

NORTH AMERICA NEWS

CANADA

QUEBEC

UNITED STATES

A QUOTATION FROM CHAIRMAN MAO

OUR POINT OF DEPARTURE IS TO SERVE THE PEOPLE WHOLE-HEARTEDLY AND NEVER FOR A MOMENT DIVORCE OURSELVES FROM THE MASSES, TO PROCEED IN ALL CASES FROM THE INTERESTS OF THE PEOPLE AND NOT FROM ONE'S SELF-INTEREST OR FROM THE INTERESTS OF A SMALL GROUP, AND TO IDENTIFY OUR RESPONSIBILITY TO THE PEOPLE WITH OUR RESPONSIBILITY TO THE LEADING ORGANS OF THE PARTY.

CONTENTS:

68. Proletarian Leadership and the Student Movement

6/28/72

69. Kim Il Sung's Talks with American Reporters

70. Necessity for Change Newsletter - Analysis of Work Under Imperialism

68. PROLETARIAN LEADERSHIP AND THE STUDENT MOVEMENT

Toronto, June 22 (PCDN)-- The June 12, 1972 issue of the Toronto Student, Vol.4, No. 2, carried a lead item entitled "Proletarian Leadership and the Student Movement". The full text follows:

In the past weeks, the working class and oppressed people of the world have been winning victory after victory in their struggle to put an end to U.S. imperialist domination and exploitation. The great victories of the People's Liberation Armed Forces of South Vietnam have struck yet another mighty blow at the monster of U.S. imperialism. The magnificent struggle of the Quebec workers, especially those of the North Shore, shows the way for all of the North American working class. In these very days the workers of Kitchener are resolutely standing up to fascist police attacks and adding another chapter to the glorious history of the Canadian working class solidarity and militant resistance.

Everywhere the bourgeoisie is being smashed and everywhere bourgeois individualism is being rejected by the people. This is an historical trend, and those who pit their egos against the forces of history will surely be crushed.

Over and over again, however, the experience of the international communist movement teaches us that the political line of the bourgeoisie is reflected in the form of bourgeois ideology inside the party of the proletariat. The ideological domination of monopoly capitalism is reflected in the fact that its ideas appear also in the ranks of the revolutionaries. In these past weeks the members of Zone 2 Branch of the Communist Party of Canada (Marxist-Leninist) have been engaged in a struggle to overthrow the line of bourgeois individualism carried by the leadership of the Party Branch. Concretely, bourgeois individualism took the form of not carrying on wide scale propaganda against the monopoly capitalist class of Canada as the agents of US imperialism, of not advancing the resistance movement against the attacks of the fascist social fascists and lackey police, and of not disseminating Marxist-Leninist theory as the basis for building the Party.

When we look at the Marxist-Leninist student movement in the light of this struggle, what does the slogan "The working class must exercise leadership in everything." mean? Working class leadership in the student movement means the dissemination of the proletarian ideology, Marxism-Leninism at its highest stage, Mao Tsetung Thought, amongst the student masses in the broadest possible manner. It means upholding proletarian ideology, by combatting the ideology of the imperialists which is the dominant ideology in the university. And it means to disseminate proletarian ideology by building a Marxist-Leninist discussion group amongst the advanced students.

Working class leadership in the student movement means that the revolutionary students must come under the leadership of the vanguard of the proletariat, of its political party, the COMMUNIST PARTY OF CANADA (MARXIST-LENINIST). Chairman Mao has pointed out: "The force at the core leading our cause forward is the Chinese Communist Party. The theoretical basis guiding our thinking is Marxism-Leninism."

Students are not a class by themselves (capable of forming alliances with another class); nor are they an oppressed national minority nor even "intellectual workers". Students are not the vanguard of the anti-imperialist revolution in Canada nor are they a simple appendix to the working class. Students are members of a definite class (by and large the petty bourgeoisie) and they have contradictions with imperialism in their own material base, the university. It is by representing the proletarian party's line in the university and by disseminating it there that the students come under the leadership of the working class. It is resisting fascist, social fascist and police attacks perpetuated on pro-

gressive students in the course of disseminating Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought that we students come under the leadership of the working class. And it is by actively opposing the fascist and slave ideas propagated by the neo-colonial university in Canada, by waging large scale propaganda campaigns against US imperialism that progressive students concretely come under the leadership of the working class. That is, students can concretely put the slogan "The working class must exercise leadership in everything" into practice by waging determined struggles against US imperialism in their own material base, the neo-colonial university in Canada. It is thus that we can defeat the line of bourgeois individualism and establish the proletarian revolutionary line of Comrade Hardial Bains in the Party.

**DOWN WITH BOURGEOIS INDIVIDUALISM!
CLASS STRUGGLE IN THE PARTY IS JUST FINE!
LONG LIVE THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CANADA
(MARXIST-LENINIST)!**

end item

69. KIM IL SUNG'S TALKS WITH AMERICAN REPORTERS

Pyongyang, June 4, 1972 (Hsinhua)--The Korean Central News Agency released on June 2, a report on the talks of Comrade Kim Il Sung with U.S. reporters. The report reads in part as follows:

Comrade Kim Il Sung, the great leader of our Party and the Korean people, received on May 26, Harrison E. Salisbury, Associate Editor of "the New York Times" of the United States, on visit to our country and John M. Lee, Tokyo Bureau Chief of this paper, who was accompanying him.

Answering some questionings raised by the American reporters, the respected and beloved leader Comrade Kim Il Sung referred first to the question of relations between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States. He stressed; the relations between our country and the United States depend entirely on the attitude of the U.S. Government. If the U.S. Government changes its policy towards our country, we will also do the same towards the United States.

He said that if the U. S. Government wants to improve its relations with our country, it must first of all, stop interfering in the internal affairs of our country so that the question of Korea's reunification be settled independently by the Koreans themselves.

Pointing out that what the U.S. Government does also displease us is that it helps to revive Japanese militarism, he recalled that in the joint communique between Nixon and Sato released in 1969, the United States instigated Japanese militarism to take its place in the aggression on Korea by ushering the latter into South Korea and to interfere in the domestic affairs of our country.

He referred in detail to the fact that as regards to the question of the United Nations the U.S. Government is also taking an unwarranted attitude towards our country.

He emphasized: if the United States

wants to improve its relations with our country, it should stop interfering in the internal affairs of our country, withdraw the U.S. troops going under the signboard of "U.N. forces" and dissolve the "U.N. Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea" so that the Koreans can reunify their country independently.

He emphasized that if the United States wants to improve relations with our country, it should also stop helping the revival of Japanese militarism and bringing it into south Korea.

Answering the question of the reporters if there can be exchanges of journalists and cultural groups and so on, to promote mutual understanding and reduce tension between two countries even before the withdrawal of U.S. troops from south Korea, Comrade Kim Il Sung said: It does not mean we want to shut the door in relation with the United States. But so long as the basic problem is unsolved, exchanges of journalists, cultural intercourse and so on will be of little significance, I believe.

He said that while the U.S. Government makes no change in its hostile policy toward our country, he favored mutual visits between us just on a limited scale, as at present.

Comrade Kim Il Sung spoke of Korea's reunification problem.

The Korean question must be left to the Korean people so that they may solve it by themselves on the principle of national self-determination without any interference of outside forces, Comrade Premier stressed, and he went on:

For the independent settlement of the question of the reunification of Korea without any interference of outside forces first of all, the U.S. troops must leave south Korea. If they leave, no war will break out in Korea.

Recalling that we have contacts with south Korea through the preliminary talks between the north and south Korean Red Cross organizations, he noted: We think that if the Koreans sit face to face, they can remove distrust and misunderstanding, find common points and achieve national unity on this basis.

He pointed out: If the north and south establish the principle of not imposing their social systems on the other side, then there is no need of fighting each other by force of arms.

To the question of the U.S. reporters as to what practical measures we are taking for an independent, peaceful reunification of the fatherland, Comrade Premier said:

...We hold that all the political parties and public organizations of north and south Korea should sit together to hold a political consultative conference and exchange views on the question of national reunification on a broad scale.

We also proposed that a confederation be enforced if it is impossible to reunify the country right now. The confederation we proposed means forming a supreme national council with representatives of the governments of north and south Korea main-

ly for the purpose of jointly discussing questions of national interests of Korea and coordinating them in a uniform way, while maintaining the two present political systems of north and south Korea as they are for the time being.

Recalling the fact that we have proposed many a time to realize exchange of economy, culture and science between the north and south, he said that we called for conclusion of a peace agreement between the north and south on refraining from the use of armed forces against each other and demanded withdrawal of all foreign forces from south Korea and a cut in the strength of forces of the two sides.

He stated that we are making all possible efforts to remove the tension and realize contacts and exchange between the north and south.

Saying that the south Korean rulers are playing every kind of trick after declaring a so-called "state of emergency" under the pretext of fictitious "threat of southward aggression from the north" and are talking about "reunification by prevailing over communism." He stated: This, after all, means an attempt to oppose the reunification of the country and perpetuate the division.

Expressing apprehensions for south Korea being subjected to Japan economically, he said: If the south Korean rulers keep the door shut to the north, Japanese capital will flow into south Korea and south Korea will be completely subjected to Japan economically.

Then, Comrade Kim Il Sung touched upon the question of relations between our country and Japan.

Noting that good-neighbour relations between Korea and Japan have not been established up to this date entirely because the Japanese Government has enforced a hostile policy towards our country, he stated: If the Japanese Government wants to establish friendly relations with us, giving up its hostile policy towards our country, we are fully ready to respond to it.

He emphasized: But we do not want to improve relations between the two countries through mendicant diplomacy when the Japanese Government continues its hostile policy and takes an unfriendly attitude toward our country.

The smaller a country is, the greater self-respect its people must have. Without self-respect even, the people of a small country cannot live.

In conclusion, Comrade Premier said: We do not oppose the people of the United States, though we oppose the reactionary policy of its government. We want to have many good friends of ours in the United States.

end item

70. NECESSITY FOR CHANGE NEWSLETTER-ANALYSIS OF WORK UNDER IMPERIALISM

Camden, June, 1972 (Necessity for Change Newsletter)--The following is a reprinting of the complete text of the Necessity for Change Newsletter #14 entitled An Analysis of Work Under Imperialism:

Necessity for Change Newsletter #11 had two reports on a public meeting sponsored by Necessity for Change Study Groups on the

topic "Contradictions in work under U.S. imperialism." This newsletter was circulated internally only in order to prepare conditions for more extended discussions on the topic. Informal and formal discussions were held in the Camden area with some of the people who participated at the public meeting. After analysis of the main strengths and weaknesses of the public meeting, people agreed that individual summing up of the contradictions on their own jobs could best serve the people and brighten the flames of revolution that are beginning to burn at various places in the area. The following analysis was written for Change Newsletter by an activist in the Camden area.

Principal contradiction: I work in a supermarket. This particular supermarket is owned by a corporation which owns hundreds of similar supermarkets. The yearly sales of all these supermarkets is over one billion dollars and is made possible by more than 30,000 employees. This corporation also owns a well-known chain of department stores and owns part or whole interest in a great number of food processing firms whose products bosses sell in their retail chain. The owners of this corporation also own a similarly named real estate corporation which rents the land and buildings to themselves. The officers-owners in one corporation can be found in the other, seemingly changing title at whim and generously adding relatives to various posts. Furthermore, these men are also directors in many other firms. A few of the operations that have my bosses sitting on their boards are: two banks, a warehousing corporation, some factories, other real estate firms, retail related companies, and corporations with financial investment in other countries.

Quite clearly, the owners of the place where I work control a good deal of resources and capital. They don't rank with the largest of the monopoly capitalists like General Motors or Standard Oil, but they easily qualify as big bourgeoisie. It is easy to see that I am the opposite of them. I own no capital; the only resource I have control over is myself. In order for me to "earn a living" I must sell my labor power to one or another group of capitalists. In their legal language, I am not a slave; the practical situation, however, indicates that I am a wage slave-dependent upon them for my livelihood. Every time the diseased U.S. imperialist body shivers from the ills of inflation, "over-production," dollar drain, extravagant waste, and war production, my economic base contorts as in an earthquake. Even if the economy is in a temporary upsurge, I must work long hours to begin to enjoy some measure of economic security. But my bosses are the germs in the economic body, fattening on its weaknesses, living extravagantly even in the depths of economic disorder.

As I look around, I see the other workers at the stores are in the same boat. There might be some differences among us because of different job classifications, etc., but these are slight. There is a tremendous potential for a solid, principled unity

in aspirations and practice among us.

The unity that exists between us and our opposites (the bosses) is a fragile thing forced upon us by the economic structure. On the one hand, we don't need the parasitic capitalists because we make the supermarkets run, but on the other hand, under the dictatorship of the imperialists, we have to work for them to survive. Although the large number of us work very hard to produce value, a small group controls and consumes that value, doling out to the workers a small percentage as wage. In other words, social production is privately expropriated. This is the principle contradiction that faces me and thousands of other employees in this corporation.

Form of the contradiction: Although the workers are more numerous and more powerful than their exploiters, the monopoly capitalists are the dominant aspect of the contradiction. This is a temporary condition that exists now (it is sure to change into its opposite in the future) because the bosses are better organized than the workers.

The bosses' method of work is bureaucratic: arbitrary rules and decisions made by a small clique divorced from the workers, and backed up by fascist threats. Ninety per cent of the decisions regarding the operation of the supermarket are made by a few in a central office. These people have no concern for the workers nor the customers and therefore their decisions often interfere with efficient serving of the people. One good example is the repetitive price changes that must be made every week. Decisions affecting the workers' lives (how many hours and when they can work) are made by the bosses behind closed doors and the employee told afterwards. If the employee

moves to change the boss's arbitrary decisions or justifiably rebels against them, he is threatened with firing. When I refused to work a schedule bad for me, I was told adjust or quit. As if the bosses' sweat keeps the shelves stocked!

But the main reason the bosses are dominant now is that they have succeeded in imposing their method of work right in our ranks. This is being done by the bosses' agents, the union hacks. These parasites living off dues forcibly extracted from the workers by the boss, parade around in high style. They do not care for nor know about the workers other than they must appear to be for labor and against the bosses.

Whenever the bosses are contemplating a move against the workers that would cause us to rebel, they tell their cohorts in the union bureaucracy first. These people then plan how best to keep us down under the pretext of working for the worker. "Our lawyers are working on this." "We've been up day and night negotiating."

When the union is close to losing passive acceptance of the workers, they call a union meeting so that they can insult us (calling us stupid because we don't want to follow their way), threaten us (their goons will evict us if we oppose their bureaucratic Roberts Rules of "order"), and ignore us regardless of what we have to say.

These people can only get away with these things because our spontaneous rebellions against them and their bosses (monopoly capitalists) have not been organized in the best way to defeat our enemy and strengthen our own ranks. To sum up: (1) the working class enemy are the monopoly capitalists; (2) the enemy's right hand agents disguise themselves as friends of the workers to disrupt us.

end item

NORTH AMERICA NEWS presents documents, reports and news items from the world-wide struggle against imperialism, social-imperialism and all reaction. News items for NAMN should be mailed to ADVANCE NEWS

PO Box 954 Annex Sta.
Prov., R.I. 02901

NEW SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Single copy, per month (or 3 issues), by 1st class—\$2.00
by airmail—\$3.00
Single copy, per issue, by 1st class mail—\$.30

Our new graduated schedule of bulk rates is available upon request from ADVANCE NEWS. Please write for one if you intend to receive more than one copy per issue of NAMN.

Make checks or money orders payable
to ADVANCE NEWS.

CORRECTION: In item 60 of NAMN (June 17 issue), the following paragraph, introducing the article in Rhode Island Student, was left out.

(This excerpt from "What Is It to be Objective?" is from a larger article written by a member of the "Experience in American Culture Discussion Group." This excerpt is being printed because it directs itself toward a question faced by students in the classroom, i.e., whether one can be "value free" and, in more particular terms, what "bourgeois objectivity"—the objectivity which purports to take no side—really is.)