"STUDENTS MARCH IN STEP BEHIND CARTER DRAFT CALL" the New York Post crowed jubilantly following Carter's bloodless State of the Union address. The article consisted of interviews with a few slick-jowled jocks at Columbia University and the son of a congressman.

One week later the headlines of the New York Daily News read "FLY AT COLUMBIA ANTI-DRAFT MELEE!" and "COLUMBIA AGAIN ON WARPATH." The campus was hit by an anti-draft demonstration of 800, the largest outpouring since the power of the solar dial and held their red-white-and-blue toilet paper triumphantly atop the statue of Alma Mater. Cameras whirred, interviewers descended, film crews scrambled. Jocks drooled with reactionary glee, and began croaking "We Won't Go!" and every once in awhile somebody would yell, "Hey the brawl will come to Columbia!"

Then suddenly the scene ripped open. The day after Carter's announcement of the reinstatement of draft registration, the University of Wisconsin and the University of Oregon in Eugene. On Friday well over 2,000 demonstrated at Berkeley. This was by no means the scene that the bourgeoisie wanted (though they undoubtedly expected some protest). As well as demonstrations on some of the bigger campuses like the University of Wisconsin and the University of Minnesota, there were sizable rallies at smaller schools like the University of West Virginia where 200 people marched from the campus to the downtown area of Morgantown. The march and rally shook up the whole town including a group of reactionaries who showed up to intimidate the marchers but ended up leaving instead, dragging their tails behind them. The town hadn't seen an anti-government demonstration of this size in over a decade.

In Washington, D.C. on Monday January 25th, 230 people demonstrated...Continued on page 12

Iran Election: A Bourgeois Thing

Grasping at every straw they come across, the U.S. imperialists have seized upon the election of Abolhassan Bani-Sadr as president of Iran to create the impression that much headway is being made in securing the release of the hostages and that a friend of the U.S. is now at the wheel. They are desperately hoping for a solution to a mess they have become so stupidly scribbling about! They were not long in coming. A dozen or so creew-cut 'Irani rats' waddled across the plaza, carrying a huge American flag, yelling "God Bless America!" and "Go Draft! Go War!" The media buzzed around them like flies on a corpse. They climbed the steps of the sun dial and held their red-white-and-blue toilet paper triumphantly atop the statue of Alma Mater. Cameras whirred, interviewers descended, film crews scrambled. Jocks drooled with reactionary glee, and began croaking "My country 'tis of thee."

Then suddenly the scene ripped open. Led by the Vietnamese Veterans Against the War, angry students ripped the filthy flag to ribbons and set fire to another, puncturing the fascist balloon and spooling a lot of great film footage for the press. The handful of chumps quietsinging in power to silence.

The whole dignified and "orderly procedure" of the recent presidential elections is a marked contrast to the turmoil and mass upsurge of the past year. But the difference is not just in the form of political activity but also in the content of it. The whole idea of forming a "voice of reason" a parliamentary "procedure" of the recent presidential elections is the wish of the bourgeoisie and offering to pull off a coup if the U.S. would back him. The whole dignified and "orderly procedure" of the recent presidential elections is a marked contrast to the turmoil and mass upsurge of the past year. But the difference is not just in the form of political activity but also in the content of it. The whole idea of forming a "voice of reason" a parliamentary "procedure" of the recent presidential elections is the wish of the bourgeoisie and offering to pull off a coup if the U.S. would back him.

Bani-Sadr gained the distinction of being fired from the post of Foreign Minister in early November due to the outrage of the students at the embassy when they tried to negotiate the release of the hostages with UN Secretary General Waldheim. A member of the Revolutionary Council, he defeated by a 9-1 margin former admiral Madani, the reactionary ex-head of the Shah's navy who was exiled by the students occupying the embassy as declaring in a secret letter his hatred for Khomeini and offering to pull off a coup if the U.S. would back him.

The whole dignified and "orderly procedure" of the recent presidential elections is a marked contrast to the turmoil and mass upsurge of the past year. But the difference is not just in the form of political activity but also in the content of it. The whole idea of forming a "voice of reason" a parliamentary "procedure" of the recent presidential elections is the wish of the bourgeoisie and offering to pull off a coup if the U.S. would back him.

The whole dignified and "orderly procedure" of the recent presidential elections is a marked contrast to the turmoil and mass upsurge of the past year. But the difference is not just in the form of political activity but also in the content of it. The whole idea of forming a "voice of reason" a parliamentary "procedure" of the recent presidential elections is the wish of the bourgeoisie and offering to pull off a coup if the U.S. would back him.

But for the masses of people in Iran such a bourgeois republic would be a giant step backwards. In the last sixteen or so months millions upon millions of Iranians have taken their future into their own hands, rising up in armed struggle and defeating the Shah's U.S. backed forces and surging forward to defend their gains and continue the revolution to completely rid their country of the stench of the imperialists and their huckeys. Millions of Iranians, filled with hatred for imperialism, have turned Iran upside down. Now these people are being begged to stop their struggle halfway and welcome a new class of exploiters, who in the name of...Continued on page 18
Maximum Sentence in Peltier Trial

Los Angeles, January 22, Federal Courthouse. Maximum sentences of seven years in prison for escape and possession of weapons were handed down to Native American freedom fighters Leonard Peltier and Bobby Gene Garcia. These terms will be added to the consecutive life sentences they are already serving. Five days earlier, the Federal Bureau of Prisons, in a duplicative sentencing for the same escape, ordered both men sent to the Control Unit in the penitentiary at Marion, Illinois for an indeterminate period. All of these events were precipitated by Mr. Garcia's appearance at the Peltier trial—"the government's attempted escape—the government's attempted murder of Mr. Peltier in prison."

Practically snorting for blood, the U.S. attorney asked for the maximum penalties. The prosecution's case was based on two examples of "criminals," Judge Lydick tried to silence any mention by Peltier of his attorney's attempts to delay the government's attack on Indian people or of what precipitated the escape—the government's attempted murder of Mr. Peltier in prison.

The government concluded this political trial in the same manner; it had conducted it from the beginning—packing the courtroom with Federal marshals, harassing and excluding many supporters, trying to isolate Peltier as a "criminal." Judge Lydick tried to silence any mention by Peltier of his attorney's attempts to delay the government's attack on Indian people or of what precipitated the escape—the government's attempted murder of Mr. Peltier in prison. The government was furious. They had brought their capitalist masters all of the scabs they had planned for in this trial. Not only were Peltier, Garcia and Duerfias acquitted of the heaviest charges (conspiracy and assault on a guard), but their trial was a glaring exposure of the FBI's murdering political attacks. Trying to make light of their political losses, the prosecutor slandered Leonard Peltier as "nothing more than a criminal hiding behind the Indian community." At that, the lying words were drowned out with the laughter of the supporters, Indian and non-Indian, who were in the courtroom, "behavior modification," Lydick's term for the control system.

The government concluded this political trial in the same manner it had conducted it from the beginning—packing the courtroom with Federal marshals, harassing and excluding many supporters, trying to isolate Peltier as a "criminal." Judge Lydick tried to silence any mention by Peltier of his attorney's attempts to delay the government's attack on Indian people or of what precipitated the escape—the government's attempted murder of Mr. Peltier in prison. The government was furious. They had brought their capitalist masters all of the scabs they had planned for in this trial. Not only were Peltier, Garcia and Duerfias acquitted of the heaviest charges (conspiracy and assault on a guard), but their trial was a glaring exposure of the FBI's murdering political attacks. Trying to make light of their political losses, the prosecutor slandered Leonard Peltier as "nothing more than a criminal hiding behind the Indian community." At that, the lying words were drowned out with the laughter of the supporters, Indian and non-Indian, who were in the courtroom, "behavior modification," Lydick's term for the control system.
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The Hawk in Dove's Feathers

...I make no apologies for raising questions about the Carter Doctrine. The exercise of dissent is the essence of democracy. As such, we have the right, indeed the duty, to examine candidates...that may shape—or shatter—our future.

So stated Teddy Kennedy in his January 28 speech at Georgetown University. Until this day, few have questioned Kennedy's campaign against the Carter Doctrine. It may be that many find it too much for one person to bear. But Ted Kennedy is no ordinary man. His is the story of a man who has fought his way through the political and military affairs investigation revealed that Christoffer- in the American media—most notably the syndicated columnist, who along with the CIA. Joseph Alsop, a ma-...
Youngstown Steel Workers

Invasion Camp

Youngstown, Ohio. The security gates were closed through the locked gate door. "Nobody's coming in—forget it!" Yeah, right! The usual battered through the glass in metal. Metal bars were bent and the door flung open. Captain America of the U.S. Steel company moved in the direction of the steelworkers inside the U.S. Steel company headquarters-McDonald Works—Youngstown, Ohio. Up past the stunned receptionist, up to the engineer's office, up the stairs and into the small, darkened room where some 200 steelworkers sat, their backs to the door. "The chairman said, "We've had it!"

The American capitalists ended up cutting millions of jobs, filling unemployment lines and the jails. The state said, "We've had it!

They've been at it for years, the destruction of the Hawaiian culture. This is a legacy that today keeps the Hawaiian people at the bottom of the working class, filling the lowest paid, menial jobs, the deployment of the unemployed into the navy, the military, etc.

In Youngstown they've come up with new weapons—outlawed junkets against the state—bad management—bad investment policy," said one of the union leaders. "High wages—greedy workers," say some of the media. "Foreign imports—dirty foreign workers,"

As for solutions, many are offered, one more twisted and misleading than the other—"The workers will buy the mill.

It was this line that was mainly being preached at a mass meeting to discuss the new wave of mill shut-downs at Youngstown. The state said, "We've had it!"

Native Hawaiians

Battle Land Grab

At dawn on January 23, roadblocks cut off the bridge to Sand Island, a small uninhabited island in Honolulu Harbor. Seventy-five armed state and city police moved in. Bullhorns pro-\*\*

claimed it had to evict the inhabitants to make way for a public park to serve the Hawaiians. The security guards moved in, put out the bridge to Sand Island, with no place left to go but into the ocean, "like refugees in our own land.

Thousands of people have been brought into motion around these struggles for access to beaches, etc. The occupation of Waiakea by Hawaiians to prevent evictions won broad support in the working class. The struggle against the Navy and the Waiakea practice bombings has brought hundreds, youth especially, in opposition against the government, against the very system which has enslaved men.

Youngstown has become a "model" for other steelworkers around the country. This kind of struggle from spreading. But the American capitalists ended up cutting $10 million to pay for their headlines, filling unemployment lines and the jails.

Livermore Nuke Plant

Lethal Little Leak

On Thursday an earthquake measuring 5.5 on the Richter scale jolted the northern California area. The quake was a "big one" that according to geologists will hit California sometime this decade, and cause millions of dollars of damage.

The quake was centered thirteen miles from the University of California Lawrence Livermore Lab (formerly known as the Lawrence Radiation Lab), where among other things 500 pounds of plutonium is kept and most nuclear weapons that the U.S. use are developed. Considerable damage was done to the lab.

Other damage at the Livermore facility included large cracks in the fifth floor of a nuclear research building, gas line ruptures and a number of one inch bolts that were sheared off a structure holding up a four story lab used in thermoelectric research. The incredible facet of the matter is this—the Lawrence Livermore facilities couldn't even meet the earthquake standards set for public schools, and yet it's sitting right on top of a number of one inch bolts that were sheared off a structure holding up a four story lab used in thermoelectric research.

This type of obvious cover-up is standard operating procedure for the nuclear power industry and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission which recently announced that the Three Mile Island "event" which threatened the lives of some of the most deadly poison known to man.

Anti-nuke activists have long pointed out the dangers of the LD radiation leak at the site, which is 1/4 mile away from an earthquake fault, to lab spokesmen who were quick to point out that the earthquake did no significant damage, and so on.

The state answered the question in the same manner as always whenever their rulers put money ahead of safety and the lives of their workers: "It just might have happened to the lab officials said this was ridiculous, and has got to stop somewhere."

They've been at it for years, the destruction of the Hawaiian culture. This is a legacy that today keeps the Hawaiian people at the bottom of the working class, filling the lowest paid, menial jobs, the deployment of the unemployed into the navy, the military, etc.
Iran Day Action

1500 Hit Berkeley Streets

Saturday, January 26, 1500 people united in Berkeley’s famous Sproul Plaza to proudly declare their disunity with the rulers of this country. “Send the Shah Back! U.S. Out—No Military Intervention! Stop All Attacks on Iranians in the U.S.!” The Iran Day Committee dragged Carter’s “never has America been so united” through the mud.

Broad and diverse forces participated. More than 50 groups and individuals sponsored it, including Vietnam Veterans Against the War (VVAW); the Oakland Feminist Women’s Health Center; Fred Hanks, a Black member of VVAW and a member of Send the Shah Back/Hands Off Delegation to Iran; Dennis Banks of the American Indian Movement; Casa Nicaragua; the New American Movement; the Iranian Students Association; the Revolutionary Communist Party; the Solidarity Bloc of the Struggles of the Salvadoran People (BPR). It reflected the international character of people’s struggle against U.S. imperialism.

The politics of the rally were razor-sharp, the tone was deadly serious. There were veterans of the student movement of the 60’s, but added to this was a good section of Blacks and Latinos from the ghettos and barrios of the Bay Area. The march, about 750 strong, was led by a contingent from the VVAW. A woman on the street was interviewed. She said, “I’m from England. There, Berkeley has a reputation. Back home people in the ’70’s were feeling apathetic, but when they hear this has begun, I think it will give them great encouragement.”

A van with Oregon plates pulled up near the rear of the march, a guy jumped out waving a RCP flag. He had just bought and yelled, “I love Berkeley! I’ve only been here an hour, and look at this! I love this city!” As the march moved down University Avenue, traffic came to a halt, people leaned on their horns, shouted support out the windows. Literature was selling fast as people came out of the stores to line the sidewalk.

The march turned left on San Pablo Avenue and headed into the Black community. Three young men came running out from a barbecue joint, shouting and smiling with their fists in the air. The Channel 7 News said that “at times today, Berkeley looked like the streets of Tehran.” While this was somewhat of an overstatement, it was clear that they caught the basic drift—something special was going on. The mindless patriotic barrage around Iran was getting met—head on. The ruling class might try to dismiss it as “just Berkeley”; but then again they have to think twice because Berkeley raises up the image of the beginning of some powerful things.

Huge stacks of leaflets were distributed, thousands of posters went up. And not just on campus, but in the ghettos of West Berkeley, where still more Black people met the march at its finish and joined in with the crowd. In the shops and factories of the Bay Area, the word was out also. Fred Hanks was out with the NUWO members morning, noon and night, struggling with workers at plant gates, union halls and bars.

When the swing shift got out at the Oakland Post Office early Friday morning, 20 workers stood outside, talking...
IF YOU WANT MORE OUT OF LIFE THAN LIVING...

I WANT YOU FOR U.S. ARMY

Join the Army. Don't miss the chance to get your guts blown out for the Bank of America, Standard Oil and the rest of our capitalist class. You are desperately needed to napalm babies, rape, murder and otherwise maintain our bloody empire. Thrill as your buddy dies in your arms and experience the unique satisfaction of blowing the face off the guy just like yourself on the other side. Be the first on your block to sign up for World War III. (If you don't we'll draft your ass anyway.) Be on the front lines as we battle the Russians. Carry out the will of God as millions of people are incinerated into atomic dust. No Russian capitalist is going to profit off the territory that we American capitalists stole fair and square.

Apply Now—We can't do it (there are only a few thousand of us and we are busy with our secretaries and the cute young men on our staffs). We'll hide in our bomb shelters so we can continue ripping the survivors off later.

JOIN THE PEOPLE WHO'VE JOINED THE ARMY
The following is an excerpted testimonial given by a Black revolutionary at a fund-raiser for the RCP's million dollar fund drive, in Washington, DC, on the first anniversary of the demonstration to give Teng Hisam a Fitting Welcome.

Welcome to this historic occasion. I'd like to start by saying I recognized a need for a big change in this system a long time ago, having grown up in the South in tremendous oppression and repression. Sitting on the back of the bus, going through the back door, getting off the sidewalk and all kinds of things. In the '60s, I was...involved in seizing the university and suspending classes and lots of things. Just constantly looking for some way to change this system...I read a lot of revolutionary books, but then I didn't have any idea about deeper, more thorough-going things, about the science of revolution, about how there really is a science that exists that can really change the way people live in this dungeon. And I didn't know very much about this science until something happened to me that I'll never forget in my life.

On Jan. 29 last year, I was coming down the street and I was probably reading a revolutionary book. At the time, I'm sure, because I took every moment on the bus, at the bus stop, on the toilet, anytime to read to gain revolutionary consciousness. So on Jan. 29th, I was sitting on the bus, after I saw this incredible display of police power, which I knew very much about in the cities, but never before...The bus inched along, I mean I was just on the bus saying "Oh, God Damn! Let me off this bus!" And I was sitting right there, I saw the whole god damn thing. A motorcade of policemen bumper-to-god-damn-bumper all the way down Columbus Road. I mean I saw this, I was sitting right there, I saw the whole god damn thing. A motorcade of police cars on top of that, bumper to bumper. Then there was a policeman coming down Columbus Road, alright?

So I'm sitting on the bus, after I saw this incredible display of police power, which I knew very much about in the cities, but never before...The bus inched along, I mean I was just on the bus saying "Oh, God Damn! Let me off this bus!" And I was sitting right there, I saw the whole god damn thing. A motorcade of policemen bumper-to-god-damn-bumper all the way down Columbus Road. I mean I saw this, I was sitting right there, I saw the whole god damn thing. A motorcade of police cars on top of that, bumper to bumper. Then there was a policeman coming down Columbus Road, alright?

As a youngster growing up in the South, I was continuously taught the right-wing point of view at home and at school. During my tour in Vietnam, I started to realize something was inherently wrong in a national system that forced young men to give their lives involuntarily in a war to keep the thieves of American business making more money. Why, I asked, were all the draftees from the lower end of the socio-economic ladder? Where were the sons of politicians, industrialists, etc.? Why are the vocal evangelists of capitalism never willing to send their sons to "defend" this noble system?

Dear Friends,

Ever though I had known for some time that organizations like yours were in existence I had been unable to contact any of them. Today I came across a copy of a flier put out by the May Day Committee in Birmingham. It appears I have found others in the struggle against capitalism with whom I can agree in total.

This letter was recently received by the May Day Committee in Birmingham, Alabama.

Dear Friends,

Even though I had known for some time that organizations like yours were in existence I had been unable to contact any of them. Today I came across a copy of a flier put out by the May Day Committee in Birmingham. It appears I have found others in the struggle against capitalism with whom I can agree in total.

As a youngster growing up in the South, I was continuously taught the right-wing point of view at home and at school. During my tour in Vietnam, I started to realize something was inherently wrong in a national system that forced young men to give their lives involuntarily in a war to keep the thieves of American business making more money. Why, I asked, were all the draftees from the lower end of the socio-economic ladder? Where were the sons of politicians, industrialists, etc.? Why are the vocal evangelists of capitalism never willing to send their sons to "defend" this noble system?

After I returned home from Nam and started to go to college, I began to read Marx, Engels, Deb and others. Only then did I realize that the working class was being ruled and exploited to the Nth degree by the so-called "free enterprise" system.

For the past 11 years I have worked for XXX and have discovered first hand what it is like to be hated by management for espousing a philosophy that does not agree with their capitalistic exploitation of the worker. I find it to be incredible that so many workers have been duped for so long by unions and politicians by the offering of a few bones occasionally. I agree with you that it is time to take the battle to the free enterprise freaks.

Please send me any information you have concerning staging May Day rallies and demonstrations.
GREENSBORO COURT RUSHES TO NAIL BOB AVAKIAN DEFENDANTS

Greenboro, North Carolina—The appeal of the misdeemeanor convictions of "Bobby" Avakian and several other defendants in the recent trial of the ILA Dock Tyrant: New "Foe" of Aggression has been denied, setting the stage for the immediate start of appeals of misdemeanor convictions—190 convictions in total—against "Bob Avakian and the movement." A settlement of these convictions is expected to be reached soon.

With great hullabaloo, the president of the East Coast International Longshoremen's Association, David K. Gleason, was called in as a consultant by the union's leaders to help them resolve the issue of the alleged "firing" of workers. Gleason, who has a long history of collaborating with U.S. imperialism, was described as a "sawed off stooge for the capitalists, a petty dock tyrant, and a collaborator with the AFL-CIO." He has been criticized for his role in the 1934 general strike of長shoreman and for his support of the 1949 boycott of Chinese goods.

The following letter is from a reader in Cleveland who recently began distributing the Revolutionary Worker in Ohio:

I was shopping one day and saw something I will never forget—a boy not more than thirteen or fourteen who had taken a can of meat was stopped by two managers and a security guard. The boy dropped the can, and shakily held up a pocket knife, pleading with the managers to let him leave. But they forced him to leave the store and detectives took the boy to jail. I couldn't stand it anymore. I wanted to strike back at the real criminals in this country.

The judge finally "relented," ordering the boy to appear in court on the 24th. He was found not guilty of breaking the law, but he was made to pay $5. That was a victory, but it was hard to swallow.

The judge's decision has been widely criticized. Many people feel that the system is rigged against the poor and the working class. The Avaakian defendants are being tried in a similar manner, and the verdicts are likely to be similar. The ILA Dock Tyrant: New "Foe" of Aggression is said to be a major factor in the trial.

With the stay of execution, the dock tyrant is likely to continue his reign of terror. The ILA Dock Tyrant: New "Foe" of Aggression is said to be a major factor in the situation, and the union is likely to continue its support of the dock tyrant.

The ILA Dock Tyrant: New "Foe of Aggression" is said to be a major factor in the situation, and the union is likely to continue its support of the dock tyrant.

Los Angeles, January 26. Two women from the Feminist Women's Health Center had entered the 1980 Women's National Powerlifting competition. Both showed up at the contest wearing T-shirts reading, "Send Back the Shah." Above, freaked out officials confront Becky Chalker, who recently returned from Iran as a member of the Send the Shah Back hands off Iran Delegation. The officials first attempted disqualification on the basis that the women's T-shirts bore no insignia representing any particular athletic club. In response, the women scribbled the word "clap" after the words, "Send the Shah Back" on their T-shirts. At that point, the officials threatened Becky with arrest for "making a political statement." Becky replied, "Sports, like everything else are now very political, especially when you see the actions of the U.S. in the world."

ILA Dock Tyrant:
New "Foe" of Aggression

With great hullabaloo, the president of the East Coast International Longshoreman and Warehousemen's Association, David K. Gleason, was called in as a consultant by the union's leaders to help them resolve the issue of the alleged "firing" of workers. Gleason, who has a long history of collaborating with U.S. imperialism, was described as a "sawed off stooge for the capitalists, a petty dock tyrant, and a collaborator with the AFL-CIO." He has been criticized for his role in the 1934 general strike of 長shoreman and for his support of the 1949 boycott of Chinese goods.

The following letter is from a reader in Cleveland who recently began distributing the Revolutionary Worker in Ohio:

I was shopping one day and saw something I will never forget—a boy not more than thirteen or fourteen who had taken a can of meat was stopped by two managers and a security guard. The boy dropped the can, and shakily held up a pocket knife, pleading with the managers to let him leave. But they forced him to leave the store and detectives took the boy to jail. I couldn't stand it anymore. I wanted to strike back at the real criminals in this country.

The judge finally "relented," ordering the boy to appear in court on the 24th. He was found not guilty of breaking the law, but he was made to pay $5. That was a victory, but it was hard to swallow.

The judge's decision has been widely criticized. Many people feel that the system is rigged against the poor and the working class. The Avaakian defendants are being tried in a similar manner, and the verdicts are likely to be similar. The ILA Dock Tyrant: New "Foe" of Aggression is said to be a major factor in the trial.

With the stay of execution, the dock tyrant is likely to continue his reign of terror. The ILA Dock Tyrant: New "Foe of Aggression" is said to be a major factor in the situation, and the union is likely to continue its support of the dock tyrant.

Los Angeles, January 26. Two women from the Feminist Women's Health Center had entered the 1980 Women's National Powerlifting competition. Both showed up at the contest wearing T-shirts reading, "Send Back the Shah." Above, freaked out officials confront Becky Chalker, who recently returned from Iran as a member of the Send the Shah Back hands off Iran Delegation. The officials first attempted disqualification on the basis that the women's T-shirts bore no insignia representing any particular athletic club. In response, the women scribbled the word "clap" after the words, "Send the Shah Back" on their T-shirts. At that point, the officials threatened Becky with arrest for "making a political statement." Becky replied, "Sports, like everything else are now very political, especially when you see the actions of the U.S. in the world."
Speaking about the original punk explosion in Britain, Joe Strummer of the Clash summed up the spirit of the movement in an interview last September: "Here you are in London and everybody’s been living in projects and then The Clash comes along and starts calling projects here, we call them council estates at home, and lots of youth have been living on these council estates which had just been put up since the war. And they’ve been cut off from the rest of the world, and so, all of a sudden everybody was kind of turning around to each other and going, ‘Hey this really is shitty!’ And that feeling wasn’t being echoed anywhere—where are you?” It’s not and yet that record that made me feel anything better... in London it was really dead. It was all full of the boys that were playing the big places. It cost a lot of money to get in and a whole section of youth found themselves without any, you know, they didn’t look up to the rock and roll heroes. Everybody just sort of went off, ‘That’s a pile of shit’ and we’re going to do our way, and that’s how it started. And within three months there was about a thousand groups pummelling away in London and it kind of exploded from there. We came out of that, and we managed to hang together because..."

Pushed to the fore by the mass movement of rebellious working class youngsters and the more politically conscious and aware, The Clash is on the scene, claiming as its own the traditional and now re-challenging a rotting rock aristocracy and challenging the people to deal with the state of affairs in the world. And being on the front lines has the outer put The Clash’s feet to the floor! The one note—this is the type of politics that The Clash has been about on London Calling—their new double LP is the latest answer to the question.

Speaking about their song, they say, "Let’s face it, there’s more than a little bit of Elvis Presley’s influence here, whatever..." Lopin’, Hendrix, Redding were murdered, Dylan conceptualized and dealt a living death. Marxists understand that as long as the bourgeoisie remain in power they will try to stamp out any people that oppose them, and as long as there is class society there will be a struggle. This is why the reason that this question comes up is not an insult, it’s a reality, and it’s precisely because of the role that The Clash has played in that comes up. And the mass movement of rebellious working class youth, the music changes and becomes positively triumphant and thus... We’re gonna march a long way, gonna fight a long time! Conga, you gotta move, you gotta get over... It’s gonna be a long one... Death or glory becomes just another story."

As the song evolves, "Death or Glory" alone it is more than music. It’s a kind of explosion from the Clash’s own words against them, The Clash’s own words against the government, against their secrets, but heading into the 1980’s it could be historic, then this was it, then the new album could be described at a breathtaking tour of the world itself. It is one of the best rock and roll albums ever, and more than that it is a stunning affirmation of where the anger of one hopes The Clash were held and is a significant development of their first two albums.

The Clash themselves have been attempting to deal with this question of selling out which objectively comes down to the contradiction facing many class who have something to say to the people and want to reach out to millions. And in order to do that they have to deal with the record companies, touring etc., while struggling to maintain their integrity and get their message across. Posed by The Clash in their first album in "Gaza" and continued in the second album with "Cheapskates", The Clash takes it on again in London Calling... Things they said before are now better understood as in the song "Death Or Glory" they say a ‘grimmick hungry old dog digging gold from rock’n’roll’Grabs the mike to tell us he’ll tell before he’s told but I believe in this—and it’s been tested by research. That he who fucks nuns will later be the one to judge said five to ten—But I say double that again! I’m not working for the clampdown! No man born with a living soul, can be working for the clampdown, kick over the walls, raise government, to fall! How can you refuse it? Let fury have the hour, anger can be power! You know that you can use it? The voices in your head are calling! Stop wasting time! There’s nothing coming/Only a fool would think someone could save you! The men at the factory are old and cunning. In these days of evil presidents/Working for the clampdown/But lately one or two has fully paid their dues/For working for the clampdown/But Ha! Gistagol Gistagol/Gristagol! In the face of “Clampdown” and “Death And Glory” and the album in general it is a little incredible that some are leveling the charge of “sellout” at The Clash. The main form this takes is brushing the form of the music and the fact that The Clash has developed from doing punk, punctuated by reggae, to experimenting and innovating, drawing more from rock and roll’s early roots. Now it’s a bit narrow, don’t you think? Isn’t that what some people say you should stick to one beat? What’s the difference between that and..."
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Continued from page 9

Joe Mechly. An article quoted this revolutionary worker as saying, "I fear for the Iranian revolution—were it not for the U.S.—Keep Your Hands Off Iran!"

Continued on page 13
Ever since the first inter-imperialist war (World War 1—"the war to end war" according to our rulers), the imperialist powers have sought to hide their preparations for new wars under a cloud of "disarmament" and "peace agreements," which also serve as anaresia of contention, with each of the chief imperialist powers trying to get its rivals to accept a position of weakness. Here the signing of the Kellogg-Briand pact to "renounce war as an instrument of national policy," initialed by France and the U.S., on the same day, the U.S. Senate started action on a bill to build 16 new warships.

Visibly wrong. The history of the twentieth century, this century of unbridled imperialism, is replete with colonial wars. But what we Europeans, the imperialist oppressors of the peoples of the world, with our habitual, despiseful European chauvinism, call "colonial wars" are often national wars, or national rebellions of those oppressed peoples. One of the main features of imperialism is that it accelerates the development of capitalism in the backward countries, and the petty-widener and intensifies the struggle against national oppression. This is a fact. It inevitably follows from this that imperialism must often give rise to national wars. Junius (pseudonym of the German revolutionary Rose Luxemburg—RW), in his pamphlet defends the above-quoted "theses," says that in the imperialist epoch every national war, against one of the imperialist Great Powers leads to the intervention of another competing imperialist Great Power and thus, every national war is converted into an imperialist war. But this argument is also wrong. This may happen, but it does not always happen. Many colonial wars in the period between 1900 and 1914 did not follow this road. And it would be simply ridiculous if we declared, for instance, that after the present war, if it ends in the extreme exhaustion of all the belligerents, "there can be no national, progressive, revolutionary wars "whatever," waged, for instance, by the Chauvinists with India, Persia, Siam, etc., against the Great Powers.

To deny all possibility of national wars under imperialism is wrong. In theory, this possible mistakes historically, and in practice is tantamount to European chauvinism: we who belong to nations that oppress hundreds of millions of people in Europe, Africa, Asia, etc., must tell the oppressed peoples that it is "impossible" for them to wage war against "our" nations!

Secondly, civil wars are also wars. Whoever recognizes this, the clear distinction between the so-called civil wars, which in every class society are the natural, and inevitable, the inevitable conflict, development and intensification of the class struggle. All the great revolutionary prove this. To repudiate civil war, or to forget about it, would be a mistake in the extreme opportunism, and renouncing the socialist revolution.

Thirdly, the victory of Socialism in one country does not at one stroke eliminate all war in general. On the contrary, it presupposes such wars. The development of capitalism proceeds extremely unevenly in the various countries. It cannot be otherwise under the commodity production system. From this it follows that it is not justifiable to say that Socialism cannot achieve victory simultaneously or all countries. It will achieve victory first in one or several countries, while the others will remain bourgeois or prebourgeois for some time. This must not only create friction, but a direct striving on the part of the bourgeoisie of other countries to crush the victorious proletarian of the socialist state. In such cases a war on our part would be a legitimate and just war. It would be a war for Socialism, for the liberation of other nations from the bourgeoisie. England was perfectly right when, in his letter to Kautsky, September 12, 1882, he openly admitted that it was possible for already victorious Socialism to wage "defensive wars." What he had in mind was defense of the victorious proletariat against the bourgeoisie of other countries.

Only after we have overthrown, finally vanquished, and expropriated the bourgeoisie of the whole world, and not only of one country, will wars become impossible. And from a scientific point of view it would be utterly wrong and utterly unrevolutionary for us to evade or gloss over the most important thing, namely, that the most difficult task, the one demanding the greatest amount of fighting in the transition to Socialism, is to crush the resistance of the bourgeoisie. "Social" parents and opportunists are always ready to dream about the future peaceful Socialism; but the very thing that distinguishes them from revolutionary Social-Democrats (now known as Communists—RW) is that they refuse to think about and reflect on the fact that struggles against the bourgeoisie, against the bourgeoisie, are necessary for the achievement of this beautiful future.

We must not allow ourselves to be led astray by words. The term "defense of the fatherland," in fact, is hateful to many, because the avowed opportunists and the Kautskyites use it to cover up and gloss over the role of the bourgeoisie in the present imperialist war. (Kautsky was a socialist leader who betrayed the revolution.) The social revolutionaries, on the other hand, see the only thing necessary for the present war is nothing more nor less than recognizing it as a "just" war, a war in the interests of the proletariat and the world revolution.

"You will be given a gun. Take it and learn the military art. The proletarians need this knowledge not to shoot your brothers, the workers of other countries, the people of other countries, the people of other countries, who are being hung in the present war, and as you are being told to do by the leaders to Socialism, but to fight the bourgeoisie of your own country, to put an end to exploitation, poverty and war, not by means of good intentions, but by vanquishing the bourgeoisie and by disarming it."

—V.I Lenin
Spy Press
Continued from page 3
Mikelson, who once set up a direct hot line between CBS headquarters and the CIA directors kept his CIA connections long after leaving CBS. In fact he went on to become president of Radio France, and Radio Liberty, both notorious CIA fronts.

Henry Luce, the head of Time Inc. also gave full cooperation to the CIA. His policies closely followed those of Walter Lippmann, who gave all the way down to the press to the CIA. Luce’s personal contract with the CIA was C.B. Jackson, the Time Inc. vice president and publisher of Life magazine until his death in 1964. Luce himself made a regular practice of personally briefing CIA directors after his return from numerous trips abroad and he encouraged his correspondents to do the same.

At Newsweek, Malcolm Muir, the editor until 1961, admitted to practicing with CIA officials as well as arranging and approving regular briefing sessions for their foreign correspondents. According to Muir, “Whenever I heard something that I thought might be of interest to Allen Dulles, we’d talk about it, and I’d try to keep people away from revolutionary politics. Most of those people, whether they be friends of policy or policies and many of the actions were marked by sharp struggle and heated debate over crucial questions around the draft and imperialism war.

At the demonstration in front of the White House the speaker from the VFW was very well received when he said, “Today’s demonstration against the draft is great, it is only a first step. This time nobody is going to be able to run off to Canada, cause what they’re talking about is not a Vietnam-type war, but world war. This is why today is only the first step. Today we can see two superpowers, both desperate, both hit by crisis, forced to fight each other to redivide the world. That’s what’s behind the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and the U.S. moves to get their hands back into Iran. We have no interest in supporting either. . . . We’re talking about cheering the war and they were free, revolution war. No to imperialist war.” The brother shot back, “During the Vietnam War, people at Kent State and Jackson State marched for peace and were gunned down by the rulers of this country, and so we were promised peace, yet here we are staring a world war in the teeth. What we have to do is get rid of this system that causes war, and the rulers of that system won’t quit without a bitter fight.” Heated discussion around this and other vital questions continued well after the rally had ended.

With many more anti-draft rallies planned for the coming weeks, thousands of students and other youth will be brought into political motion around the reinstatement of the draft and stepped up U.S. and Soviet war moves in general. More and more people are being shocked awake by the rapid approach of world war and are seeing a way out. Through struggle many can and will be won to the understanding that it is not really a question of are we going to fight or not, are we going to shed our blood or not, but a question of for whom and for what are we going to shed our blood, for the imperialists or to get rid of them.
When President Carter took the stage to deliver the 1980 State of the Union address last week, he looked as if he had just washed up from a PTA meeting or a bar mitzvah. "Don't you want your children to have a chance?," he said.

"The thing that's most distressing to me," he continued, "is to think of the millions of people all over the world who have no chance of ever having a decent life, a decent education, a decent job."

"And that's why we have to keep our standards high," he said. "We have to set a high standard for ourselves, and we have to set a high standard for our children."

"For too long," he added, "we've been too complacent, too accepting of the status quo."

"We have to make sure," he concluded, "that our children have a chance to live up to their potential, to have a chance to succeed, to have a chance to be happy."
The Science of Revolution (Part III)

This is the third in a series of articles on the science of revolution that are being published in this month. These articles will summarize and give an introduction to the basic points of a new book now in preparation. To be published in the next few months, this book will contain, in concentrated form, the foundations of the science of revolution—Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tsetung Thought and the line of the Revolutionary Communist Party, USA. As Lenin summed it up: “Without revolutionary theory, there can be no revolutionary movement.”

“The theories of the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat are the quintessence of Marxism-Leninism. The question of whether revolution should be upheld or opposed and whether the dictatorship of the proletariat should be upheld or opposed have always been the focus of struggle between Marxism-Leninism and all kinds of revisionism.” (On Khrushchev’s Peaceous Current and its Historical Lessons for the World)

The Science of Revolution—

Proletarian Revolution—

Basic Principle

Lenin’s teachings simply outline the nature of any and every state apparatus in a 1919 lecture: “If you examine the state from the standpoint of this fundamental division, you will find that before the division of society into classes, as I have already said, no state existed. But as the social division into classes arose and took firm root, as class society arose, the state also arose and took firm root... it has always been a certain apparatus which stood outside society and consisted of a group of people engaged solely or almost solely, or mainly, in ruling... This apparatus, this group of people who rule the state, always possesses certain means of coercion, of physical force, irrespective of whether this violence over people is expressed in the primordial club, or in the more perfected types of weapons in the epoch of slavery, or in the fire-arms which appeared in the Middle Ages, or, finally, in modern weapons, which in the twentieth century are technical marvels and are based entirely on the latest achievements of modern technology.”

But what is the importance of such dividing lines? Is such struggle, as some claim, an inherently irrational quarrel that should be put aside for more important things? Is there any systematic connection between the conditions and struggles that the bourgeoisie face? This article will take up the question of the dividing lines between Marxism and revisionism that are still effective today, and in doing so it will focus on what in fact is the quintessence of Marxism-Leninism: proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

But first, a brief definition of revisionism. Revisionism is opposition to Marxism that carried out in the name of Marxism. It first arose in the late 19th century, after Marxism had a number of serious setbacks, especially in its relations to other ideologies claiming to be for the freedom of the people. Those ideologies—ranging from the petty bourgeoisie—that is, the middle strata of peasants and small farmers, teachers, intellectuals, etc.—which both felt itself crushed and hated the rule of the bourgeoisie, but equally resisted its only real alternative: the rule of the workers.

Reflecting their “in-between” position, these middle forces dreamed of a society somewhat free of both class struggle and the anarchy of capitalism, in which “reasonable” people would make things work better, as we shall see, such dreaming—when concentrated into an ideological and political line—inevitably ends by siding with the bourgeoisie.

With the victory of Marxism over these various trends in many countries, they generally took a new form: one of clamant adherence to Marxism with certain “revision” made necessary by new developments, unforeseen by Marx—under the label “revisionism.” Revisionism, whatever its particular strain—and there are a variety of its “revolutions”—achieves remarkable unity on one point: opposition to the proletarian revolution. And that is the point to which we shall now be leading, that, proletarian dictatorship.

Proletarian Revolution—

In the first 4 years of the Russian Revolution, 20,000 workers and soldiers worked in the Soviet, representing the heart of Russia’s class-conscious working class. The village Soviets that sprang up during and after the revolution. As one person says: “We are teaching ourselves how to rule ourselves.”

But first, a brief definition of revisionism. Revisionism is, in one form or another, the bourgeois republic.

For these reasons—the nature of the state as an organ of class suppression, and its intrinsic connection to the ruling class which created it—violent revolution is a necessity for the proletariat. For those who doubt this, the U.S. ruling class has demonstrated and nature by its stunningly brutal war in Indochina, its slaughter of unarmed protesters at Kent State, Attica and countless other places, its support of butchering puppets from Zaire to Chile to Korea, and its irremovable suppression of groups that actually do work for revolution. Plainly the ruling class which does not hesitate to unleash its dogs against non-revolutionary groups in non-revolutionary periods in this country, and which will travel the world to push down revolution in other countries, will hardly agree to come along peacefully when their very existence is at stake.

Yet, a hallmark of revisionism is, in one form or another, to claim just this! Revisionists have been remarkablyconsistent in their attempts to prove otherwise. They have consistently shown that the old feudal monarchies and erecting instead one form or another of bourgeois republic.

For example, revisionists like the “Communist” Party, USA insist on dividing the U.S. bourgeoisie and its state apparatus into a sane and sensible wing on the one hand, and a crazy, ultra-right one on the other. Yes, they may concede, the working class should probably take independent action, but since Kennedy is “more sensitive to the needs of the oppressed” than Reagan or Carter, that means lining up behind him. The “CPUSA” goes a phony “revolutionary” strategy out of the tactical differences that Kennedy and the forces he represents may have with other sections of the bourgeoisie—and even more so, going along with the old Dr. Jackyl-Mr. Hyde routine in which the bourgeoisie always has at least one phony spokesman for the oppressed out there, the “CPUSA” goes all out to pit the proletariat to the tail of the bourgeois donkey—all in the name of communism!

As for violent revolution? The “CPUSA” envisages the election of an “anti-monopoly coalition” which will then find itself compelled to pave a constitutional amendment outlawing imperialism. True, they attack a rider mentioning the possibility of bourgeois resistance to such an amendment,
but quickly rush to say that "in today's world the possibility exists of creating such a relationship of forces that monopoly capital can be prevented from attempting to drown the popular will in blood." (See New Program of the CPUSA, 1970)

Such an insane fantasy would be funny if it didn't play on real illusions among people and if it hadn't itself already resulted in "drowning the popular will in blood," most especially in Chile. There the revisionist CP of Chile promoted socialism through the ballot, a socialism to be gained without blood. A majority of people, {

\textit{...}laufing an army to fight the inevitable civil war to determine nationwide political power. (This model mainly applies to developed capitalist countries—various important modifications, which this article will not go into, come into play in the semi-colonial, semi-feudal countries oppressed by imperialism. However, both the armed nature of the revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat that follows are common to all countries.) On smashing the bourgeois state the proletariat moves to establish its own state power—the dictatorship of the proletariat. This proletarian dictatorship differs from all previous states, in which a minority of exploiters dictates to the majority of people, but tries to hide it. Since the proletarian state is a dictatorship of the majority over the minority, of the formerly exploited over their erstwhile masters, it has no need to conceal or misrepresent what it is doing.

Much more fundamentally different is the purpose and goal of the proletarian dictatorship. The proletarian state works to eliminate itself—chaos, to create the basis for the day when humankind will need no states because it will have passed out of the stage of class division.

Socialism, then, is a transition period in which the proletarians have the historical task of not only dictating to the vanquished but also of stepping on the throat of the victors to ensure that they never again rise to power. It is a period of opposing armed revolution, natural—"look out for number one" thinking has vanished... labor has become a way of life. (Critique of the Gotha Programme) Revisionist Opposition to Proletarian Rule

Revisionism, which makes a specialty of opposing armed revolution, naturally opposes its result: the dictatorship of the proletariat. Kautsky, the foremost revisionist to do battle with Lenin, either outrightly opposed the very phrase "dictatorship of the proletariat" as an unfortunate slip of the tongue on the part of Marx and Engels, or else envisioned one that, in his own words, was no different from British bourgeois democracy, complete with a "monarchy at the top!"

\textit{...}ndividual to the division of labor, and therefore also the antithesis between mental and physical labor has vanished... labor has become not only a means of life but life's prime want... (and) the productive forces have also increased with the all-round development of the individual and all the springs of co-operative wealth flow more abundantly."

Continued on page 18
Disarmament
Continued from page 11

Theoretical, it would be quite wrong to forget that every war is but the continuation of politics by other means. It is the crass error of the imperialist politics of two groups of Great Powers, which were engaged in the military struggle and were opposed to each other, that they fought against each other in order to extinguish the victorious proletariat in war against some Galliford (a general who suppressed the Paris Commune—R.W.) by bourgeois means.

The fact that the bourgeoisie is armed against the proletariat, that it is not only the most important, but also the most urgent and most important facts in modern capitalist society. And in face of this fact, revolutionary Social-Democrats, among the whimpering petty bourgeois pacifists, offer the most enticing, the most luring, and the most satisfying creed. It is sufficient to recall the use of arms by strikers in all capitalist countries.

The advocates of disarmament oppose the point in the programme about the "armcd nation" for the reason. among others, that this demand, they allege, ounly leads to concessions to opportunism. We have examined above the relations of parties and of the working-class parties about international revolution-Social Democracy, about the socialist revolution, and about war against war.
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Disarmament

Continued from page 16

periodical alliance with one or the other group of Great Powers... We want to be left in peace in our remote corners... We are ready to demand disarmament, compulsory courts of ar- bitration, permanent neutrality, etc. ("permanent"...)

After the second World War, and particularly when the first atomic bombs were dropped, the most powerful military in the world... 

The petty striving of petty states to stand aside, the petty striving of petty states to stand aside... 

In Switzerland, for example, the imperialist environ- ments... 

We refused like many when orders came... 

The problem of racism... 

The call for Iran Day was clearly...
continued from page 15

mentioning the phrase in its entire pro-
gress and then contrasted the concept of “socialism” slip out a little bit when they were still dealing with the can-
didate Gus Hall promised on national TV in 1976 that if he elected he could de-
ty only as a first step toward political re-

dominant Congress!

Khrushchev, who led the revisionist take-

on, development of a new society or
testimony to the conception that the state is the entity which represents the total power of the society.
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