.

From the beginning of martial law the Marcos government has represented in the main the newer, growing sectors of the Philippine national bourgeoisie, those identified with industrialization, the financing of capitalist development in both industry and agriculture, and a breaking away from the past colonial pattern of trade. President Marcos has utilized his authoritarian powers to decree development measures and policies benefitting these newer bourgeois groups, measures and policies that previously were obstructed by feudal and oligarchal sectors wielding preponderant influence on the former Philippine Congress that was suspended by martial law decrees.

National bourgeois sectors, in the all-pervading neo-colonialism imposed by U.S. imperialism after 1946, have functioned in a junior partner relationship with U.S. interests. The concessions to foreign investors decreed by Marcos before and after martial law were not new but flowed from this established pattern.

However, the investment incentives decrees of Marcos were not all one-sided in favoring foreign interests. Although they expanded foreign investments in key sectors of the economy, they also placed limitations on both fields of investment and percentage of foreign equity holdings in areas of industry, and they reserved economic sectors for Filipino capital.

The martial law years have been marked by a growth of national bourgeois capital. In the year before martial law (1971) the total of corporate equity investments in domestic corporations was 787 million pesos; by 1976 it had hit an annual rate of 2,602 million pesos. Whereas foreign equity investments from the beginning of the special incentive decrees in March 1973 to the end of 1978 totalled 4,545 million pesos (\$606 million), Filipino equity investments in the same period were 8,738

million pesos (\$1,165 million). Filipino capital, in other words, was growing at double the rate of foreign capital even with the latter's privileges.

Much of the new Filipino capital admittedly is tied up in joint venture arrangements with foreign firms. A growing proportion, however, is independent Filipino capital that represents a strengthening of the national bourgeoisie. As a consequence of their growing strength, the national bourgeois sectors, particularly the new industrial interests, have pressed the Marcos government for a curtailing of foreign investment privileges and for an enhancement of Filipino opportunities. The Marcos government has increasingly tended to respond to this pressure.

In 1974 the 28-year old U.S.-Philippine economic agreement, introduced at the time of independence, which gave the U.S. the notorious "parity" privilege (this gave U.S. businessmen equal rights with Filipinos in all parts of the economy) was allowed to expire. While this essentially benefitted foreign investors and traders of other countries who could not enter the Philippines without the obstacle of a U.S. preferential position, it also considerably encouraged Filipino capital.

Following this, Filipino businessmen began to protest the unrestricted freedom given to foreign companies to borrow investment capital from local sources. Using their stronger credit position, U.S. multinationals in particular were absorbing the capital accumulated by Filipinos, who found it difficult to borrow for their own needs.

In July 1977 the Marcos government declared restrictions on the amount of peso funds that could be borrowed by foreign companies. Banks were directed not to loan funds to foreign companies in excess of a fixed "debt-equity ratio." Foreign companies complained that Marcos was changing the rules in the game.

Filipino entrepreneurs have also demanded that foreign equity holdings in corporations be reduced, and the Filipino share be increased. This indicates a tendency by Filipinos in joint venture arrangements to shake off subservience.

In reaction to these trends, the U.S. business community in the Philippines in 1977 began to apply pressure for a restoration of "parity" privileges. Instead of using the word "parity," which

had become a hated term in the Philippines, U.S. companies have called for a "non-discrimination" policy and for "investment guarantees." This demand immediately produced strong condemnation from Filipino businessmen, as well as from such leading officials as Finance Secretary Cesar Virata. Editorialized the *Manila Times-Journal*, a press voice of government viewpoint:

Parity should now be left in the dustbin of history, and a new economic agreement based on mutual recognition of each nation's sovereignty right must be forged. Never again should Filipinos be made to share their inalienable rights, at the expense of national dignity, to a friend, however close or powerful he may be.

Early in 1978 President Marcos took another step to curtail privileges of foreign companies and to satisfy demands by national bourgeois sectors. He approved amendments to the Philippine Patent Law that hit at the operations of multinational companies, introducing controls on the practice of transfer pricing and on the making of excessive profits. The Patent Law amendments contain provisions for the transfer of technology to the Philippines, which is one of the key demands by developing countries. This is probably the most important move by Marcos so far to alter the neo-colonial arrangements, and it had brought predictable protest and pressure from U.S. interests, including the Carter government.

These emerging signs of contradictions between Philippine national bourgeois interests and those of foreign, particularly U.S., companies do not yet represent a drastic turn-about by the Marcos government, but they are sufficient to cause U.S. imperialism to feel that it can not rely on Marcos to assure long-term stability for its investments.

The tendency for a stiffening attitude toward foreign investment by the Marcos government has come at a time when U.S. imperialism is undertaking to increase its investments in Eastern and South East Asia. At a meeting in Manila on May 8, 1978, of the Pacific Basin Economic Council, a body with the affiliation of senior business executives in the region, James D. Hodgson, a member and former U.S. ambassador to Japan, said that U.S. investment will "increase sharply" in the forthcoming period in the "Pacific Basin" area. He pointed to

the doubling of U.S. investment that had occurred from 1970 to 1977, from \$7 billion to \$14 billion, and said that this would be stepped up.

Plans by U.S. imperialism for a "return" to South East Asia have been underlined by President Carter and Vice-President Mondale, emphasizing the intention of the U.S. to remain a power in Asia. This was the point of the Mondale trip to South East Asia and Australia in June 1978. In these plans the Philippines occupies a key role, being the only country in South East Asia with U.S. military bases where U.S. interests have a long-standing predominant economic control.

Both of these have been undergoing erosion during the past six years of martial law. Proportionately, U.S. economic control is diminishing. The growth of Filipino national bourgeois interests is but one factor in this trend. Diversification of foreign investment, loan sources and foreign trade by the Marcos regime are reducing the share of U.S. interests.

At the outset of martial law, largely as a consequence of "parity," U.S. investments accounted for over 80 per cent of all foreign investments in the Philippines. In the period from 1970 to 1976, out of a total of \$633.6 million of foreign investments, the U.S. accounted for \$273 million or only 43 per cent; Japan ran second with \$162 million or 26 per cent. In 1976 the U.S. accounted for but 37 per cent of investment and this share has reportedly declined further. The same trend has occurred in foreign trade.

A renewed attempt by U.S. corporations to restore their "parity" privileges in the Philippines is connected with this steady diminution of the U.S. share in the country's investment and trade. Occurring at a time when the U.S. is seeking an increase of its export trade to overcome huge deficits, these trends foretell a sharpening contradiction between imperialist and Philippine aims.

Development of relations with socialist countries, the most pronounced shift away from the one-time absolute dictation of Philippine foreign policy by the U.S., has also begun to play a significant part in the economic policies of the Marcos government. In the martial law years trade with socialist countries has risen from virtually nothing to over 3.9 per cent of total Philippine trade in 1976. Projections were

made in January 1978 for overall trade with socialist countries to rise to at least 5 per cent of the total in the foreseeable future. However, this may well be accelerated: in May 1978 the Philippine Export Council submitted a plan to President Marcos urging an increased shift of trade to socialist countries as well as to the EEC, the Middle East, and fellow-ASEAN countries.

Other forms of relationship with socialist countries have also been developing. A Philippine-Soviet shipping agency (Fil-Sov) has been in existence for several years and has enabled Philippine exports and imports to be carried in Soviet vessels at shipping rates up to 20 per cent below those exacted by the imperialist shipping companies.

The outlook of the Marcos government on relations with socialist countries may be observed from the agreement on trade and economic relations signed on December 7, 1977, between the Philippines and the German Democratic Republic. In exchange for Philippine coconut oil, coffee, tobacco products, animal feeds, plywood, foodstuffs, abaca products, copper concentrates, textiles, building materials, footwear, and travel goods, the GDR agreed to supply a considerable range of capital goods and other materials. Similar agreements have been signed with Czechoslovakia, Rumania and Bulgaria, and a major trade and economic relations agreement is in the offing with the Soviet Union.

President Marcos, in other words, has followed trends in the Third World and has opened the door for alternative trade and economic assistance from socialist countries, providing a stronger bargaining position for the Philippines.

One of the main sources of friction between the U.S. and the Marcos regime has been the pressure by Marcos for the renegotiation of the U.S. base and military assistance agreements. This was called for by Marcos even before martial law. The U.S. reaction may be gauged by the prolonged stalling and delays on negotiations by successive U.S. governments. Formal negotiations did not get under way until 1976, to be interrupted by lengthy U.S. adjournments.

The military agreements were literally imposed on the Philippines at the time of independence, as was "parity." U.S. bases, 23 in number as cited in the agreement, originally had a 99-year lease, and

were renewable. Under nationalist pressure, this period was trimmed in 1966 to terminate in 1991. The U.S. has run the bases like areas of U.S. territory, paying no rent, exercising jurisdiction over U.S. servicemen and their offenses against Philippine laws, and denying any form of Philippine control over their operation. Endless friction has been caused by the crimes by U.S. servicemen (including the murdering of scores of Filipinos), by the flouting of Philippine labor and tax laws, and by the extensive smuggling carried out through the bases.

Demands by the Marcos government, presented in the current drawn-out negotiations, include: recognition by the U.S. of full Philippine sovereignty over the bases, Philippine control over the bases including the stationing of Filipino commanders on each base, Philippine jurisdiction over offenses committed by U.S. servicemen, the payment of annual rental by the U.S., drastic reduction of the area of the bases, customs duties on goods imported for the use of the base personnel, no introduction of nuclear or other offensive weapons into the bases, and cutting of the lease period to no more than five to ten years.

It is to be noted that when the Marcos government established diplomatic relations with the Socialist Republic of Vietnam it pledged that the U.S. bases in the Philippines would not be used in any way to infringe upon Vietnam's territory or interests. The Marcos endorsement of the ASEAN resolution to turn South East Asia into a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality is predicated on control over and removal of U.S. bases.

Anti-Marcos groups in the U.S., particularly those with a Left-wing coloration, have tried to depict the negotiating position of the Marcos government as a kind of sham, aimed on the one hand at getting greater military aid to use for repression and on the other hand at creating a facade of "Filipinization" to screen the continued presence of U.S. bases in the country.

The PKP position, however, recognizes that the Philippine renegotiation demands spring from genuine nationalist feeling in the country and a desire for full exercise of sovereignty. In its program the PKP goes further to call for "a unilateral denunciation of the Bases Agreement, the Military Assistance Agreement and the Mutual Defense

Treaty with the United States, together with a notice upon the U.S. government for the withdrawal of its military forces within one year from the date of denunciation."

However, the PKP also recognizes that neo-colonial allies of the U.S. are still a strong force in the Philippines while the people are still insufficiently mobilized to force removal of the bases. The latter factor, indeed, is inhibited by the Marcos rule by decree instead of by encouragement of mass activity in support of nationalist policies.

Since the PKP 7th Congress, the Party and the mass organizations it influences have been conducting a growing propaganda and petition campaign for removal of the bases, and have been mobilizing mass support for the stiffening of the Philippine negotiation position.

Contradictions between the U.S. and the Marcos government that have been growing around economic and military bases issues have been considerably deepened by U.S. dissatisfaction with the political system being developed by Marcos. One of the first martial law steps was the enactment of a new Constitution that did away with the congressional, two-party system patterned after the U.S. system, and introduced a parliamentary system with strong executive powers. Although the Marcos decrees that gave concessions to multinational companies pleased U.S. imperialism, the Marcos political system was less appreciated, as indicated by the anti-Marcos propaganda line that appeared in key sectors of the U.S. press (such as the *New York Times*) and in some U.S. congressional quarters from as early as 1972.

The reason for this is that the traditional U.S. imperialist method of interference and control in Philippine politics, by financing and supporting opposition parties and alternating parties in power, thus preventing stable independent policies, has been interrupted by martial law.

In the old political system a facade of democracy existed without democratic content. It satisfied the wealthy classes and even the intellectual elite. However, the workers and peasants had literally no role in the two main parties, which were run by landlords, comprador businessmen and their hirelings. Corruption on a vast scale, electoral frauds and violence and political "warlordism" in which

regional political bosses ruled by means of private armed forces were prevalent features of the system. The Partido Komunista ng Pilipinas was outlawed, along with "all similar" organizations.

In the "New Society" of Marcos political institutions have been introduced that provide the means at least for greater popular participation.

Under martial law and the developing of new political forms associated with it, the traditional reactionary forces that were formerly in control of Philippine politics have grown increasingly restive, deprived of many of the levers of influence they had exercised. Although all of these forces have their spokesmen either in or around the Marcos government, the curtailment of political activity by martial law has prevented them from making bids for power and from ousting President Marcos. (This is not to say that the developing industrial sectors of the national bourgeoisie are democratically inclined; they are generally reactionary. But the needs of industrial capitalism, particularly in a struggle for independence from foreign control, forces many of them to accept some popular participation.)

Prior to martial law, U.S. preference had already swung toward the opposition Liberal Party headed by Senator Benigno Aquino, who was being groomed to contest the presidency in 1973. Political turbulence, street violence and growth of warlordism in the early 1970s were linked with U.S. destabilization moves against Marcos, in which the CIA played a part, to prepare the ground for an Aquino victory. President Marcos placed Aquino under arrest and in detention when martial law was instituted on charges of subversion. A clue to the U.S. attitude toward Marcos is that Aquino has been made something of a martyr in the U.S. press and by the anti-Marcos groups in the U.S.

From the beginning of martial law the U.S. opened its doors as a haven for anti-Marcos forces. The political leader, Raul Manglapus, who had headed an anti-Marcos Christian Social Movement that was linked with Catholic Church sectors (especially the Jesuit order) and led street demonstrations against Marcos, fled to the U.S. and was given shelter in the South East Asia project section of Cornell University. Manglapus set up a Movement for a Free Philippines that has organized resident

Filipinos against Marcos.

The wealthy oligarchal Lopez and Osmena families, which had fought Marcos before martial law and had had their monopoly empires taken over, found refuge in the U.S.

Much of the anti-Marcos activity in the U.S. has been conducted by Filipino Maoists, who were either sent to the U.S. for that purpose or fled there after martial law. Their groups—the Katipunang Demokratikong Pilipino, the International Association of Filipino Patriots, the National Committee for the Restoration of Civil Liberties in the Philippines—have disseminated extravagant claims about guerrilla warfare by a Maoist "New People's Army" in the Philippines (all the original leaders of which have in fact been killed, captured, surrendered or fled to China). The pertinent fact is that the U.S. government harbors the Filipino Maoists and turns a blind eye to their anti-Marcos activity, which is obviously valued by U.S. interests for confusing and misleading Left and progressive sectors in the U.S.

(Broadest of the anti-Marcos groups in the U.S., the Friends of the Filipino People, has sought to focus on "human rights" and anti-imperialist issues in attacking Marcos, and has therefore attracted a number of liberal and progressive supporters. Unfortunately, the FFP has based itself on uncritical acceptance of anti-Marcos propaganda from Maoist and Catholic Church sources. However, it is noticeable that the FFP has increasingly turned to concentrating on the U.S. imperialist role in the Philippines, which the PKP in the Philippines regards as the main enemy of the Filipino people.)

As the five-year period originally set by Marcos for the duration of martial law approached expiration (1977) and it became evident that the Marcos authoritarian powers would be extended, the Carter Administration, U.S. Congressional quarters and the U.S. press undertook to compel Marcos to lift martial law and to return to electoral processes. For the past two years the hostility toward the Marcos government in leading U.S. quarters has developed to an official level. Moves to arouse Filipino forces opposing him have all the earmarks of what has become standard destabilization policy.

The technique has been to employ the by now

familiar "human rights" weapon. In particular, the U.S. press and news services have given maximum publicity to opposition political groups and figures such as Benigno Aquino. The opposition to Marcos has been played up as a "human rights" fight.

In 1977 the remarkable "coincidence" occurred of U.S.-dominated lending agencies, especially the International Monetary Fund, putting a ceiling on borrowing by the Philippine government. By mid-1978 the Philippines had already reached this borrowing limit for the year and was undergoing an economic squeeze.

U.S. pressure, developing strongly in 1977, was for immediate elections. It undoubtedly forced Marcos to make his call for a National Assembly election for April 7, 1978. However, the Marcos government did not concede the type of election that was being pressed for. In December 1977 President Marcos held a national referendum in which the question was posed, "Would you approve President Marcos continuing in office as both President and Prime Minister after the convening of an Interim National Assembly?" He received a "Yes" ballot of well over 90 per cent. The National Assembly, when elected, would function on an interim basis until martial law was terminated, the interim period to last at least six years. In the game of maneuver Marcos had fended off U.S. pressure and had retained control.

In this referendum the PKP urged the people to vote "Yes," but declared that "the value of the coming referendum rests not on the act of answering 'Yes' to the question on the ballot, but on the opportunity for the Filipino people to discuss the larger issues related to the programs of the present administration—whether or not these have positive or negative effects on national sovereignty and social progress, and what ought to be done to strengthen the progressive trends." Therefore, the PKP called on people to write on the ballot demands for the lifting of restrictions on organizations of the people, including the PKP, to organize and freely participate in all aspects of national life, for a free and independent economy through nationalization of key industries and strict control over multinational companies, for withdrawal of U.S. military bases, and other demands for broadening of popular representation and for strengthen-

ing Philippine independence. This position was consistent with the PKP policy of supporting the positive features of the Marcos regime while seeking to mobilize people to struggle for national democratic changes.

U.S. imperialist antagonism toward President Marcos came into the open in the most pronounced manner to date during the campaign for the Interim National Assembly election in April. The Marcos government put forward its own slate of candidates in each region, under the banner of a newly-projected Kilusan ng Bagong Lipunan (KBL) or New Society Movement. Independent candidates and independent group candidates ran in many regions of the country. The principal anti-Marcos campaign, however, was conducted solely in the city of Manila by an opposition group calling itself Lakas ng Bayan (People's Power) or LABAN (the abbreviation being a word in the Filipino language meaning "against"). Manila was selected by the opposition because in the past the city had the reputation of being traditionally "oppositionist" in elections, but, also, of more importance, because its candidates could conveniently be in close touch with foreign newsmen and backers.

Overwhelmingly the U.S. press coverage (as well as that of newsmen from Japan) favored the LABAN candidates. U.S. newsmen, a large contingent of whom arrived from the U.S. to reinforce resident correspondents, not only confined their reporting to opposition candidates and their campaigns, but participated in meetings and demonstrations of the opposition.

LABAN candidates were a curious amalgam of Right-wing politicians, radicals with Maoist and Catholic Church connections, and some well-known nationalists who are at odds with Marcos on the issue of martial law restrictions. The grouping, however, put forward no real coherent program to replace the "New Society," but concentrated on attacking the regime. At the head of LABAN was Benigno Aquino, who was permitted to run for the National Assembly from his place of detention, from which he gave television and radio broadcasts during the campaign.

So open was the U.S. backing for the LABAN that President Marcos in the course of the campaign made a speech against U.S. interference in the elec-

tions for the purpose of furthering imperialist economic, political and military bases aims. The KBL produced evidence that Benigno Aquino had been a CIA agent in the past. Aquino could not deny this and had to admit in a radio broadcast that he had had ties with the CIA. Unable to refute the charge, the LABAN resorted to the lame campaign line that Aquino had "worked *with* the CIA, not *for* the CIA."

On election day Manila voters rejected Benigno Aquino and all other LABAN candidates and gave Marcos' KBL a clean sweep in the city. An attempt by the opposition to claim fraud did not prosper. Several LABAN candidates who were accused of organizing pre-election disorder went underground. One of them, Charito Planas, fled to the U.S., where she was admitted under "emergency immigration procedures" (not likely to be extended to progressive, anti-imperialist figures).

On May 6, in the wake of the election and in the immediate aftermath of a visit to the Philippines by U.S. Vice-President Mondale, President Marcos delivered a major speech to ROTC cadets at the University of the Philippines in which he hit out sharply at efforts by U.S. interests and the Carter Administration to destabilize his government, and warned that this would hurt U.S. interests as much as the Philippines. He announced that he warned Mondale against attempts to use a so-called "human rights" issue as a means of putting pressure on him to yield to U.S. wishes on economic, political and military bases questions. He charged the U.S. with dragging their feet on bases negotiations. There was a strong implication in his speech that the U.S. was trying to organize a coup to overthrow his government.

A few days later Marcos ordered a series of retirements and reassignments of top officers in the Philippine armed forces, obviously intended to dislocate any coup plots affecting the armed forces (in which the influence of the Pentagon has been prevalent for decades).

U.S. interference that became obvious to all in the course of the election campaign contributed to the emergence of a significant new phenomenon in Philippine politics. For the first time in a national

election leading candidates of a national bourgeois party made U.S. interference a major issue. In the case of some cabinet members and others who ran for the National Assembly, this was projected as an anti-imperialist issue. They assailed the U.S. not only for election interference but also for its attitude of stalling on military bases negotiations, for the role of its multinationals in controlling the Philippine economy, and for its hypocritical "human rights" campaign for destabilization purposes.

Although a PKP application to be recognized as a legal party and to run its own candidates in the election was turned down by the military authorities, PKP-influenced mass organizations played an important part in the campaign, especially in propagandizing against U.S. imperialist interference and activity in the Philippines, past and present. The PKP-led forces did not give a blanket endorsement to the KBL and all its candidates but gave support only to those who agreed to take an anti-imperialist position.

As the PKP has pointed out, the Marcos administration can only maintain and expand its independence, and can only serve the development needs of the masses of the people, or of the national bourgeoisie itself, by removing restrictions on the participation of the people in development. The pressures of imperialism and its Filipino allies to force the Marcos government to reverse its tentative steps toward independence can only be withstood, says the PKP, if the masses of the people are encouraged and mobilized to resist imperialist pressure and to support anti-imperialist policies.

In the view of the PKP it is possible within the present situation in the Philippines to organize the masses, to build up their strength and thus to influence the development of reforms toward genuinely national democratic changes. Those groups and individuals in the United States who have expressed honest concern about the interests of the Filipino people would do well to study the assessment and tactics of the PKP in the complex situation that exists in the Philippines, and to act in unity for ending imperialist influence in that country.



On the Coal Strike

PAUL J. NYDEN

Portia Siegelbaum's article on the coal strike (*PA*, April 1978) is a very helpful analysis of one of the nation's key unions and industries. A few points, however, need clarification.

First, the coal operators themselves are the source of the notion that rank-and-file or "wildcat" strikes (generally over safety) were the primary cause of the financial problems of the UMW Welfare and Retirement Fund. This is not true; last fall, the U.S. Department of Labor itself pointed out that 80 per cent of these problems were caused by the skyrocketing costs of medical care itself, costs which could not be met by the more slowly-increasing royalty payments from the operators.

Second, while mine safety in the United States ranks among the worst in the world, the accident rate has decreased significantly since passage of the 1969 Coal Mine Health and Safety Act; no major disaster has occurred in a union mine since that time. It is important to take note of such improvements, for they were won by the struggles of miners themselves, notably the 1969 Black Lung Strike and 1972 Miners for Democracy victory. While our mines will never be really safe until they are publicly owned, it is important to stress that improvements have been made through the struggles miners have waged.

Third, the companies are constantly trying to scare Appalachian miners into softening their militant stance on safety and other issues by the threat of nonunion western coal production. While production west of the Mississippi is increasing dramatically, and does constitute a real danger to the strength of the UMW, all industry

analysts predict that coal production will always be based primarily in the Appalachian coal fields—whose quality and extent are unparalleled anywhere in the world. Today, every major company is opening new mines in the East (at a cost of between \$15 and \$30 million per mine) and expanding production at existing pits. Production may temporarily taper off in certain areas, but the long-range outlook is for the bulk of coal to continue coming from the eastern fields.

Fourth, while it is true that the companies liked Boyle, his credibility had become so low after his defense of Consolidation Coal in the wake of the Mannington tragedy, his opposition to the successful Black Lung strike, his dishonesty during the 1969 race for UMW President, and his complicity in the Yablonski assassinations, that the coal operators recognized he no longer possessed the legitimacy to influence or "control" his own membership. By 1970 or 1971, the more sophisticated coal operators knew that new leaders would have to be found (such a view was expressed in the 1971 *Fortune* article, "Anarchy in the Coal Fields"). The rank-and-file militancy which

began sweeping the coal fields in the mid-1960s in reality upset "the smooth working relationship [the BCOA] had with the UMWA" some years before the "ouster of Boyle."

Finally, two minor points. Peabody Coal is no longer owned by Kennecott Copper; in 1976 it was sold to Newmont Mining and a consortium of five other companies. Second, the sulphur content of different coals varies, but the percentage of sulfur is not what differentiates sub-bituminous from bituminous coal.

I felt Portia Siegelbaum's article was particularly useful in recognizing the retreat of Arnold Miller from the principles upon which he was elected in 1972 and again in 1977, and his open collaboration with the companies during the recent strike. This, more than anything, underlines the necessity for continuing rank-and-file organizations, even when progressive union leaders are elected. Had miners' rank-and-file organizations not been disbanded after the 1972 and 1973 MFD victories, Miller may never have taken such a turn to the Right. And when he did, rank-and-filers would have been in a position to wage an organized battle against the BCOA themselves, and the new 1978 contract would have been a better one.

A Note on Lenin's Letter to American Workers

CLAUS WEBER

I recently read again with deep interest the article by Art Shields "The Story Behind Lenin's Letter to American Workers" (*PA*, January 1970). Shields mentions a German who, as a former member of the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW), took part in writing a letter to Lenin.

Lenin's reply to this was the famous Letter to American Workers.

Because of the fact that Heinrich Lubbert (spelled "Lietgert" in Shields' article) was later a resident of the German Democratic Republic, I made further inquiries. I learned that Lubbert migrated to the U.S. in 1913 and there-

after actively participated in the struggle for the rights of the working people of your country. He joined the IWW and, in 1917, participated in writing the letter to Lenin.

The letter was given to Comrade Nikolai Dimitriwitsch Krukow, commissar of the Soviet military transport vessel *Shilka*, who took that document on board his ship in Seattle, Washington, in 1917. Here the letter was hidden in a life jacket and sent on its way to Lenin via White Guardist Russia. In

1918 received your progressive work. This reply became the renowned Letter to America.

Lutsk was imprisoned several times because of his political views and his activities against capitalism in the U.S. In November 1919 a ship dubbed the "Arc" sailed from New York to Russia carrying 249 socialists who were considered a "menace to law and order." Heinrich

Lubbert was among them.

He died about three years ago in Schwerin, GDR.

The sailor who carried the letter to Lenin lived in Leningrad. Maybe one can get in touch with his family or obtain further information through *Wetscherni Leningrad*, a daily newspaper in that city.

*University of Greifswald
Greifswald, German Democratic
Republic*

BOOK ENDS

AIMS Occasional Papers

BEN LEVINE

Sender Garlin, *Charles P. Steinmetz: Scientist and Socialist*. John Swinton: *An American Radical*. American Institute for Marxist Studies, (AIMS) Occasional Papers, New York, N.Y. 10016.

In his recent studies Sender Garlin has brought to our attention two forgotten figures in the earlier radical history of this country: Charles Steinmetz, scientist, and John Swinton, journalist.

Steinmetz, who was to become GE's "electrical wizard" and inventor, fled Bismarck's Germany in his youth. But his Socialist orientation persisted, and in some ways he would demonstrate an extraordinary prescience. For instance, as far back as 1915 Steinmetz warned of a coming energy crisis. Around that time he also pointed out the necessity of social insurance as "an overhead expense of the industrial process."

After the Bolshevik Revolution an

interested Steinmetz exchanged correspondence with Lenin and offered his help if it were needed in the great electrification project undertaken by Soviet Russia.

Steinmetz served in Schenectady's Socialist administrations and did much to improve the health and education of the city's children. Although he thought American monopolies would gradually and peacefully tend toward a society with public ownership of the basic means of production, he was, for his time, a prototypical Socialist.

* * *

John Swinton, who lived through the major part of the 19th century, was a crusading journalist and organizer who had been associated with the *New York Times*, the *Sun*, the *World*, and the *Brooklyn Eagle*. He saw the "octopus" of corporate capitalism grow out of the Civil War and was to voice the

grievances of the laboring class as well as the anti-trust feeling that grew along with the monopolies.

He participated in the anti-slavery struggles of the 1850s and in the struggle of labor and the unemployed in the 1870s. In a weekly called *John Swinton's Paper*, he gave prominence to organized labor and to anti-monopoly movements.

Swinton protested the Tompkins Square "police riot" against the unemployed in an impassioned appeal to the New York State Legislature in March 1874.

He met and interviewed Karl Marx in 1880.

Sender Garlin's scholarship, his writing skill, and his unusual feel for the subjects has produced two works of fascinating interest and brought alive American radicals who were more than reformers and just short of being revolutionaries—indicative of their time and place.

The text of the Lenin correspondence and the interviews with Marx are appended in full to the monographs.

**NOTHING
COULD
BE
FINER**

NOW AVAILABLE

by
**Michael
Myerson**



Rev. Ben Chavis

...Truly rips the mask from the so-called liberal state of North Carolina...Never again can North Carolina hypocritically boast of being "First in Freedom." It has been exposed as never in its history. This book is a must for everyone.

Dr. Charles E. Cobb, *Executive Director, Commission for Racial Justice, United Church of Christ*

...A well documented account of the arrogance, abuse of power, and shameful and immoral conduct of "small-time tyrants" and corporate barons who have controlled much of the economy and politics of North Carolina with their anti-labor practices. It should stir public emotion and move others to confront and challenge North Carolina's power structure until constitutional rights are fully restored.

Ray Rogers, *Corporate Campaign Director, J.P. Stevens Campaign, Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union, AFL-CIO**

(*Title listed for identification only)

\$3.95 paper

\$12.00 cloth

INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS
381 Park Ave. South
New York, N.Y. 10016



the spectacular winter celebrations of the U.S.S.R.....

Hundreds of thousands of Soviet workers throng Red Square. Now you can share the excitement in Moscow, Leningrad and Kiev—

November 5 - 19: Two exciting 2-week tours

Tour #1 - for workers and trade unionists and their families only. Stay in trade union hotels. \$765

Tour #2 - open to all. Accommodations in first class Intourist hotels. \$816

.....or join the the Winter Festival

for the jubilant holiday season, abundant cultural attractions, a New Year's Eve banquet, and more.

December 24 - January 7

Winter Festival Tour - first class accommodations, Moscow, Leningrad and Kiev. \$900.

Holiday Gala Tour - for youth only (35 or under). Co-sponsored by NCASF. Stay in youth hotels, Moscow and Leningrad. \$775

All tours include special meetings with Soviet Friendship Societies, visits to pioneer palaces, museums, historical sites, theaters and other cultural attractions.

Remember, we handle air, train or bus travel to anywhere.

ANNIVERSARY TOURS - (212) 245-7501
250 W. 57th St., Suite 1428
New York, N.Y. 10019



struggle with us for peace, jobs, equality, socialism

The Communist Party, U.S.A. is the political party of the working class and is dedicated to the interests of all working people and all specially oppressed peoples. Its aim is a socialist society.

Such a social system will act in the interests of the people rather than for private profit of capitalist corporations. Only through abolition of the capitalist system and the socialist re-organization of society can exploitation of one human being by another be ended, and with it the evils of oppression, war, racism, and poverty.

The heart of the Communist Party's day-to-day program is the struggle for peace, democracy, equality, against racism and for improvement in the living conditions of all working people.

*Preamble to the Constitution
of the Communist Party, USA*



JOIN THE COMMUNIST PARTY, USA

Yes, I would like information on the Communist Party, USA

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Clip and send to:

Communist Party, USA
235 West 23 Street
New York, N.Y. 10011