German Youth Trash NATO Birthday Party

May 6, 1980—the sports stadium outside Bremen, West Germany was going to host a military extravaganza, a clear statement from the government to the West German people themselves. 1,200 recruits were going to be mass inducted into the West German military machine, pledging their allegiance and their young lives to the imperialist Constitution. Even the day, May 6, was carefully chosen for symbolic significance. Twenty-five years ago, on May 6, 1955, West Germany joined NATO, as its imperialist rulers dropped their sham masquerade of guilt and repentance for the crimes of World War II, and started to seriously remilitarize, this time as a Junior partner in the U.S. war bloc.

Coming quickly on the heels of West German support for the boycott of the Moscow Olympics and a new, fudging war budget, this military spectacle was an unmistakable signal to the West German people to resign themselves to the "unthinkable"—the third world war of this century.

But the message millions received from Bremen on May 6 was not the sobering pomp of war preparations and reactionary national unity. As the ceremonies started, just as the national anthem of the Vaterland started to rise from the military band, vigorous chants broke out from various places in the stadium crowd: "Stop it! Stop it!" and "Out of NATO!" Police moved in quickly to restore the "dignity" of the occasion. But by then the flares and fireworks raining into the stadium from outside, and the wail of police sirens, heard over the martial music, made it clear that the statement in Bremen that day was being made in the streets.

Outside the stadium, over 7000 angry, rebellious youth squared off with police and turned the entire area into a battle ground. Armed with cobblestones, clubs and firebombs, the demonstrators forced the police to retreat time and again, leaving their vehicles behind to be burned. Three military buses and several cop cars were put to the torch. A barricade, manned by military police, was needed to prevent the youth from storming the stadium itself. Here were the very youth that imperialism plans to turn into cannon fodder, firing firework rockets at the helicopters evacuating West German President Karl Carstens and War Minister Hans Axel to safety far from the Bremen stadium.

The quickly organized demonstration was an extremely broad action, drawing its forces from widely divergent political trends in West Germany, including many "squads" (semi-anarchist youths) as well as members of the Revolutionary Youth League, affiliated with the Communist Workers League of Germany (KABD). Once in the streets, some march organizers, specifically the youth groups of the Socialists Party and the pro-Soviet German Communist

Continued on page 9
It's About Time!

TITO: ORTHODOX REVISIONIST, DIES

Tito's unorthodox brand of communism, characterized by his advocacy of "self-management" and "anti-imperialism," made him a controversial figure in the world of politics. Tito's death on May 4, 1980, was a significant event in the history of Yugoslavia, and it sparked a wave of speculation over the future of the country.

Tito was a complex figure, known for his unorthodox approach to communism. He was a "towering figure on the world stage," as proclaimed by Jimmy Carter. Tito's praise and glory from these pillars of capitalism is not at all surprising, since Tito himself was stamped from the same mold. What is often called "Tito's unorthodox brand of communism" is in reality nothing but revisionism—the betrayal of revolution under the guise, even if rather thinly veiled, of Marxism.

Tito was never a communist, orthodox or otherwise. "Get rid of the old exploiters and bring in the new" was as high as his aspirations ever went. He hitched his wagon to the then-socialist Soviet Union in the 1920s and '30s, because it was the only force giving an uncompromising aid in the fight against the type of monarchy that ruled ruthlessly over the Yugoslav people. Tito rode to power at the conclusion of World War 2 on the strength of the anti-imperialist movement that dealt blows against the exploiters and bring in the new. It was a powerful mass movement that dealt blows against the Germans and helped to topple Yugoslavia's former rulers, many of whom were Nazi collaborators. The ground was cleared of the "old" but with Tito's revisionist outlook in command, the "new" which was substituted for this amounted to capitulation in words, but capitalism in fact. The economics of Tito's "orthodox communism" was analyzed in the RW shortly after Tito's leg was amputated and is only briefly recapped here—see RW No. 43. Tito, embarking on the road of capitalist development, was expelled from the international communist movement in the late '40s. "Independent Yugoslavia" thereafter reeled off billions of dollars in U.S. aid as well as aid from (other capitalist country) to develop the economy. "Workers' self-management" was Tito's brainchild for both aid under a very rigidly socialist cover. Basically, workers' self-management is nothing but handful of workers turned into bureaucrats who run things for one purpose—profit. Tito's foreign policy has consequently become totally subservient to the U.S., with Tito at the head of a troika of U.S. strategists as well as providing a convenient channel for the U.S. to support the independence, territorial integrity and unity of Yugoslavia. We reaffirm today that America will continue its propaganda and military policy of support for Yugoslavia and do what it must to provide its support. The U.S. imperialists are indeed concerned about maintaining the independence of Yugoslavia—fortified by the Soviet Union. Tito's death was a clear warning to the Soviet Union to stay off U.S. turf—that the U.S. would use military force if necessary to counter any moves in the area by the Soviet Union. This question was addressed in RW No. 42, shortly before Tito began to lose his chin.

Of course, the amount of sabre rattling between the superpowers over Yugoslavia has subsided somewhat since Tito first fell ill; it has been overshadowed by events in Iran and Afghanistan. But even so, Yugoslavia continues to be a focus of contention, as Leonid Brezhnev's appearance at Tito's funeral indicates. Yugoslavia sits right in the dead center between Eastern and Western Europe, and could well become a flashpoint in the near future.

In one of the many hymns of praise sung to him by the press, Tito was called "a tough, practical, canny politician who walked a political tightrope between East and West." Actually, he resembled a bureaucratic caricature of a Stalinist who plunged into the depths of counter-revolution long ago. He will be immor- talized by his foreign policy for being the first ruler to blaze the trail into the pit of revisionism, stabbing the working class in the back under the signboard of "socialism." And for this, future generations of workers will spit on his grave.
The United States, after the "easy" part of the operation for the imperialists, is now being drawn into a "war mentality" and whip up a storm of controversy about "the ability of the U.S. to protect its interests." IRAN FIASCO REKINDLES DEBATE ON U.S. MILITARY READINESS—screams the Christian Science Monitor, worrying the U.S. public and military establishment. Amidst the chaos, the New York Times points out: "The U.S. military was ahead of the curve in preparing for the "war against terrorism."" Meanwhile, the Washington Post reports: "The U.S. military has been "alleviated" enough to allow him to start some limited travel and camp playing among the junior ranks of the imperialist rulers of the U.S. that Carter represents are desperate, recoil fighting to stay pinned down. As one official was quoted in the New York Times, "We were prepared in whatever necessary to protect and cover that operation."

The U.S. imperialists have seized the opportunity to further pump up the American public into a "war mentality" and whip up a storm of controversy about "the ability of the U.S. to protect its interests." Iran Fiasco Rekindles Debate on U.S. Military Readiness—Screams the Christian Science Monitor, Worrying the U.S. Public and Military Establishment. Amidst the Chaos, the New York Times Points Out: "The U.S. Military Was Ahead of the Curve in Preparing for the 'War Against Terrorism.'" Meanwhile, the Washington Post Reports: "The U.S. Military Has Been 'Alleviated' Enough to Allow Him to Start Some Limited Travel and Camp Playing Among the Junior Ranks of the Imperialist Rulers of the U.S. That Carter Represents Are Desperate, Recoil Fighting to Stay Pinned Down. As One Official Was Quoted in the New York Times, 'We Were Prepared in Whatever Necessary to Protect and Cover That Operation.'"
May 4th marked the tenth anniversary of the massacre at Kent State University in 1970 when National Guard troops opened fire on student anti-war protesters demonstrating against the U.S. invasion of Cambodia, killing four and wounding nine. The murderous volley lasted 13 seconds, its echo thundered into every corner of this country, and these were indeed shots heard round the world.

Along with Jackson State (an all-black college in Mississippi) where two students were murdered a week later when police riddled a dormitory with gunfire during an uprising against the Cambodia invasion and national oppression, Kent has come to symbolize for millions the militant spirit of resistance to U.S. imperialism right in the belly of the beast itself as well as the spirit of international solidarity with oppressed peoples worldwide fighting to rid themselves of the same enemy. It is a spirit this country's rulers have never been able to bury. At a demonstration at Kent State on May 4, 1977, a Cambodian resident of the U.S. told how the blood shed at Kent and Jackson State had cemented the unity between the Cambodian and American people. She presented the flag of her newly-liberated country as a gift to the students and said: "The people of Cambodia will never forget how Americans rose up against the U.S. invasion of their country."

What happened at Kent State on that bloody day ten years ago still holds important lessons for the struggle here in the U.S.

For one thing, Kent taught people something about the vicious nature of the imperialist enemy. While every year, the bourgeois press sums up the murders at Kent as "blatant violations of civil rights," what was actually revealed was the fact that their rule is no thing but capitalist dictatorship and ultimately rests on naked force. Kent State was a vivid example of how, as Lenin pointed out, even in the "free," "most democratic" capitalist countries, the state with its armed en forcers is nothing less than a machine for the suppression of one class by another and that, when necessary, the capitalists will not hesitate for a moment to unleash their apparatus of violence and coercion—in this case the National Guard—to subjugate by force any who would challenge them regardless of formal "civil rights."

For four days after Nixon's announcement of the invasion on April 30, the students at Kent went right up in the face of U.S. imperialism. Instead of cowering down, students were shouting "Strike! Peace! Long live the spirit of Kent and Jackson State!"—a foreboding sign of what was to follow. But the students held their ground, refusing to obey. The Guard began lobbing tear gas, but the students were picking up the burning canisters with handcuffs and throwing them back in their faces. Even as the Guard prepared to open fire, some demonstrators were shouting their defiance from as close as 15 yards. When the Guard opened fire at 12:24 a.m., shockwaves reverberated across the U.S. Kent State became a battle cry on the lips of thousands, and students around the country rose up, forcing colleges and university administrations to close the schools for the semester, dealing a powerful blow to the U.S. rulers' plans to continue the war in Indochina. At first the government attempted to deny any wrongdoing in the Kent shootings. But when it became clear that their flimsy mask of "democracy" was being torn away, they scrambled to portray the massacre as an "unfortunate mistake," as "regrettable tragedy." The Seranton Commission, appointed by the federal government to "investigate" the shoot ings, while asserting that "the actions of some students were small and criminal," was also forced to conclude in the face of massive evidence that the indiscriminate firing of rifles into a crowd of students and the deaths which followed were "utterly unwarranted and inexcusable"—though, of course, no one was ever convicted in connection with these calculated murders.

Try as they might, the capitalists were unable to scrub the blood from their hands despite their transparent whis tle-blowing. Desperate to bury the perennial memory of Kent State, in 1972 they began construction of a giant statue where the four students were gunned down. This sparked another wave of struggles from across the country converging on KSU in defiance of court injunctions and university ultimatums. They tore down the fences surrounding the construction site and occupied it with a tent city until April 19 were finally arrested. Again in 1978 demonstrations attacked the fence, driven off only by riot-clad police laying down a barrage of tear gas. That Kent re cital required a showing of resistance to the crimes of U.S. imperialism was indicated by the fact that many students and youth who participated in these actions later were no more than junior high school students at the time of the original shootings.

That every year for the past decade, the anniversary of the Kent State struggle has been commemorated in protests of one form or another is testimony to the fact that what happened there still points the way to the future. As the righteous exclamation that will blast the landscape of the U.S. upside down in the '80s.

On May 4, 1980, a 1,500-assembled at Kent State for a march and rally at a new factor appeared on the scene, capturing the attention of the crowd with chants of "Give 'em hell on the Fourth of May!" It was the direct descendant of the movement of revolutionary students, Vietnamese youth, Iranian students and a small but significant force of other workers, having seized history by the shoulders on May 4, 1969. In the face of massive repression, they had come to uphold the revolutionary significance of Kent State. Ten years later, the bloo red flag of the proletariat waved on the Kent State campus in tribute to those who died and fire and blood ran in the ears of those responsible for the massacre: "Give the imperialists no peace! Long live the spirit of Kent and Jackson State!"
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Cuban Refugees

Imperialist Political Plum Turns Sour

The immigration of tens of thousands of Cubans to the U.S. has been characterized as a "state of emergency." Thousands of refugees take the freedom ride to Florida, snarls Time magazine, President Carter wishes it to be known that the United States, "itself a nation of immigrants," will "welcome the Cubans." Certainly "open hearts and open arms" is Castro's basic theme ever since; "We are confident," he declared, "that the good work of the Cuban Revolution will have its just reward, and that the Cubans, whatever their condition, are welcome to come and share the fruits of the Revolution." But it is the brute necessities, the rush to get them away as many Cubans as possible, that has given rise to this convulsive migration, of the sort that is so familiar all throughout the era of imperialism.

The present migration originated last month, when the U.S. government declared the port of Mariel open to all those who desired to leave the regime, while conducting its "lumpen scum" desiring to leave "soviets and sugar crops, which still form the shaky foundation of the Cuban economy just as they did when the U.S. ran things, had to fail. Poverty and actual hunger are spreading throughout the island. It is not out of place to draw a parallel between the current desperate flight of masses from Cuba and the huge exodus from Ireland at the time of the Potato Famine in the 19th century. These thousands have suffered the same fate as the Mexican braceros, the Haitians, and millions of others of the many different nationalities who are uprooted by their homeland from their economic necessity and forced to go to the imperialist countries that have sucked their own countries dry in search of work. Or the millions of other nationalities who are being set up in Florida, and the Cuban "refugees" to a "special case" of the Cubans to set a precedent for dealing with other waves of immigrants. The U.S. is already here, thousands more were on their way, and the whole process could only be halted by a politically suicidal "crackdown." At the same time, the media has begun to play up different aspects to what is now being termed the "Cuban crisis." The real problem is that Castro is ruled by a small group of "outsiders" who left Cuba after the revolution and are determined to see that the Cuban government does not get its way in any case. The U.S. government plans to demand substantive negotiations to establish normal diplomatic relations with the U.S. as a condition for discussing the departure of 380 Cuban refugees from the American diplomatic mission in Havana. In addition, red carpet treatment, including private transport to the U.S. for tourists and mountain resorts, has been provided by the Cuban government for Cuban-Americans styling themselves as "outsiders" who left Cuba to fetch their relatives.

Cuba: The Evaporation of a Myth

Cuba, home of the first successful revolution against Yankee imperialism in Latin America, a country which as a result became a symbol for revolution for a great many people opposing imperialism around the world—Cuba, which despite all this has become a pawn of Soviet imperialism, a breeding farm for cannon fodder for the expansionist ambitions of the revisionist superpower—Cuba, which pampered contacts and establishing economic linkages to the U.S., which has been growing as a "special case" of the Cubans to set a precedent for dealing with other waves of immigrants, and ordering them to join the exodus. Obviously, public opinion is being prepared for some figure to move to cut off the flow so that it prove to be incomplete. The U.S. government has been providing substantial aid to the Cuban government for Cuban-Americans styling themselves as "outsiders" who left Cuba to fetch their relatives. There is another potential angle to this affair, however, that is worth watching. The Wall Street Journal carried a report that, as summarized by the New York Times, "The Cuban government plans to demand substantive negotiations to establish normal diplomatic relations with the U.S. as a condition for discussing the departure of 380 Cuban refugees from the American diplomatic mission in Havana. In addition, red carpet treatment, including private transport to the U.S. for tourists and mountain resorts, has been provided by the Cuban government for Cuban-Americans styling themselves as "outsiders" who left Cuba to fetch their relatives. This pampered contacts and establishing economic linkages to the U.S. to the extent possible, and ordering them to join the exodus. Obviously, public opinion is being prepared for some figure to move to cut off the flow so that it prove to be incomplete. The U.S. government has been providing substantial aid to the Cuban government for Cuban-Americans styling themselves as "outsiders" who left Cuba to fetch their relatives. There is another potential angle to this affair, however, that is worth watching. The Wall Street Journal carried a report that, as summarized by the New York Times, "The Cuban government plans to demand substantive negotiations to establish normal diplomatic relations with the U.S. as a condition for discussing the departure of 380 Cuban refugees from the American diplomatic mission in Havana. In addition, red carpet treatment, including private transport to the U.S. for tourists and mountain resorts, has been provided by the Cuban government for Cuban-Americans styling themselves as "outsiders" who left Cuba to fetch their relatives.
Existentialism, Marxism and Jean-Paul Sartre

Jean-Paul Sartre—playwright, novelist, essayist, political activist, and above all the leading representative of the philosophy of existentialism—died April 15 in Paris.

Existentialism grew and flourished, becoming a social phenomenon, in the years following World War II. In Sartre's hands it became a philosophy of rebellion, but one which always remained profoundly individualistic. Of the most prominent representatives of existentialism, Sartre was the most marked. From Martin Heidegger in Germany who found difficulty reconciling his philosophy with Nazism, to Gabriel Marcel in France who pushed his religious preoccupations above all the leading representative of existentialism in the early 1960s—embraced it to Gabriel Marcel in France who pushed his religious preoccupations, was the first, to Sartre, to replace the idea of some who do protest Marxism but try to drag the red flag of revolution in the mud. However, existentialism is no longer the social phenomenon it once was, and today almost no one repeats Sartre's balancing act: existentialism remains an influence and an outlook in which a number of people, especially among students and intellectuals, but also among artists, parents, and workers, believe, with the dilemmas of the mass society, with the decline of the U.S. imperialist, and with the possibility of revolution looming on the horizon, that existentialists support.

But against the national liberation struggle of the Poles.

This book lived most of his life on the tightrope of fighting against the outrages of imperialism without being able to or willing to adopt a revolutionary world-view. He never made the leap to Marxism, despite some tentative steps in that direction—but on the other hand he managed not to fall off that tightrope into communism, quiescence, or counter-revolution. A somewhat strange and inconsistent performance was to be recommended, but far better than the common performance of some who do protest Marxism but try to drag the red flag of revolution in the mud.

Existentialism, therefore, is no longer the social phenomenon it once was, and today almost no one repeats Sartre's balancing act: existentialism remains an influence and an outlook in which a number of people, especially among students and intellectuals, believe, with the dilemmas of the mass society, with the decline of the U.S. imperialist, and with the possibility of revolution looming on the horizon, that existentialists support. This outlook is most likely to go over very easily into cynicism and despair, or into mysticism. (Bob Dylan is a good example in point. After a very progressive period he got bitten by existentialism degeneratively, and went into belly-crawling posts.)

Existentialism

"Life is absurd. It has no inherent meaning in itself, but only what you give it yourself." This is the sentiment given philosophical expression by existentialism which creates a great emphasis on human subjectivity on the individual's nature.

But this, however, is not far better than the more common performance of some who do protest Marxism but try to drag the red flag of revolution in the mud.

Freedom

Freedom for Sartre always consists in the fact that human consciousness can (and in fact must) constantly define itself in its own way, that a person's own past, and projecting itself toward a non-existent future. Thus freedom is a negation (a "nihilation") of the past and present, and movement toward a non-existent future. It is in terms of this "upogeneity," as Sartre calls it, that the world is organized around the individual.

For instance, this is how Sartre approaches the question of why people rebel against oppression:

"It is on the day that we can conceive of a different state of affairs that a new light will shine on us as an affair suffering and that we decide that these are unbearable conditions, that a certain action can be itself a motive for [a person's] act. Quite the contrary, it is after the opposite has been tried that changing the situation that it will appear absurd to continue to do in other words, that what he will have to give himself room, to withdraw in relation to it, and will have to have an experience of its actualization on the one hand, he must posit an ideal state of affairs as a future possibility, on the other hand he must posit the actual situation as nothingness. (Being and Nothingness, p. 435.)

This is a truth that can be found here. Freedom and change involve nothingness of the case at present. Real change will not be discovered. But where does this come from? For Sartre it is freedom, actualization of oneself, conscious negation does the present and the future and the movement toward the non-existent which is a trip to try.

To this, we can add Mao said:

"It is only when there is class struggle that there can be philosophy... The oppressors oppress the oppressed, while the oppressed need to go on a base withering and seek a way out before they start looking for philosophy. When they lack this they must look at their starting-point that this was Marxism and since then...

Mao's Talk to the People, pp. 212-213.

In other words, it is consciousness which is primary, but practice—real ideas, but interaction with the world of experience to change things is the only way to grow and in turn serve practice. After correct thought is developed (out of practice and not as a spontaneous creation of consciousness), it can only be used to guide practice—thus giving scope and initiative to the dynamic role of human consciousness.

Further (and closely related to this), what Sartre also cannot be concretized in the fact that if consciousness can grasp this negation of internal evil and its practical realization, it is because consciousness can grasp this external evil and its practical negation. This is the case for the dialectic relation, in fact and human freedom consists in grasping through practice the actual conditions in the world, and then using this grasp, understanding, to change the world.

"The splitting of a single whole and the cognition of its complementary parts: essence..." (dialectics, Encyclopedic Works, Vol. 38, p. 350.) The key here is understanding everything in its real movement and change, it is understanding that the dialectic is not that as a unity of opposites, a contradiction. All reality—nature to society, from man to another of matter in motion. However, Sartre, however, the concept of dialectics in the realm of
buried into Zaire on May 2, Pope John Paul 2 started off his latest expedition with the usual humble greeting. The Vatican press corps had already been waiting for over five hours, which on this occasion was conducted in any African language, but in Latin (the language of the Vatican) and in French (the language of the French and Belgian colonialists who have dominated Zaire for a century). In Kenya, the Holy Father held a special mass for young people when he heard that revolutionary elements had gathered among students and pointedly attacked "atheism"—a symbolic reference to the growing challenge to Western colonialism from the Soviet forces and the anti-Western revolutionary forces.

An atheistic ideology can be as dangerous as an active militant group. The Catholic Church has been building its own in a way that is much more advanced in the last 50 to 100 years than the French and the Belgians. In those countries, the Catholic Church has grown, from 13 million to 90 million people, over a similar period of time. The Catholic Church has been working with an African strategy that has been more effective in creating a system of puppet regimes. The Catholic Church has been a vigorous participant in the political life of the African continent. It has worked to manipulate the political strategies of the colonial powers, often by "absorbing and reinforcing" the traditional values of the African peoples. The Catholic Church has been open-minded about accommodating new ideas and even rejecting its own traditional values.

In one sense, the Pope's whirlwind tour of Africa marks the end of a period for Catholicism in Africa. Up until now, the Pope has been able to provide leadership and direction to the Catholic Church in Africa. However, with the Pope's departure, the Catholic Church in Africa will have to find new ways to respond to the challenges of the modern world. The Pope's departure also marks the end of an era for the Catholic Church in Africa, as the Church will have to find new ways to respond to the challenges of the modern world.

Bwana John Paul Crusades Into Africa

When You See the Cross, the Gun Ain't Far Behind

In the late 1960s, the Palestinian people were fighting for their rights and freedom from colonialism. The Bikel family in particular had been involved in the struggle. The Bikel family in particular had been involved in the struggle. The Bikel family in particular had been involved in the struggle.

Zionist Biker Bites the Dust
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In the late 1940s, the Bikel family in particular had been involved in the struggle. The Bikel family in particular had been involved in the struggle. The Bikel family in particular had been involved in the struggle.

In the late 1940s, the Bikel family in particular had been involved in the struggle. The Bikel family in particular had been involved in the struggle. The Bikel family in particular had been involved in the struggle.

In the late 1940s, the Bikel family in particular had been involved in the struggle. The Bikel family in particular had been involved in the struggle. The Bikel family in particular had been involved in the struggle.

In the late 1940s, the Bikel family in particular had been involved in the struggle. The Bikel family in particular had been involved in the struggle. The Bikel family in particular had been involved in the struggle.

In the late 1940s, the Bikel family in particular had been involved in the struggle. The Bikel family in particular had been involved in the struggle. The Bikel family in particular had been involved in the struggle.

In the late 1940s, the Bikel family in particular had been involved in the struggle. The Bikel family in particular had been involved in the struggle. The Bikel family in particular had been involved in the struggle.

In the late 1940s, the Bikel family in particular had been involved in the struggle. The Bikel family in particular had been involved in the struggle. The Bikel family in particular had been involved in the struggle.
Thus it is at the same time a rational and a material realization of necessity. For Sartre, "revolutionary practice" is a vehicle of movements and of the energy of human consciousness. It is a means of changing the objective situation, but not in a mechanical or deterministic way. The individual can become more than just a cog in the machine of society and can resist the forces of oppression. Sartre believed in the possibility of human freedom and the ability of individuals to change their circumstances through action.

In his later years, Sartre became disillusioned with the French Communist Party (FCP) and the Soviet Union, and he criticized the party's adherence to Marxism-Leninism and its failure to understand the dynamics of the world. He also criticized the FCP's failure to grasp the importance of existentialism and the individual's freedom to choose and make decisions.

Sartre's philosophy emphasized the importance of human freedom and the individual's ability to choose and create their own reality. He argued that human beings are free to make conscious choices and that these choices are the basis of human freedom. Sartre's philosophy has had a significant impact on the development of existentialism and continues to influence the work of many contemporary philosophers.
Ruling Ranks Tighten as Vance Falls Out

The resignation of Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, and his replacement with Senator Edmund Muskie, represents another step in the tightening up of the U.S. imperialist leadership in preparation for war, with their deadly goal in the Soviet Union. While the Vance resignation has been interpreted as the result of a power struggle with President Carter's National Security Advisor, Zbigniew Brzezinski, it is also a result of Vance's personal disagreements over the embassy siege in Iran. The fact is that Vance had come to represent an overall foreign policy which no longer corresponds to the actual necessities of U.S. imperialism.

There has also been some attempt to portray Vance as a "dove" in contrast with the "hawk" Brzezinski. But this "dove" has a long history of service to the bloodiest exploits of U.S. imperialism. In the 1960s, Vance was called to the Wall Street law firm of Simpson, Thacher and Bartlett to serve as counsel to a Congressional committee investigating America's "military preparedness." During Lyndon Johnson's administration, Vance served as general counsel to the army and as an Undersecretary of Defense during the height of the Vietnam War. And in 1965 he landed in the Dominican Republic, where he served as counsel, to a Congressional committee investigating the Airborne Division sent in to occupy the country and prop up a military junta that had overthrown the government.

But following the defeat of U.S. imperialism in Vietnam, Vance became a chief spokesperson for overall U.S. policy vis-a-vis the Soviets. Vance was thus a great believer in the SALT talks and detente. But Vance's foreign policy, when he ran for president in 1972, Muskie had made it clear that he has learned his lesson and is now prepared to do whatever it takes to bring America's "permanent" enemies to heel. Vance's knowledge while he was out of office has been filled with barely veiled calls to put the U.S. on the "front foot" in the face of the nightmare of world war.

The seriousness of the escalation of events and the sharp new necessities for the ruling class were brought home by Vance's abrupt resignation and a very embarrassing moment for Carter. Vance had in fact already been eased out of the key decision-making role. The April 11 decision to go ahead with the raid on Iran was made without Vance's knowledge while he was out of town on a vacation. When he got back and found out, he sent his letter of resignation to Carter and prepared to go back to Wall Street whence he came.

While Senator Muskie has been widely identified in the past with the basic policies of Vance (Vance was Muskie's foreign policy advisor when he ran for president in 1972), Muskie has made it clear that he has learned his lesson and is now prepared to do whatever it takes to bring America's "permanent" enemies to heel. Vance had been the floor manager for the 1972 Water Powers Act which supposedly prevents the president from sending U.S. troops abroad in hostile action without first consulting Congress. Congress now sings a different tune. On the Iran raid, he said, "If the president had the authority and the responsibility to develop it as an option and carry it out at any time and at his own discretion...we cannot rule out the use of any appropriate means which might end the confrontation and bring sanity back to Iran." Muskie, having long been a supporter of deterrence and SALT (and thus widely, if incorrectly, identified as being on the left side of the "doe"/"hawk" continuum), is now in a position of being able to go public with a "responsible man...pushed beyond the limit of endurance" by the naysayers. Interviewed in January about the new views of developing bases and stockpiles for war, he said "We feel betrayed, and we believe that the bourgeoisie has taken over the system." The point to be learned from all this frantic cabinet juggling is this: Vance was the "Stakhanovite" who shape policy, but rather the necessities of the imperialists that shape statesmen in a system which is driven toward war for its very survival.

In contrast to Vance's series of negotiations with European allies to arrange sanctions against the Soviet Union, Brzezinski responded to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan by rushing to Pakistan to be photographed vacating the Afghan countryside through binoculars. "Maybe it will start to worry them up to reporters," he said. A scene reminiscent of John Foster Dulles' "inspection" of the Suez canal a few weeks before the start of the Korean War. The seriousness of the escalation of events and the sharp new necessities for the ruling class were brought home by Vance's abrupt resignation and a very embarrassing moment for Carter. Vance had in fact already been eased out of the key decision-making role. The April 11 decision to go ahead with the raid on Iran was made without Vance's knowledge while he was out of town on a vacation. When he got back and found out, he sent his letter of resignation to Carter and prepared to go back to Wall Street whence he came.

While Senator Muskie has been widely identified in the past with the basic policies of Vance (Vance was Muskie's foreign policy advisor when he ran for president in 1972), Muskie has made it clear that he has learned his lesson and is now prepared to do whatever it takes to bring America's "permanent" enemies to heel. Vance had been the floor manager for the 1972 Water Powers Act which supposedly prevents the president from sending U.S. troops abroad in hostile action without first consulting Congress. Congress now sings a different tune. On the Iran raid, he said, "If the president had the authority and the responsibility to develop it as an option and carry it out at any time and at his own discretion...we cannot rule out the use of any appropriate means which might end the confrontation and bring sanity back to Iran." Muskie, having long been a supporter of deterrence and SALT (and thus widely, if incorrectly, identified as being on the left side of the "doe"/"hawk" continuum), is now in a position of being able to go public with a "responsible man...pushed beyond the limit of endurance" by the naysayers. Interviewed in January about the new views of developing bases and stockpiles for war, he said "We feel betrayed, and we believe that the bourgeoisie has taken over the system." The point to be learned from all this frantic cabinet juggling is this: Vance was the "Stakhanovite" who shape policy, but rather the necessities of the imperialists that shape statesmen in a system which is driven toward war for its very survival.

NATO Birthday

Continued from page 1

Party, attempted to reduce the entire point to a plea for illiberal detente and disarmament, spreading fairly tales in a world where mammon imperialism war bloes are carring on behind the scenes and where only revolution offers the possibility of either avoiding or ending the bloc war in the interests of the masses of people. Huge sections of the demonstrations broke with this false reformism, and fought militarily to take the stadium and disrupt the ceremony. For all practical purposes, the demonstration became two separate actions. As thousands of radical youth, many wearing helmets and face scarves, fought the cops back and forth across the streets, their chants targeted not only the accelerating war preparations, but to a considerable extent the system itself. Chants of "Screw the Statue" were particularly popular as youth charged into police-manned high-pressure water hoses.

According to bourgeois reports, 250 riot police and 40 demonstration were injured.

In the aftermath of the battle in Bremen, all of West Germany is buzz ing with debate. The bourgeois mediaolf the "doves" slipped itself into the usual "anti-terrorism" frenzy, trying desperately to link the actions in Bremen with the recent bungling in Paris in the same day of two Ger mans charged with bombings. The press has been filled with barely veiled calls for the suppression of any internal opposition to the war moves.

The bourgeoisie in West Germany has every reason to be worried. First hand reports from those on the ground now sing a different tune. On the Iran raid, he said, "If the president had the authority and the responsibility to develop it as an option and carry it out at any time and at his own discretion...we cannot rule out the use of any appropriate means which might end the confrontation and bring sanity back to Iran." Muskie, having long been a supporter of deterrence and SALT (and thus widely, if incorrectly, identified as being on the left side of the "doe"/"hawk" continuum), is now in a position of being able to go public with a "responsible man...pushed beyond the limit of endurance" by the naysayers. Interviewed in January about the new views of developing bases and stockpiles for war, he said "We feel betrayed, and we believe that the bourgeoisie has taken over the system." The point to be learned from all this frantic cabinet juggling is this: Vance was the "Stakhanovite" who shape policy, but rather the necessities of the imperialists that shape statesmen in a system which is driven toward war for its very survival.

In contrast to Vance's series of
In the few days since the historic Revolutionary May Day demonstration, the RW has received a number of reports that begin to flesh out more of what actually went down on that day at the demonstrations and more broadly at various workplaces and throughout society. Some of these reports are published in various forms in this section. While these reports are still scattered and inchoate, representing only the tip of an enormous iceberg, they already confirm and deepen the analysis made in the first issue of the RW (May 5, 1980), that amidst sharp and intense struggle a tremendous leap was made on May First, 1980 as the U.S. working class exploded onto the political stage, that literally millions of not only workers but of other classes had their heads turned by this historic political event, and that the actions of the working class and others opposed by the U.S. imperialists on this day dramatically illustrate the potentially intransigent revolutionary enthusiasm of the masses of people in this country (a potential that could have been tapped even more by the class-conscious forces).

Reports like those that have begun to come in are key to making the kind of assessment and summation of May Day that is needed to both more accurately gauge the breadth and depth of the qualitative leap toward the goal of revolution. Reports like those that have begun to come in are key to making the kind of assessment and summation of May Day that is needed to both more accurately gauge the breadth and depth of the qualitative leap toward the goal of revolution. These reports are still scattered and initial, representing only the tip of an enormous iceberg, yet they already confirm and deepen the analysis made in the first issue of the RW (May 5, 1980), that amidst sharp and intense struggle a tremendous leap was made on May First, 1980 as the U.S. working class exploded onto the political stage, that literally millions of not only workers but of other classes had their heads turned by this historic political event, and that the actions of the working class and others opposed by the U.S. imperialists on this day dramatically illustrate the potentially intransigent revolutionary enthusiasm of the masses of people in this country (a potential that could have been tapped even more by the class-conscious forces).

Carrying out this agitation correctly—applying Marxism-Leninism—has revealed many things that were previously hidden. The crowds of "curious onlookers" that followed the matches in most cities turned out not to be actual support matches made up of large numbers of workers who had taken off work to come to the demonstrations and wanted to show their support and participate but were still carrying out intense struggle with themselves about actually taking the step of joining the march proper, and some of these workers did in fact join the marches at certain points. In Chicago, for example, a crowd of 50 followed behind the march and many more followed across the street. In cities all over the country there are many many examples of individuals or small groups of workers taking off work and even sneaking in to get other workers to join them. Many plants reported higher than usual absenteeism. Although it is not possible to determine exactly how many people actually stayed out—to take a stand on May Day—clearly a significant number of workers did stay out—considerably more than indicated simply by the tallies of those who actually showed up at the rallies and marches. One construction worker, for example, told RW writers, as he stood in his living room playing a tape he had made of the Washington, D.C. rally, that he knew at least half a dozen others on his block that stayed off work on May First. Besides workplaces, a number of students and teachers in junior high and high schools, and even in a few elementary schools, participated in May First, with some joining the marches themselves. This turned out to be an easy job, since a large percentage of the school's students had stayed away from school themselves. As reported in the April 25 issue of the RW, May Day had a very large impact on millions of people around the world and more of an impact right here in this city. I've worked here 16 years—never have I seen anything like it. I don't know what the world is coming to!

All of this scattered and partial information indicates the "tremendously broad impact of May Day, but much more investigation is needed. Not only must the profound advances made be summed up, but mistakes and shortcomings as well. It has to be completely analyzed away, for example, the goal of 10,000 in the streets (ten thousand directly participating in the demonstration) was not realized. But the fact that the ruling class raised the stakes of the battle with such a real effect on the participation of workers and others, and that the fact that the conscious forces were not fully able to make the necessary tactical and political advances to overcome these new examples placed in their path by an enraged and wounded bourgeoisie must be investigated and analyzed. The RW calls on all of its readers and distributors to take up this challenge and send us reports. A big leap has been made. Let's hear all about it. Become Co-committer now!
Thank you. It's very good to be here. We were just down a little bit further south in Cincinnati where, once again and correctly so, our Party's been right in the middle of a lot of things that you know, or as you should know, down in Cincinnati in recent months. The city has been very sharply involved and embroiled in some very sharp issues. There's been a lot of debate in the places where people work, and where people or maybe even over the media and everywhere about what's been going on, particularly in the Black community in Cincinnati because for once, after a long time, people are willing to say to themselves, is this going on is not going on only one way down in Cincinnati. For the first time in a long time people are divided in their efforts, to see beyond the cancer and at most beg for a few kneepads, who want to say, 'Oh we'll go straight back and move with the system to accommodate themselves to the system, to condemn their own mess and make sure that people in this country, yeah, that's what we're after here, this is the center of things.'

Now our strategy for revolution has been laid out. It is not random killings. We don't advocate any assassinations, and random killings is not our strategy. The basic question that divides real revolutionaries—people working to abolish the exploitation and oppression people are subjected to in this country in this period—is the question that divides them from all those, whining, bootlicking, world-record belly-crawling so-called revolutionaries who in one way or another want to continue people to stay on their knees and at most beg for a few kneepads, who want to say, 'Oh we'll go straight back and move with the system to accommodate themselves to the system, to condemn their own mess and make sure that people in this country, yeah, that's what we're after here, this is the center of things.'

This murder goes on here everyday, the police terror that goes on in the dark of night and even in broad daylight. The people in this country, working people, particularly, though not only against Black people and other minorities in this country. We're glad to see people rising up, cause we can see in that not the final strategy, not the fully-developed mass movement we need for revolution, where there will rise, notissue, but the seeds of the future. We can see the desire, the burning determination of the oppressed to rise up, strike back against their oppressors and break away out of these chains that drag us down. And, we're glad to be here. We're glad to be here in the thick of it. This is our battle. We're right in the midst of every such turmoil, every such uprising of every sharp question pointing to the source of the oppression, the source of the murders, that is not simply just these dogs out here that get the nerve to call themselves peace officers. We not only have to direct our profit of a few above anything else, that treats every other and commit violence and vent our hatred on their knees and at most beg for a few kneepads, who want to say, 'Oh we'll go straight back and move with the system to accommodate themselves to the system, to condemn their own mess and make sure that people in this country, yeah, that's what we're after here, this is the center of things.'

Now we stand up, our Party stands up and says, 'Look, we're communists.' Like Karl Marx said in the first place, we don't hide nothing. We disdain to conceal our views and aims; we're straight up for revolution. We represent the exploited and oppressed masses of people in this country—the working class and oppressed people and all those who are sick and tired of living under this system and can see what a rotten, corrupt, murdering and degenerate parasitic system it is, and how it turns everything, everyone into something with a price tag on its head, to be bought and sold by a handful of bloodsuckers. We say it straight up: we're going to lead all these people to unite their efforts, to overcome the petty division and differences they try to sow in our ranks, to set beyond the way they try to get to us, to have our anger erupt at each other and commit violence and vent our hatred on each other, to see beyond that to unite and rise up and strike down this capitalist system and move on to classless society—communism. We're straight up about it: we won't hide it, or apologize for it. We'll say it to everyone who'll listen today and we'll go out and get people who don't even want to listen and tell them anyway. Cause people gotta be waked up.

These capitalists can't stand to be called capitalists. 'Oh, nobody here but us entrepreneurs.' This is all just free enterprise. Call me industrialist, say anything but don't call me a capitalist. Now every once in a while one of them will run some little private institute somewhere and talk about capitalism and talk among themselves about how, 'You people hate it all over the world but we're gonna go over with it ain't we? So let's keep it goin' and when we get out there in front of all those people, let's say that everybody can become a millionaire— anybody if they work hard, if they open their own little business can get ahead. Let's lie and cover up how do you become a millionaire or a super-billionaire or billionaire in this country. Let's not talk to people you do it on the blood and the bones of the suffering of the people here and around the world. Let's hide the real history of this country and push it inside out and upside down. And let's keep anybody from calling us capitalists.

See, what is a capitalist? What is capital? Capital is nothing—and this is what it scientifically is—but the control over and the exploitation of the ability of other people to work. It is the control over and the forcing of other people to work for you for wages that keep them alive and keeps them doing it over and over again—the control to force them to do that so that you can accumulate more and more profit, so that you can fight some other capitalist dog-eat-dog cutthroat thief among thieves and see which one of you can pile up the most wealth. That's what capitalism is.

Don't talk to us about free enterprise! The only thing it's free for is a handful of bloodsuckers and for the masses of people there's no freedom in it. We're tired of hearing about freedom and democracy, people's rights, without asking the basic question: freedom for whom? For what class? For the exploiters or freedom for the exploited? Freedom for the oppressor or freedom for the oppressed? You can't have both. Anybody who jumps out here and tells you that they represent all the people—slavemaster and slave alike; capitalist and proletariat alike; rich and poor alike; you know they're lying. How can you represent Dracula and Dracula's victim? There's no way you can. We're being raised over by a class of Draculas. In fact these people can make Dracula look like Mary Poppins. That's a whole class of vampires sucking the blood of the peoples of the world and that's the law, that's the law that they live by; that's the nature of the beast.
CIA Gets Blank Check

In the aftermath of the aborted embassy raid in Iran, Congress quietly dropped any attempt to enact a “charter” for the CIA which would restrict the agency’s operation and subject it to the review of Congress. In fact, the same Senator who was sponsoring the so-called “reform” charter, Senator Huddleston of Kentucky, turned around and introduced a new proposal following an April 30 meeting at the White House. The new bill would, in effect, repeal any restriction of the Hughes-Ryan amendment of 1974. It would exempt the agency from most provisions of the Freedom of Information Act, it would make no mention of the use of newsmen, clergy and professors as covers for CIA operations, and it would make it a heavy felony to reveal the name of an intelligence agent. It further states that if the CIA targets American citizens for investigation, it must do so “under guidelines established by the Attorney General,” in other words, the pigs shall be closely supervised by the hog.

The original plan for a charter came as the result of partial disclosures of the role of the CIA in the overthrow of the Allende government in Chile in 1973 and the installation of the U.S. puppet, Pinochet. This action, led by the Nixon administration, was never universally supported in the capitalist class. Various bourgeois elements had sought to develop a manufacturing economy in Chile based on American high technology and capital and implemented by “moderate” Christian democratic government. The result of the infighting was a series of hearings led by Senator Church designed to discredit the Nixon/Kissinger policy in Chile. This petty squabbling within the ranks of our rulers has been overshadowed by developing events in the world, namely, the coming showdown between the U.S. imperialists and their rivals in the Soviet Union. Any “restriction” on the CIA—even if only formal—has become an anachronism as the bourgeoisie needs instead to expand its covert actions. The failure of the great embassy raid has been alluded to as the result of “faulty intelligence.” Great moans have been heard—“If only we hadn’t shackled the CIA.” Of course, the CIA was never shackled at all. And while the capitalist class will unquestionably take any action it deems necessary, no matter what laws may be on the books, the official rejection of restrictions on the CIA is playing an important role for the bourgeoisie: it is spreading the notion that “yes, the CIA is into some nasty shit, but this is vitally necessary for the sake of our national interests.”

The fole of the CIA in the organization of coups, murders and torture in Iran, Guatemala, Brazil, Chile, Ghana, Zaire, Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, etc., etc., shows that there is no crime to which these craven mercenaries will not stoop. The abandoning of any restrictive charter on the CIA shows that the agency’s employers—the bourgeoisie—has far greater crimes in mind.

Welcome to the organization

This cartoon was submitted to the RW by a San Francisco artist.
Eastern Hogs Ball Out
Texas Pigs
Hunt Bros. Debacle Threatens Whole Barnyard

On Sunday evening, March 30, a select group of the nation's biggest bankers held a desperate meeting in a hotel room in Boca Raton, Florida, trying to prevent a panic when the Wall Street stock market opened the next day. Present were William Spencer, president of Citibank; William Fisher, president of Chase Manhattan; Lewis Preston, president of Morgan Guaranty; A.W. Clausen, president of Bank of America; and John McCallum, chairman of Manufacturers Hanover Trust. Around two in the morning, Paul Volcker, chairman of the board of governors of the Federal Reserve System, camed in and said disaster could be averted.

The immediate cause of the crisis was the collapse of the silver market and with it the recent investments of the Hunt brothers, heavy silver speculators and sons of the late H.L. Hunt, Texas oil billionaire and patron saint of right-wing political causes. The Hunt brothers needed a loan of $2 billion to make good on their commitments. The loans they required were larger than the loans going to bail out Chrysler, but the alternative was the collapse of several leading Wall Street brokerage firms and perhaps several banks. As with the bankruptcy Chrysler corporation, the fragile crisis of the silver market could not stand the shock of their sudden collapse. Something would have to be done to stop the losses, publicly, that is, the problem began last year when the Hunt brothers tried to corner the silver market. In less than a year, the price of silver tumbled from $16.25 an ounce to $10.18. On March 26, the Wallow Street Journal reported that the Hunts bought up another $100 million in cash, and the silver used as margins on stock purchases declined. The Hunts were called on to make good the difference, but the Hunts couldn't do that forever. On the afternoon of March 26, the Wall Street firm of Bache-Halsey Stuart Shields Inc., called on the Hunics to put up another $100 million in cash, and the Hunts had to admit they didn't have it.

In a panic, an officer of Bache called Fed Chairman Paul Volcker that afternoon to tell him that the Hunts had failed to make a $400 million margin call. Volcker, in turn, huddled with Treasury Secretary G. William Miller. The problem was that Bache, the fifth largest firm on Wall Street, had a network of 143 branches—so many that even the Hunts had to admit they didn't have it. In a panic, an officer of Bache called Fed Chairman Paul Volcker that afternoon to tell him that the Hunts had failed to make a $400 million margin call. Volcker, in turn, huddled with Treasury Secretary G. William Miller. The problem was that Bache, the fifth largest firm on Wall Street, had a network of 143 branches—so many that even the Hunts had to admit they didn't have it. In a panic, an officer of Bache called Fed Chairman Paul Volcker that afternoon to tell him that the Hunts had failed to make a $400 million margin call. Volcker, in turn, huddled with Treasury Secretary G. William Miller. The problem was that Bache, the fifth largest firm on Wall Street, had a network of 143 branches—so many that even the Hunts had to admit they didn't have it. In a panic, an officer of Bache called Fed Chairman Paul Volcker that afternoon to tell him that the Hunts had failed to make a $400 million margin call. Volcker, in turn, huddled with Treasury Secretary G. William Miller. The problem was that Bache, the fifth largest firm on Wall Street, had a network of 143 branches—so many that even the Hunts had to admit they didn't have it. In a panic, an officer of Bache called Fed Chairman Paul Volcker that afternoon to tell him that the Hunts had failed to make a $400 million margin call. Volcker, in turn, huddled with Treasury Secretary G. William Miller. The problem was that Bache, the fifth largest firm on Wall Street, had a network of 143 branches—so many that even the Hunts had to admit they didn't have it. In a panic, an officer of Bache called Fed Chairman Paul Volcker that afternoon to tell him that the Hunts had failed to make a $400 million margin call. Volcker, in turn, huddled with Treasury Secretary G. William Miller. The problem was that Bache, the fifth largest firm on Wall Street, had a network of 143 branches—so many that even the Hunts had to admit they didn't have it. In a panic, an officer of Bache called Fed Chairman Paul Volcker that afternoon to tell him that the Hunts had failed to make a $400 million margin call. Volcker, in turn, huddled with Treasury Secretary G. William Miller. The problem was that Bache, the fifth largest firm on Wall Street, had a network of 143 branches—so many that even the Hunts had to admit they didn't have it. In a panic, an officer of Bache called Fed Chairman Paul Volcker that afternoon to tell him that the Hunts had failed to make a $400 million margin call. Volcker, in turn, huddled with Treasury Secretary G. William Miller. The problem was that Bache, the fifth largest firm on Wall Street, had a network of 143 branches—so many that even the Hunts had to admit they didn't have it. In a panic, an officer of Bache called Fed Chairman Paul Volcker that afternoon to tell him that the Hunts had failed to make a $400 million margin call. Volcker, in turn, huddled with Treasury Secretary G. William Miller. The problem was that Bache, the fifth largest firm on Wall Street, had a network of 143 branches—so many that even the Hunts had to admit they didn't have it. In a panic, an officer of Bache called Fed Chairman Paul Volcker that afternoon to tell him that the Hunts had failed to make a $400 million margin call. Volcker, in turn, huddled with Treasury Secretary G. William Miller. The problem was that Bache, the fifth largest firm on Wall Street, had a network of 143 branches—so many that even the Hunts had to admit they didn't have it. In a panic, an officer of Bache called Fed Chairman Paul Volcker that afternoon to tell him that the Hunts had failed to make a $400 million margin call. Volcker, in turn, huddled with Treasury Secretary G. William Miller. The problem was that Bache, the fifth largest firm on Wall Street, had a network of 143 branches—so many that even the Hunts had to admit they didn't have it. In a panic, an officer of Bache called Fed Chairman Paul Volcker that afternoon to tell him that the Hunts had failed to make a $400 million margin call. Volcker, in turn, huddled with Treasury Secretary G. William Miller. The problem was that Bache, the fifth largest firm on Wall Street, had a network of 143 branches—so many that even the Hunts had to admit they didn't have it. In a panic, an officer of Bache called Fed Chairman Paul Volcker that afternoon to tell him that the Hunts had failed to make a $400 million margin call. Volcker, in turn, huddled with Treasury Secretary G. William Miller. The problem was that Bache, the fifth largest firm on Wall Street, had a network of 143 branches—so many that even the Hunts had to admit they didn't have it. In a panic, an officer of Bache called Fed Chairman Paul Volcker that afternoon to tell him that the Hunts had failed to make a $400 million margin call. Volcker, in turn, huddled with Treasury Secretary G. William Miller. The problem was that Bache, the fifth largest firm on Wall Street, had a network of 143 branches—so many that even the Hunts had to admit they didn't have it. In a panic, an officer of Bache called Fed Chairman Paul Volcker that afternoon to tell him that the Hunts had failed to make a $400 million margin call. Volcker, in turn, huddled with Treasury Secretary G. William Miller. The problem was that Bache, the fifth largest firm on Wall Street, had a network of 143 branches—so many that even the Hunts had to admit they didn't have it. In a panic, an officer of Bache called Fed Chairman Paul Volcker that afternoon to tell him that the Hunts had failed to make a $400 million margin call. Volcker, in turn, huddled with Treasury Secretary G. William Miller. The problem was that Bache, the fifth largest firm on Wall Street, had a network of 143 branches—so many that even the Hunts had to admit they didn't have it. In a panic, an officer of Bache called Fed Chairman Paul Volcker that afternoon to tell him that the Hunts had failed to make a $400 million margin call. Volcker, in turn, huddled with Treasury Secretary G. William Miller. The problem was that Bache, the fifth largest firm on Wall Street, had a network of 143 branches—so many that even the Hunts had to admit they didn't have it. In a panic, an officer of Bache called Fed Chairman Paul Volcker that afternoon to tell him that the Hunts had failed to make a $400 million margin call. Volcker, in turn, huddled with Treasury Secretary G. William Miller. The problem was that Bache, the fifth largest firm on Wall Street, had a network of 143 branches—so many that even the Hunts had to admit they didn't have it. In a panic, an officer of Bache called Fed Chairman Paul Volcker that afternoon to tell him that the Hunts had failed to make a $400 million margin call. Volcker, in turn, huddled with Treasury Secretary G. William Miller. The problem was that Bache, the fifth largest firm on Wall Street, had a network of 143 branches—so many that even the Hunts had to admit they didn't have it. In a panic, an officer of Bache called Fed Chairman Paul Volcker that afternoon to tell him that the Hunts had failed to make a $400 million margin call. Volcker, in turn, huddled with Treasury Secretary G. William Miller. The problem was that Bache, the fifth largest firm on Wall Street, had a network of 143 branches—so many that even the Hunts had to admit they didn't have it. In a panic, an officer of Bache called Fed Chairman Paul Volcker that afternoon to tell him that the Hunts had failed to make a $400 million margin call. Volcker, in turn, huddled with Treasury Secretary G. William Miller. The problem was that Bache, the fifth largest firm on Wall Street, had a network of 143 branches—so many that even the Hunts had to admit they didn't have it. In a panic, an officer of Bache called Fed Chairman Paul Volcker that afternoon to tell him that the Hunts had failed to make a $400 million margin call. Volcker, in turn, huddled with Treasury Secretary G. William Miller. The problem was that Bache, the fifth largest firm on Wall Street, had a network of 143 branches—so many that even the Hunts had to admit they didn't have it. In a panic, an officer of Bache called Fed Chairman Paul Volcker that afternoon to tell him that the Hunts had failed to make a $400 million margin call. Volcker, in turn, huddled with Treasury Secretary G. William Miller. The problem was that Bache, the fifth largest firm on Wall Street, had a network of 143 branches—so many that even the Hunts had to admit they didn't have it. In a panic, an officer of Bache called Fed Chairman Paul Volcker that afternoon to tell him that the Hunts had failed to make a $400 million margin call. Volcker, in turn, huddled with Treasury Secretary G. William Miller. The problem was that Bache, the fifth largest firm on Wall Street, had a network of 143 branches—so many that even the Hunts had to admit they didn't have it. In a panic, an officer of Bache called Fed Chairman Paul Volcker that afternoon to tell him that the Hunts had failed to make a $400 million margin call. Volcker, in turn, huddled with Treasury Secretary G. William Miller. The problem was that Bache, the fifth largest firm on Wall Street, had a network of 143 branches—so many that even the Hunts had to admit they didn't have it. In a panic, an officer of Bache called Fed Chairman Paul Volcker that afternoon to tell him that the Hunts had failed to make a $400 million margin call. Volcker, in turn, huddled with Treasury Secretary G. William Miller. The problem was that Bache, the fifth largest firm on Wall Street, had a network of 143 branches—so many that even the Hunts had to admit they didn't have it. In a panic, an off
The following excerpt is the conclusion of "The Urgent Tasks of Our Movement," an article written by the Russian revolutionary leader V. I. Lenin in 1900. At that time a true revolutionary proletariat party, a communist party (then called "Social Democrats") had not yet been formed in Russia. Another major difference with today's conditions in the U.S. is the fact that the stage of the Russian revolution at that time was democratic (against the Czar and feudalism) and not socialist. But even with these important differences, this essay remains very relevant today—RW.

What lesson can be learned from the past?

The entire history of Russian socialism has led to the condition in which the most urgent task is the struggle against the autocratic government and the achievement of political liberty. Our socialist movement concentrated itself, so to speak, upon the struggle against the autocracy. On the other hand, history has shown that the isolation of socialist thought from the vanguard of the working classes is greater in Russia than in other countries, and that if this state of affairs continues, the revolutionary movement in Russia is doomed to impotence. From this condition emerges the task which the Russian Social-Democracy (Communist—RW) is called upon to fulfill—to imbue the masses of the proletariat with the ideas of socialism and political consciousness, and to organise a revolutionary party inseparably connected with the spontaneous working-class movement. Russian Social-Democracy has done much in this direction, but much more still remains to be done. With the growth of the movement, the field of activity for Social-Democrats (Communists—RW) becomes wider; the work becomes more varied, and an increasing number of activities in the movement will concentrate their efforts upon the fulfillment of various special tasks which the daily needs of propaganda and agitation bring to the fore. This phenomenon is quite natural and is inevitable, but it causes us to be particularly concerned with preventing these special activities and methods of struggle from becoming ends in themselves and with preventing the political work from being regarded as the main and sole activity.

Our principal and fundamental task is to facilitate the political development and the political organisation of the working class. Those who push this task into the background, who refuse to subordinate it to all the special tasks and particular methods of struggle, are following a false path and causing serious harm to the movement. And it is being pushed into the background, firstly, by those who call upon revolutionaries to employ only the forces of isolated conspiratorial circles cut off from the working-class movement in the struggle against the government. It is being pushed into the background, secondly, by those who restrict the content and scope of political propaganda, agitation, and organisation; who think it fit and proper to treat the workers to "politics" only at exceptional moments in their lives, only on festive occasions; who too solicitously substitute demands for partial concessions from the autocracy for the political struggle against the autocracy.

"Organise!" Rabochaya Mysl keeps repeating to the workers in all keys, and all the adherents of the "Economist" trend echo the cry. We, of course, wholly endorse this appeal; but we will not fail to add: organise, but not only in mutual benefit societies, strike funds, and workers' circles; organise also in a political party; organise for the determined struggle against the autocratic government and against the whole of capitalist society. Without such organisation the proletariat will never rise to the class-conscious struggle; without such organisation the working-class movement is doomed to impotency.
Dare to Grapple with the Battle Plan For Revolution

"If there is to be a revolution," said Mao Tse-tung in 1948, "there must be a revolutionary party." Today in the U.S., there is such a party, a party based on Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung Thought—the Revolutionary Communist Party, USA.

With the recent publication of draft documents of the New Programme and New Constitution of the Revolutionary Communist Party, the RCP has issued a declaration of war. These draft documents are a battle plan for destroying the old—rising in armed revolution and overthrowing the U.S. imperialist ruling class—and then building the new—the consolidation of the role of the proletariat and the establishment and construction of socialism in this country.

These new documents are drafts. While they represent the most correct and highest concentration of the understanding of the RCP, broad discussion and struggle must take place to hone them into an even sharper weapon in the revolutionary struggle.

For a short period over the next few months, the RCP is calling on all revolutionary-minded individuals and organizations and others to take up concentrated discussions of these documents. It is within reach to draw literally tens of thousands into this process, propagandists assigned by the Party will travel to meet with people, from discussions on the factory floor, to study groups behind prison bars, from struggle over the line among forces in the national movements to discussion among radical and revolutionary students, from the farmworkers of California's Salinas Valley to the wheat farmers in South Dakota—the New Draft Programme and New Draft Constitution of the RCP will circulate. Meetings in housing projects and neighborhoods to discuss the new drafts should be held, women's organizations, anti-nuke groups—wherever people are in struggle against this capitalist system we are calling for broad attention to be focused on the New Draft Programme and the New Draft Constitution of the RCP. We call on people to bring forward their own ideas, too, about the best ways to popularize and carry on discussion over these documents.

Over this period, the pages of the Revolutionary Worker will be opened as a forum for the thoughts, agreements and disagreements of those thousands entering this discussion and struggle. The newspaper will regularly print letters and articles of this nature and will invite response.

The synthesis of this process will be the final New Programme and New Constitution of the Revolutionary Communist Party—a weapon, a battle plan for revolution.

World events are rapidly escalating. Crisis and war are upon us. Along with this, we may well be approaching an extremely rare moment in history—the development of a revolutionary situation.
Continued from page 11

Now how can you talk about freedom, equality and democracy in a world full of nations that have free to your neck you're not free to be rid of him. If you're free to drive a stake in his heart then he's not free to talk. And it always will be whenever you have a society dominated by the ruling class. We see this quite clearly in situations we can't even imagine—you can go into a housing project and add up the total number of self-made millionaires. As many buildings as they got in their mansions. All accumulated off the backs of working people here and around the world... And because we put this up straight, "cause we hold the truth. Cause we don't back down. Cause we don't give in to the master's plans, we don't just curse at the enemy. We don't just unite with people's hatred for the way we have to live, we expose the truth. And we don't just tell the same old story over and over again. We have to do that. We have to tell them that the violence that the masses of people have to go through comes out here soft-talking or half-stepping about how there's nothing here. And the more people begin to think about the class basis of what goes on. understand that it's not gonna be; we're gonna rise up and abolish it. It's not gonna be, it's going to be. So what you better do since this ain't no goddam brainwashing the people. We've got a stand on that. We've got a stand of philosophy that says. And all the stuff they put on the tv is not meant for the working people here and around the world. Women are just a piece of meat. Why are they surprised? On the average, the people's conclusion is that they don't want to get involved and start raping them. Now we don't support that but you gotta put the blame where it is. It's on the system and the people. And we're not going to deal with it subtly. There'll be no tolerance shown for that, but we'll understand what the source of that is. And then your promiscuity is only the beginning. And then there's another subtle way to work on your mind. Check Superman. Now they had to make a new movie here. The reason was because the people who took it to its logical conclusion and went off and exploded them and shot the capitalists' so-called Free Enterprise—actually slavery, a modern day slave system. And they've got to put in a new picture, cause the old Superman went and committed suicide. Because apparently he wasn't so super. So they spent all these millions of dollars, made a brand new picture. And they've got to sell it to you. And how about a little something to make it a little more tolerable. As least can't they do it a little differently. But no, we're more so we can just get through another day? No! WE DON'T WANT YOUR SHITTRY! IT STRAIGHT UP WHAT'S GONNA BE DONE.

Now of course they lie about everything they do. And they say, "You're free to do anything in this country. but capitalist counter-parties—who've restored the profit motive in the Soviet Union, to see if one can check and plunder and understand the violence that's going on out here everyday and everywhere. And they don't want to tell you that this actually went on and people accepted it? I can't understand how. It's no good people. I can't understand how people believe this. But yet and still, the people rose up and they turned them around and exploded them and shot the bullets of the people who had given them to them in the name of God or anything but the masses. And all the rest of you have to live for me, work for me, give me your goods, your hours, your sweat, your tears, and your spirit. And all the rest of you stand in line for hours to get some liquid fuel to rub your scabbed over hands. With plastic and rubber around them and four little things that went around and around and they all lived. And when they were done they would make these things go round and round so that they could go forward and backward and side to side out the door and the streets. And all the rest of the people who never talked to each other? Millions of people or thousands of people. They would think that they're talking to the same person and they never talked to each other and people said that was the highest society that the women were living. And all the rest of you had to live for me. For me. For me. For me. I DON'T WANT TO HEAR THAT! That's monstrous. And it always will be whenever you have a society dominated by the ruling class. And the more people begin to wake up and the real picture of what the future's gonna be like. It's not gonna be; it's going to be. And the more urgent the need, and our determination, hatred, all of which can be and has to be understanding what this is and how people can be so stupid. Not the dumbest. Not the dumber. That's a lie. No, I'm not saying any of that. I'm saying people. And that's the way it is. Women are just a piece of meat. Why are they surprised? Why are they shocked? What's gotta be done. And we're not going to do it and think we're going to get away with it. You mean you can amidst this pain or try to find some way to laugh it out—struggle, yes, but struggle to move for other people. And the more people begin to Wake up and understand that it's not gonna be; we're gonna rise up and abolish it. It's not gonna be, it's going to be. So what you better do since this ain't no goddam brainwashing the people. We've got a stand on that.

Continued on page 18
Iran
Continued from page 3

After the U.S. trading team was forced to take off the last of the diplomats and their families from the ground on the U.S. embassy, they were forced to take cover in bed. The scene was calm and peaceful, with the diplomats and their families going about their business as usual, with the sound of the gunshots and explosions in the background.

The following day, the U.S. embassy was seen to be badly damaged, with many of the diplomats and their families injured. The situation was described as chaotic and dangerous, with the diplomats and their families forced to take cover in the embassy and the U.S. military providing security.

The following day, the U.S. military provided security to the embassy, with a large number of U.S. military personnel seen outside the building. The situation was described as tense, with the diplomats and their families forced to take cover in the embassy.

The following day, the U.S. military provided security to the embassy, with a large number of U.S. military personnel seen outside the building. The situation was described as tense, with the diplomats and their families forced to take cover in the embassy.

The following day, the U.S. military provided security to the embassy, with a large number of U.S. military personnel seen outside the building. The situation was described as tense, with the diplomats and their families forced to take cover in the embassy.

The following day, the U.S. military provided security to the embassy, with a large number of U.S. military personnel seen outside the building. The situation was described as tense, with the diplomats and their families forced to take cover in the embassy.

The following day, the U.S. military provided security to the embassy, with a large number of U.S. military personnel seen outside the building. The situation was described as tense, with the diplomats and their families forced to take cover in the embassy.

The following day, the U.S. military provided security to the embassy, with a large number of U.S. military personnel seen outside the building. The situation was described as tense, with the diplomats and their families forced to take cover in the embassy.

The following day, the U.S. military provided security to the embassy, with a large number of U.S. military personnel seen outside the building. The situation was described as tense, with the diplomats and their families forced to take cover in the embassy.

The following day, the U.S. military provided security to the embassy, with a large number of U.S. military personnel seen outside the building. The situation was described as tense, with the diplomats and their families forced to take cover in the embassy.

The following day, the U.S. military provided security to the embassy, with a large number of U.S. military personnel seen outside the building. The situation was described as tense, with the diplomats and their families forced to take cover in the embassy.

The following day, the U.S. military provided security to the embassy, with a large number of U.S. military personnel seen outside the building. The situation was described as tense, with the diplomats and their families forced to take cover in the embassy.

The following day, the U.S. military provided security to the embassy, with a large number of U.S. military personnel seen outside the building. The situation was described as tense, with the diplomats and their families forced to take cover in the embassy.

The following day, the U.S. military provided security to the embassy, with a large number of U.S. military personnel seen outside the building. The situation was described as tense, with the diplomats and their families forced to take cover in the embassy.

The following day, the U.S. military provided security to the embassy, with a large number of U.S. military personnel seen outside the building. The situation was described as tense, with the diplomats and their families forced to take cover in the embassy.

The following day, the U.S. military provided security to the embassy, with a large number of U.S. military personnel seen outside the building. The situation was described as tense, with the diplomats and their families forced to take cover in the embassy.

The following day, the U.S. military provided security to the embassy, with a large number of U.S. military personnel seen outside the building. The situation was described as tense, with the diplomats and their families forced to take cover in the embassy.

The following day, the U.S. military provided security to the embassy, with a large number of U.S. military personnel seen outside the building. The situation was described as tense, with the diplomats and their families forced to take cover in the embassy.

The following day, the U.S. military provided security to the embassy, with a large number of U.S. military personnel seen outside the building. The situation was described as tense, with the diplomats and their families forced to take cover in the embassy.

The following day, the U.S. military provided security to the embassy, with a large number of U.S. military personnel seen outside the building. The situation was described as tense, with the diplomats and their families forced to take cover in the embassy.

The following day, the U.S. military provided security to the embassy, with a large number of U.S. military personnel seen outside the building. The situation was described as tense, with the diplomats and their families forced to take cover in the embassy.

The following day, the U.S. military provided security to the embassy, with a large number of U.S. military personnel seen outside the building. The situation was described as tense, with the diplomats and their families forced to take cover in the embassy.

The following day, the U.S. military provided security to the embassy, with a large number of U.S. military personnel seen outside the building. The situation was described as tense, with the diplomats and their families forced to take cover in the embassy.
suppression and the violence in their lives every day—all that is acceptable to you. That when people go out here and start shot down in cold blood, that is acceptable to you. You read about a dude two weeks ago who had a bible—what they always tell us to rely on and take up, and that'll make life safe, that's the protector—a dude came up to the police in an argument with a bible in his hand, and he shot him down anyway! And you're saying that’s what goes on every day out here to thousands of people every year—that’s acceptable to you. You're saying that when a mother's child is bitten by a rat in the middle of the night, and its face is ripped open, that that's acceptable to you—that violence is OK with you, that when hundreds, thousands, even millions of babies' stomachs are chewing inside, erupting and bleeding for lack of decent food and medical care—which is not anything if it's not violence—that that is acceptable to you, that violence is acceptable to you. You’re saying that when 20,000, 20,000 die, on the job, having their lives snuffed out by the capitalists' grinding machines of exploitation, that that's acceptable to you; and the couple of million more who are maimed or injured on the job, the miners who are burnt alive for the profit of the capitalists—all that is acceptable to you; the millions of people around the world who die from so-called natural causes that really are caused by the imperialist system which keeps them poor and keeps them oppressed—these millions of people dying from that—all that's acceptable to you, even though it wouldn't be any different if the imperialism just took them all, lined them up and just ran a machine gun down the line and shot every one of them dead. It wouldn't be any different. That’s that. That’s what you're up to.

We made a poster of this, because our Party doesn't support the violence perpetuated against the masses of people, even among themselves as the frustration and anger creeps, in addition to all the violence that comes down from the system on the people every day in one form or another. You support that. You support the violence that keeps the people oppressed and degraded; you support counterrevolutionary violence, but you cannot support the people rising up and using the violent means, which is the only possible means, to rid themselves of this oppression and exploitation, and to rid society of that system which keeps them poor and keeps them exploited, except for a few we put in the grave and we can bury them except for a few we put in the grave and we can bury them because there's no longer enough people, and therefore it's no longer enough people to loot, plundering and ripping off people, and therefore it's no longer enough people to loot, plundering and ripping off people.

You're saying that when a mother's child is bitten by a rat in the middle of the night, and its face is ripped open, that that's acceptable to you—that violence is OK with you, that when hundreds, thousands, even millions of babies' stomachs are chewing inside, erupting and bleeding for lack of decent food and medical care—which is not anything if it's not violence—that that is acceptable to you, that violence is acceptable to you. You're saying that when 20,000, 20,000 die, on the job, having their lives snuffed out by the capitalists' grinding machines of exploitation, that that's acceptable to you; and the couple of million more who are maimed or injured on the job, the miners who are burnt alive for the profit of the capitalists—all that is acceptable to you; the millions of people around the world who die from so-called natural causes that really are caused by the imperialist system which keeps them poor and keeps them oppressed—these millions of people dying from that—all that's acceptable to you, even though it wouldn't be any different if the imperialism just took them all, lined them up and just ran a machine gun down the line and shot every one of them dead. It wouldn't be any different. That’s what you're up to.

We made a poster of this, because our Party doesn't support this rebellion. And you've gotta stand with that rebellion. We went to one young dude, I'll never forget it, and we put a picture of it in our newspaper—he took the poster and held it up with a great big smile, pointing right to the middle of it. And he wasn't saying, “Oh, I was so degraded, I wish somewhat I could have avoided it.” He was saying, “Yeah, I was just the first, it was tremendous. It was the best day in my life. I band the other people out there got more justice in those two days than we ever got in a lifetime, and for once, so did the pigs get a taste of real justice.”

See, this is what you got to understand. It is not degraded, it is uplifting, to begin to get that taste of freedom, that taste that people got in the 1960s and the 1970s fighting for today even more. I remember my wife telling me about a heavy sense. I was watching television, in 1965, when Watts erupted, shook the whole country, parted the rulers of this country. And here was this silly newspaper—I guess they gotta do this for a living—he goes out, approaches this 15 or 17-year-old black girl and says, “Listen, What's going on here and why are people doing this?” She just looked him in the face with a look that said “You got no goddamn feel that;” and instead of answering him she asked him another question. She said, “Let me ask you, do people everywhere know what we're doing here?” And he said “Oh, yes,” and she said, “Good.”

You see, that’s the stand of our Party, because she had the taste of freedom in her mouth, if only for a day. People in Detroit were not degraded. They were uplifted when they ran the pigs out, took the guns away from the National Guard, fought back against the 82nd Airborne for four days—they were not degraded, they were uplifted. But not far enough, and not thoroughly enough. Because what we're striving for is simply, and what we need is not simply to strike back against the oppressor, not simply to take a few of them by the back of the neck to get some revenge, but much more than that to rise up all the way, carry through and make revolution, and, yes, finally advance society to the point where we can bury all these weapons of destruction, bury them because there's no longer enough people, and therefore it's no longer enough people to loot, plundering and ripping off people, and therefore it's no longer enough people to loot, plundering and ripping off people. We're looking forward, not just to rebellion for a day but to make revolution that carries all the way through—we put out the poster. And this poster showed the brilliant light of the day. People in Detroit were not degraded. They were uplifted. But not far enough, and not thoroughly enough.
Get Down with the Line of Bob Avakian and the RCP

“If we want to get free we’re going to have to struggle to learn and apply this theory.”

—Chairman Bob Avakian

**New Draft Programme and New Draft Constitution of the Revolutionary Communist Party, USA**

In a situation which is developing as rapidly as today’s, the actions taken by the advanced section of the proletariat and of decisive importance. They will in no small part determine how far we go and whether we are able to break through at all when the conditions fully open and the opportunity for revolution is there to seize. These moments, particularly in a country such as this, are rare in history, and their outcome has a profound influence on history for years, even decades, to come. Those who do understand what is going on and choose not to act are contributing to the prolonging of this destructive and decadent system. The programme is a declaration of war, and at the same time a call to action and a battle plan for destroying the old and creating the new. It must be taken today. The words of Mao Tse-tung ring out with full force: “Seize the Day, Seize the Hour.”

**The Science of Revolution**

Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism. Mao Tse-tung Thought and the Line of the Revolutionary Communist Party, USA. Book by Victor Wild. Making revolution is the wild dream of slavery. It’s a science, developed through summing up centuries of struggle between slave owners and slave owners, peasants and landlords, workers and capitalists. And if you want to make revolution, you need to understand that science. In a unique volume the book presents a lively and fresh exploration of the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism. Mao Tse-tung Thought in the areas of philosophy, political economy, the nature of imperialism, the state, the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the dictatorship of the proletariat. And it shows their application in the US and the world today, explaining the line of the Revolutionary Communist Party, the strategy for revolution in the US, and the possibilities for revolution. (Available Summer 1980 from Banner Press)

**REVOLUTION**

Kennedy: Knight of the Living Dead

Get Your Hands on the Revolutionary Worker!
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