

**WORKERS' PRESS**

THE POLITICAL ORGAN OF THE MARXIST-LENINIST COLLECTIVE

**RUBBER STRIKE EXPOSES UNION LEADERS!**

The four-month-long rubber strike has shown that a militant and highly determined rank-and-file can push a threatened union leadership, but only so far. The role of these labor traitors as agents of the bourgeoisie within the labor movement can be exposed, but not changed. There is no way to change them, only, GET RID OF THEM!

The rubber workers, after suffering through a horrible three-year sell-out contract, signed in 1973, were bound and determined to make out much better this time around. Their strength and high resolve, plus the fact that five of the seven local union officials involved in the 1973 sell-out had been given the boot, forced the present leadership to take a fighting posture.

Although sounding so high and mighty, the United Rubberworkers (URW) leadership, headed by President Peter Bommarito, proved by their actions to be the traitors they have always been. First, the international boycott of Firestone tires, which union hacks cackled would 'help bring the dispute to an early and favorable conclusion' proved totally ineffective. The efforts put into the boycott were half-hearted at best, and obviously did no such thing as bring the strike to a settlement in favor of the workers. Second, a substantial number of unionized tire plants remained in operation during the strike. Local URW leaders, particularly the General tire union negotiators, played the most treacherous role in undermining union solidarity and allowed continued tire production. Bommarito, instead of demanding that all plants be shut down and all workers go out, could only mutter, 'This is not in the best interests of the URW.' Otherwise, he did nothing! Third, the issue of strike benefits showed the labor misleaders' attempts to defuse the strike. When the strike fund ran dry after only three weeks, the Executive Board of the URW refused to vote for further benefits. Of course, these traitors made no mention of the millions of union dollars holed up in capitalist investments that could have been used to supplement the depleted strike fund.

Other examples of the treachery and deceit of the union leadership -- their expressions of faith and trust in the capitalist courts, their attempts to keep the lid on the workers' militancy, and their constant efforts to limit the strike to economic issues -- clearly show that these 'leaders' are not fit to lead the working class. Beyond the events surrounding the strike, it is easy to pick out the words and deeds of the union leaders that tie them to the capitalist state.

The URW's Committee on Political Education (COPE) is directly connected with bourgeois candidates and elections. In an appeal to URW members for political contributions, COPE explains, '1976 is a pivotal election year. The Presidency is at stake as well as scores of too-close-to-call US House and Senate contests. Many good friends of working people face tough elections.' ("United Rubber Worker" Dec. '75) As if they really expect bourgeois candidates to serve the interests of working people.

Another political plea in the June issue of the URW paper made by the international official asked for 'support for Israel and for the US to continue giving military and economic aid that Israel needs to survive.' This is a good example of the labor traitors' support for US imperialism.

(continued p 2)

## What's Inside

Carter or Ford: Two Side of Same Coin  
Struggle for Land in Southwest & Mexico  
Olympics  
The Term "USNA"

The URW leadership, despite any kind of occasional militant posturing, says or does little to serve the real interests of the rubber workers. As always, they do a fine job of exposing themselves as labor traitors and misleaders. Now it is the workers' turn to do a job -- EXPEL THE UNION BUREAUCRATS! It is imperative that the trade unions be wrested away from these agents of the bourgeoisie. Only then can the unions be turned into revolutionary weapons for the working class in waging class struggle.

## CARTER OR FORD - TWO SIDES OF THE SAME COIN

It has been proven conclusively that there is no connection between the drought that hit so much of the US this year and the hot air generated by capitalist politicians seeking office. As proof, one need only examine the facts: many of the candidates have been spewing out their rhetoric for the last two or three years.

The already sloth-like government bureaucracy has ground to a near halt as Democrats and Republicans alike have adopted a hands-off policy on controversial legislation until after November, while hundreds of candidates jet around the country on the taxpayers' money trying to drum up support for themselves or their colleagues. Representative Alphonzo Bell, a conservative California Republican, estimates that the salary, fringe benefits, and other expenses of each member of Congress comes to about \$500 thousand a year! He wonders if taxpayers 'think we are worth it'.

The focal point of the 1976 elections is the quest for the Presidency. The choice is between Gerald Ford and Jimmy Carter. This article will focus on Carter.

Carter has resurrected the myth that 'anyone' (anyone, that is, who is white, male, and wealthy) can become president -- all he needs is to have been born in a log cabin to complete the lie. In addition, he has succeeded in creating an image of himself as 'anti-Washington', as a 'simple' Georgia peanut farmer.

Behind Carter's Cheshire-cat-grin, however, lies a calculating politician. Despite his anti-Washington rhetoric, Carter remains tied to Washington and Wall Street by a thousand and one threads. David Rockefeller, President of Chase Manhattan Bank, knows this. Three years ago, he and Zbigniew Brzezinski formed the Trilateral Commission, composed of leading finance capitalists from the US, Japan, and Western Europe. They asked Carter to join, and he accepted. If Carter is elected, Brzezinski will probably become his Secretary of State.

Carter has worked hard to build up his image. Like all other capitalist politicians in an election year, he has mastered the art of making impossible promises. For example, US News & World Report, July 26, quotes Carter as saying: 'There's no doubt in my mind that before I go out of office, the budget will be balanced...' Then, in the August 2 issue, the same magazine prints an article proving that balancing the US budget is virtually impossible -- under capitalism, we would add. Carter makes other impossible projections: He would ask (increased) federal aid...for services such as nursing homes, day-care centers and hospitals... would cut defense by five billion to seven billion dollars...' In fact, and it can be no other way since we live in the era of decaying and dying capitalism, we see the very opposite happening: the military budget continues to swell at the expense of public services. Throughout the US--throughout the entire capitalist world--the trend is cutbacks in education, hospitals, day-care, and other public services, so that military spending can be increased.

Every four years, people get to choose who will oppress them. This is the essence of capitalist democracy. Lenin said of this very point:

"It was Marx who best appraised the historical significance of the (Paris) Commune. In his analysis, he revealed the exploiting nature of bourgeois democracy and the bourgeois parliamentary system under which the oppressed classes enjoy the right to decide once in several years which representative of the propertied classes shall 'represent and suppress' the people in parliament." (Theses and Report on Bourgeois Democracy and Dictatorship of the Proletariat, First Congress of the Communist International, March, 1919)

The agents of monopoly capitalism claim to represent the people. Nothing could be further from the truth. Capitalist democracy is the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, which means democracy for the bourgeoisie. Choosing between Ford or Carter does not alter the fact -- they both represent the bourgeoisie. How can there be real democracy when a handful of parasites rules over the majority? Only under socialism, the dictatorship of the proletariat, where the vast majority rules, can democracy exist for the people. This is the essence of proletarian democracy.

---

SUBSCRIBE TO THE WORKERS' PRESS  
\$2 per year

---

## THE STRUGGLE FOR LAND IN THE SOUTHWEST AND MEXICO

A number of important events have recently occurred in New Mexico and the northern part of Mexico. In Tierra Amarillo County, New Mexico, La Federacion, a statewide coalition of Chicano peasants, students, and workers has successfully led a struggle to halt the construction of a million dollar private airstrip. The airstrip was intended to service a nearby ski resort and would displace many Chicano small farmers from their land. In Mexico, in the northern border states of Senora and Sinola, armed peasants and campesinos (agricultural workers) have, in the last year, occupied and seized over 60,000 acres of land from large landholders. In Senora, 1700 armed peasants recently took over 1000 acres of land in the Yaqui Valley.

Two common threads link these struggles. First is the question of land. Second is the principal enemy, which in both cases is US imperialism.

In May of this year, the march of Reis Lopen Tijernia to Mexico City dramatically symbolized the unity of these two struggles for land in New Mexico and Mexico. Tijernia has long been a leader of the struggle by the Chicano people in the Southwest to recover their lands stolen by US imperialism. Tijernia and members of the Alianza Federal de Pueblo Libres marched to Mexico City to petition Mexican president Luis Echeverria to assist them in their struggle. Why? In 1846, the US provoked the infamous Mexican War. By 1848, the US army occupied Mexico City and the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo was signed between the two countries. It provided that the US annex California, New Mexico, Arizona, Nevada, Utah, and part of Colorado, while recognizing the Rio Grande as the southern border of Texas. Mexico received a mere \$15 million in return, and the US agreed to respect the political, economic, and cultural rights of Mexicans who remained in that territory. The US government specifically recognized the grants of land which had been made by Spain and Mexico to the inhabitants prior to the annexation by the US.

The provisions of the treaty were never followed by US imperialism. In the two decades after 1848, the US government, with savage brutality and violence, ex-

propriated 20 million acres of land. In New Mexico, much of the land was then turned over to the Arizona and New Mexico Land Company and the St. Louis-San Francisco Railroad. Both companies were owned by the Rockefellers. By the 1880's, the US imperialists had thoroughly penetrated the Southwest, seizing not only the land but the vast forests and mineral resources. Then, as now, a handful of finance capitalists controlled the industry and resources of the Southwest. From the exploitation of these resources and the labor of the indigenous people, the imperialists have reaped huge superprofits.

In Mexico, US imperialism rapidly penetrated the economy. In 1910, US capital represented the largest share of all foreign investment in Mexico by the imperialist countries. This export of capital was particularly concentrated in railroads and mining, and later came to dominate all the important branches of industry and agriculture. Today Mexico is a neo-colony of US imperialism. The multi-national agribusiness corporations like Anderson-Clayton and Del Monte own or control most of the fertile land. (US agri-business in Señora and Sinola produces  $\frac{1}{2}$  of the winter vegetables consumed in the US) In the countryside, an estimated 90% of the peasants are landless and unemployed -- about four or five million people. Those peasants with land are subsistence farmers. In many of the northern border states where the mechanization of agriculture by the imperialists has meant a decreased demand for agricultural workers, unemployment is between 40-50%. Thus, we can clearly see the basis for the struggle over land in Mexico.

What are the tasks of communists and advanced workers in relation to these struggles in Mexico and the Southwest? In general we must uphold the right of nations to self-determination. In relation to Mexico, we must fight for the unconditional end to all forms of political, economic and military oppression by US imperialism. Ultimately we know and must always point out that particular questions like land, as well as other manifestations of imperialist exploitation, can only be resolved by proletarian revolution.

We recognize the oppression of the Chicano people in the Southwest to be a national question. An urgent task of the communist movement is to scientifically analyze this question in accordance with the principles of Marxism-Leninism. We are investigating this question and studying the positions of other organizations. Furthermore, we understand that the immediate demands of the Chicano national movement must be constantly linked with the final aim of socialism. In this way, the struggle for democratic rights will be given a revolutionary and not a reformist character.

---

## POLITICAL OLYMPICS

Behind the hundreds of commercial breaks and chauvinist commentaries of the television coverage of the Olympic games in Montreal last month, a dramatic display of international politics was taking place. The Canadian government refused to allow the Taiwan regime to represent China, while the International Olympic Committee (IOC) rules barred one-fifth of the world's population, represented by the People's Republic of China, from participating. By the opening day of the games, thirty African nations were pulling their teams out as a protest against the South African apartheid state that was viciously suppressing its Black majority population.

These and other political 'intrusions' into the Olympics were lamented by the liberal press and TV broadcasters, who cried for a separation of sports and politics. This conception of a 'pure' athletic event denies the reality of the international class struggle and idealistically separates the Olympics from their context. Douglas Roby, a US member of the IOC, pointed out that "we have created the greatest forum

in the world for political statements. What happens on our stage attracts more attention than what happens at the United Nations." (Time, 8/2/76, p 49)

#### THE AFRICAN BOYCOTT

The African nations used this international spotlight, viewed by a TV audience estimated at one billion, to stage a coordinated demonstration of their unity in opposition to the apartheid, fascist state in South Africa and Rhodesia. While both white minority regimes have been excluded from participating at Montreal as a result of international pressure on the IOC, New Zealand, in a gesture of complicity with the politics of white supremacy, sent a rugby team on tour in South Africa the same weeks that at least 176 Blacks were gunned down in Soweto. The pullout by the African nations underlined their opposition to the hypocrisy of white chauvinism in South Africa that fosters separate (and unequal) athletics, as well as politics, for the majority of Blacks and minority of whites.

#### WHO REPRESENTS CHINA?

The People's Republic of China and the All China Sports Federation are the sole legitimate representatives of China and Chinese athletics. The IOC, however, ruled against their participation and recognized the reactionary Chiang clique on Taiwan. Under pressure from the US, the IOC policy seeks to 'legitimize' the puppet government on Taiwan. This issue will only be settled when interference in China's internal affairs by US imperialism ceases, and Taiwan is politically reunited with the mainland.

#### THE FUTURE OF SPORTS

In the past half century, athletics in the US have increasingly become a passive, expensive, spectator sport. Competition on the playing field is reflected by competition for the highest salaries, some of which reach \$1,000,000 per year!

In a socialist country, such as the People's Republic of China, the emphasis is on cooperation, not competition. Athletics are seen as an important part of the peoples' social and physical well-being. Sports events are free, for the most part, or reasonably priced. This is because socialist society is based on the needs and interests of the masses of people where the slogan is 'serve the people!' Sports in the US, like everything else, will change its character when the workers become organized, carry out the proletarian revolution, and build a socialist society.

## THE TERM "U.S.N.A."

The Marxist-Leninist Collective has, until now, used the term 'United States of North America' rather than simply United States. We did this to avoid making a national chauvinist error, as other countries also refer to themselves as the 'United States', such as Brazil and Mexico. Further investigation has led us to drop the term 'United States of North America' (USNA) and use 'United States'. We present here a report on our investigation.

The name United States of America was used for the first time in the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776. But its appearance was the result of a process that started with the colonies themselves. All that Jefferson did in drafting the Declaration was to substitute 'States' for 'Colonies'. When the colonies formed a common front for mutual defense against the King of England, the phrase 'united colonies' was first used. A section of the Articles of the Confederation of the New England colonies of 1643 said that the name of the Confederation should be 'The United Colonies of New England.' On May, 1775, the name also appears in a letter from the Convention to Massachusetts. From this time on, the phrase is usually

found in official pronouncements, alone or followed by 'of America' or 'of North America', and was frequently preceded by 'Twelve or Thirteen'. Sometimes the word 'English' came before 'colonies.'

It is a fact that the name America was first applied to the Southern half of the Western Hemisphere before the existence of the Northern half was known, and that after the Northern half was discovered, it received the name of North America and the Southern half was thus known as South America.

In Jefferson's draft of the Declaration on Taking Arms of July 6, 1775, the title used is 'United Colonies of America'; but in Dickinson's draft the title is 'United Colonies of North America'. Franklin, in his sketch of Articles of the Confederation of July 21, 1775, also proposed the 'United Colonies of North America'. This is the form used in the treaty with France and in the bills of exchange with Paris, May 19, 1778. However, on July 11, 1778, Congress resolved to drop the word 'North' from the title used on the bills.

According to Charles H.J. Douglass, 'the corporate name of the Mexican Republic furnishes an analagous case.' The United States of Mexico signifies the country of Mexico, which is a united state. It is thus correct to speak of this country as the United States, just as we speak of the United Kingdom; or as America, just as we speak of Great Britain and Ireland. Or yet the Republic of America compared to the Republic of France. The same can be said of the United States of Brazil, in South America. Brazil, like Mexico, and America, is a Federal Republic. The encyclopedia's definition is: United States, a federal republic composed of North America, and the Pacific (Hawaii). Now, the world Atlas considers that North America comprises Greenland, Canada, the US and Mexico. So how could the United States be equivalent to North America?

The name of the mainland is then, America, named for Amerigo Vespucci! This usage of the term is not only chauvinist, but incorrect, since America is the name of the lands of the Western Hemisphere (North, Central, South America). To call the mainland North America would be equally wrong, since it is the name of the northern continent of the Western Hemisphere.

Therefore, we are dropping the term USNA. The name United States should be used instead, when referring to the corporate states, that is the mainland, and territories and possessions, including Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands of the US, Guam, American Samoa, Wake, Midway, Canton, Enderbury, and several other islands. If we consider that these territories and possessions were obtained because of imperialist expansion, then we can safely use the name US when referring to the mainland only.

Workers' Press is written and published by the Marxist-Leninist Collective. We are a communist organization based on Marxism-Leninism, the science of the revolutionary class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie. We are part of the international struggle of the working class to end exploitation and oppression by overthrowing capitalism and establishing socialism. We aim to bring communist ideas and analyses to the working class. We strive to broaden the outlook of our fellow workers and to arm workers with proletarian class consciousness so that together we can lead the struggle against all forms of oppression and exploitation by imperialism. To do this we must organize ourselves into an independent political party to concentrate the resistance of the proletariat into a single fighting force. Correspondence, inquiries, criticisms and articles should be sent to:

WORKERS' PRESS  
PO Box 24116  
Bayview Station  
San Francisco, Ca.