Workers Struggle Exposes Capitalism in Soviet Satellite

UPHEAVAL IN POLAND

By August 21st more than 100,000 Polish workers were out on strike, including more than half of the labor force of the northern industrial region of Poland. As we go to press there are reports of a general strike breaking out in the nation's capital Warsaw. Striking workers in the Lublin region of Poland—among the first to go out in mid-July. By August 21 over 100,000 Polish workers were out on strike.

Shipyards have been occupied by workers for days, ports have been closed, railroads and other forms of transportation have been shut down. The city of Gdansk, Poland's second largest port and the site of some of the largest shipyards in the world, has been completely paralyzed. As the strike continues to spread, almost every major industrial city in the country has been hit. Even the huge "model" steel works of Nowa Huta in the southern part of the country near Cracow experienced at least temporary strikes this week. Every section of Polish society has been affected and there are reports of peasants, students and intellectuals joining the struggle. So far the Polish government

Continued on page 18

Crucial Questions in Coming From Behind

by Bob Avakian, Chairman of the Central Committee of the Revolutionary Communist Party, USA

Recently some very important articles have appeared in the Revolutionary Worker focusing on key targets and tasks that must be fulfilled, politically and organizationally, in order to fully build off the momentum established through May First and to make further leaps forward in the face of the rapidly developing situation—on the one hand, the deepening crisis and the accelerating motion toward world war and the intensifying preparations of the imperialists for this war; and on the other hand, the growing restlessness, protests and outbursts of rebellion among various sections of the masses. In particular I am referring to the all-important call in the August 1 Revolutionary Worker ("Wanted: 100,000 Co-Conspirators") to expand distribution of the paper to the 100,000 level, on a sustained basis, and to the reprints in the RW (June 20 and June 27) of very relevant excerpts from Lenin's landmark pamphlet What Is To Be Done?, which shed further light on the need for greatly strengthening party organization in order to really carry out the kind of political work that, together with the development of the objective situation, can strengthen the development of a revolutionary movement, with the working class—and first and foremost the class-conscious workers—at the head, under the Party's leadership, a movement capable of actually accentuating the prospects for revolution in the period ahead and of seizing the opportunity for revolution at whatever point it ripens, in connection with all this, and more broadly with the points raised in the talk (reprinted as a pamphlet) Coming From Behind to Make Revolution, I want to address here some crucial questions raised by Lenin (and included in the reprinted excerpts), first of all the problem he gives great emphasis to: that the conscious revolutionaries, the communists, are lagging behind the spontaneous upsurge of the masses.

Does this assessment Lenin made of the revolutionary movement in Russia in 1902 also apply to the situation in the U.S.? Today, and if so in what ways? In one way, looking at the surface of things and keeping in mind that Lenin was speaking in good part of the fact

Continued on page 2
"Oh, oh... Say Can You See..."

Sailor's Torpedo National Anthem

The TV cameras were ready to roll, the reporters were assembled. The spotlights were trained on the recruits sitting in the auditorium of Great Lakes Naval Training Center's movie theatre. The Chief Petty Officers were stationed at their posts ready to apprehend any disrupters. There was a tense moment as everyone waited for the Star Spangled Banner, listening for the sailors' reaction. As the poignant strains blew over the loudspeaker silence prevailed throughout the sparsely attended theatre. The newbie breeched a slight smile.

This moment was the climax of a three-day 'breakout' build-up over the crisis at the Great Lakes Naval Training Center. For two months a battle has raged with the base commander, Rear Admiral Charles Gurney III on one side, and rebellious recruits on the other. The Ad
miral was caught in a dilemma that had him squirming under his Navy uniform. He was in charge of—whom are supposed to be prepared to fight for, and if necessary die for. There was no choice in showing the tune all the respect it deserved.

By Wednesday, August 20, it was front page news when the angry Ad
miral declared the 'breakout' a win one, if you like to call such a thing winning. The national anthem at Rosso Auditorium Theatre for as long as I'm commander here." This was after the whole thing was merely a walkout, and the admiral just forced the ban the tune. After removing the anthem in early August, he tried once again to bring it back. As he said, by complaints and letters of protest from sailors. The only condition Gurney laid down was that all patrols turn Dixon, finger the usher, the sailors were reported to angrily so they could be punished. The result was the anthem turned off and hisses—and no one reported the off
fenders.

First the whole thing was merely an unpleasant blot on Admiral Gurney's nerve. Such things are not supposed to happen, especially not among Naval recruits who are, after all, a few weeks away from being able to say their first to be a shift above the army. And the vast majority of the moviegoers at Rosso Auditorium are supposed to be able to say the same thing. So their average sailor, as well as having finished boot camp and been carefully screened to attend one of the technical schools on the base. But after two months of combat, the admiral was well aware that the whole thing smacked of a spit in the face of the imperialist war
terpreters. Something had to be done to rein
t the proper discipline, obedience and patriotism into these, recruits who only a year ago had staged an uprising on the base.

For two days last June 500-800 sailors stormed out of the base, fighting with the police, refusing to return to their bunks only one sailor's family had been punished. In an attempt to free the Cuban revolutionaries, the navy recruiting officer meant nothing but a decreed future, rotten barracks and sadistic petty officers—and they were angry. The local riflepuff business pips

on the "strip" near the base caught the brunt of the sailors' anger as they smashed windows right and left. The boot camp was hick as rooks were fly

ing through the credit union and bar

tacks windows to shouts of "the Navy sucks!" The rioting was caused by an invasion of Marines who ringed the base with armed patrol, 20 ports were sealed to the base for mob action and 25 others faced court

martial.

Admiral Gurney knew very well that he was standing on shaky ground with three sailors. So, he appealed to the public. The result was the laughable sight of Admiral Gurney contributing to a New York Times feature analyzing the recent "Back to Havana" wave of refugees. "I'm a realist," complained a navy official. "I don't expect it to go over all a stormy sea."

Meanwhile, the mass media churned up all kinds of national chauvinism. In particular, "worms" who left Cuba after the Cuban revolution! Other "revolutionaries" were pledged to take in refugees and find them jobs, even for the homeless and penniless when Cubans actually showed up on their doorsteps. There have been a number of instances of refugees refusing to return to their barracks. The admiral was soon to be taken back to his post. But this "breakout" has gone sour for the military. There is widespread hatred against the "ungrateful" refugees. The earlier propaganda sheets showed the "true" and fre
dom loving refugees, ditching well-thumbed ed
ditions of Thomas Jefferson's writings. There have been no reports of Cubans against American soil, soon gave way to dia
tributes for foreign enemies descending on America like a swarm of locusts. The Cubans were just a bunch of lazy, loafers who came here looking for a handout. In one breath, "they don't want to work!"; in the next breath, "they want to take away our jobs." The media, which at first censored Rael Cifro for his statements that those who wanted to leave Cuba were "parasites and antisocial scum" soon began not only to echo him but to go out of their way to deliberately dumb down any "criminal, pervert and Florida striats to find. Thousands of big talking Gusanos (pro-U.S. political agents) in other con

ternation. That's supposed to be happening, especially not among Naval recruits who are, after all, a few weeks away from being able to say their first to be a shift above the army. And the vast majority of the moviegoers at Rosso Auditorium are supposed to be able to say the same thing. So their average sailor, as well as having finished boot camp and been carefully screened to attend one of the technical schools on the base. But after two months of combat, the admiral was well aware that the whole thing smacked of a spit in the face of the imperialist war preparations. Something had to be done to rein in the proper discipline, obedience and patriotism into these, recruits who only a year ago had staged an uprising on the base.

For two days last June 500-800 sailors stormed out of the base, fighting with the police, refusing to return to their bunks only one sailor's family had been punished. In an attempt to free the Cuban revolutionaries, the navy recruiting officer meant nothing but a decreed future, rotten barracks and sadistic petty officers—and they were angry. The local riflepuff business pips on the "strip" near the base caught the brunt of the sailors' anger as they smashed windows right and left. The boot camp was hick as rooks were flying through the credit union and bar racks windows to shouts of "the Navy sucks!" The rioting was caused by an invasion of Marines who ringed the base with armed patrol, 20 ports were sealed to the base for mob action and 25 others faced court martial.

Admiral Gurney knew very well that he was standing on shaky ground with three sailors. So, he appealed to the public. The result was the laughable sight of Admiral Gurney contributing to a New York Times feature analyzing the recent "Back to Havana" wave of refugees. "I'm a realist," complained a navy official. "I don't expect it to go over all a stormy sea."

Meanwhile, the mass media churned up all kinds of national chauvinism. In particular, "worms" who left Cuba after the Cuban revolution! Other "revolutionaries" were pledged to take in refugees and find them jobs, even for the homeless and penniless when Cubans actually showed up on their doorsteps. There have been a number of instances of refugees refusing to return to their barracks. The admiral was soon to be taken back to his post. But this "breakout" has gone sour for the military. There is widespread hatred against the "ungrateful" refugees. The earlier propaganda sheets showed the "true" and freedom loving refugees, ditching well-thumbed editions of Thomas Jefferson's writings. There have been no reports of Cubans against American soil, soon gave way to dir
tributes for foreign enemies descending on America like a swarm of locusts. The Cubans were just a bunch of lazy, loafers who came here looking for a handout. In one breath, "they don't want to work!"; in the next breath, "they want to take away our jobs." The media, which at first censored Rael Cifro for his statements that those who wanted to leave Cuba were "parasites and antisocial scum" soon began not only to echo him but to go out of their way to deliberately dumb down any "criminal, pervert and
Crucial Questions in Coming From Behind
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that the communists were lagging behind the spontaneous developments within the working class itself, it might seem that what he says there is not really applicable to the U.S. at the present time. It is, after all, not the case that the masses of workers (or even a large minority, numbering in the millions) are engaging in political struggle against the system and demanding guidance from the communists in that struggle. And again, viewed from the surface of things, it might actually seem—and certainly it is being loudly declared by various and sundry forces—that, far from lagging behind the spontaneous movement of the masses, we are too far out in advance of it. But the problem here is precisely that this kind of viewpoint represents looking only at the surface of things—that it is superficial, and along with that, static and one-sided (and often smugly conservative), not only in its analysis of the present situation in the U.S. but in its understanding of what Lenin is getting at.

It is true—and constitutes a significant difference from our situation today—that when Lenin wrote What Is To Be Done?, the workers in Russia on the whole faced starker conditions of exploitation and oppression and had already been waging a struggle on a broader scale and generally in a more militant way than the workers in the U.S. over the past period of time, and further that a good number of these Russian workers were both familiar with and basing support upon the general idea of socialism. First of all, however, it must be stressed that at that time the majority of these Russian workers were by no means real “socialist” tendencies, and only a relatively small minority of these Russian workers were both familiar with and basing support upon the general idea of socialism. First of all, however, it must be stressed that at that time the majority of these Russian workers were by no means real “socialist” tendencies, and only a relatively small minority of these Russian workers were both familiar with and basing support upon the general idea of socialism.

True, these protests and rebellions are mainly limited to the provinces and to the largest cities, and amount to little more than a wave of anti-government demonstrations. But if one looks closely at these protests and rebellions, one finds that in fact they are much more widespread than the newspapers and the official organs of the regime claim. And one finds that the masses, including the working class masses, and for the masses, as a collective organizer of the party itself and the revolutionary forces generally.

Do not these basic principles stressed by Lenin have broad application in all countries at all times, and more specifically does he not emphasize that Marxist agitation and propaganda, especially scientific, living exposure, and on the central role of the communist newspaper, have great relevance and importance for the present situation and its future prospects in the U.S.? Who will deny it?

Are there not already many different “protests and rebellions” in this country—such as the wave of anti-smuggling protests, anti-nuclear movements and, certainly not least, the mass protests against the military draft? Do not these basic principles stressed by Lenin have broad application in all countries at all times, and more specifically does he not emphasize that Marxist agitation and propaganda, especially scientific, living exposure, and on the central role of the communist newspaper, have great relevance and importance for the present situation and its future prospects in the U.S.? Who will deny it?

Are there not already many different “protests and rebellions” in this country—such as the wave of anti-smuggling protests, anti-nuclear movements and, certainly not least, the mass protests against the military draft? Do not these basic principles stressed by Lenin have broad application in all countries at all times, and more specifically does he not emphasize that Marxist agitation and propaganda, especially scientific, living exposure, and on the central role of the communist newspaper, have great relevance and importance for the present situation and its future prospects in the U.S.? Who will deny it?

Are there not already many different “protests and rebellions” in this country—such as the wave of anti-smuggling protests, anti-nuclear movements and, certainly not least, the mass protests against the military draft? Do not these basic principles stressed by Lenin have broad application in all countries at all times, and more specifically does he not emphasize that Marxist agitation and propaganda, especially scientific, living exposure, and on the central role of the communist newspaper, have great relevance and importance for the present situation and its future prospects in the U.S.? Who will deny it?
"Who shot J.R.'s arm?" The headliner in yesterday's Houston sports pages asked millions to wonder about the Houston Astros' ace hurler, J.R. Richard. When J.R. left the game on June 28th, with the Houston Astros leading the Chicago Cubs, the headlines screamed for blood: "Who shot J.R.'s arm?" The question still lingers. Just before the ball of John Mayberry Jr. hit the catcher's chest, J.R. had left the game with a "dead" arm. How dead? Did he have a stroke? A heart attack? A brain hemorrhage? His condition was so critical that even this distinction was robbed from him as J.R. Richard was one of the best pitchers in baseball. In fact, he had been标榜ed or why it happened. We've been told all we had was "muscle fatigue" and should only pitch 5 or 6 innings per game. The treatment of J.R. Richard paralleled the treatment of numerous other athletes who were injured in the same manner. The manager, the team doctor Harold Bretsford, gave the diagnosis "excellent." By what scientific method? He pressed on J.R.'s arm "excellent." By what scientific method? He pressed on J.R.'s arm "excellent." By what scientific method? He pressed on J.R.'s arm "excellent." By what scientific method? He pressed on J.R.'s arm "excellent."

"Flotilla"
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mental detective" on the island onto leaky rafts headed for Key West. It's quite possible that Fidel did miscalculate in some such unspiring conduct, perhaps under pressure from the CIA's defoliation campaign against Castro's beard which was conducted in the early 60s. But Castro's main objective, amongst the wreckage of his revisionist economy, is to transfer the Cuban unemployment rolls to those of the U.S. and that's the inspiring story of the freedom Flotilla. What catchy nickname will now be invented? What boat is currently gathering steam: the reverse migration which has been so often subsidized by airplane hijackings by Cubans who "had the wrong idea"? It can at least be said of those who have had to resort to hijacking airplane flights in their desperation to get out of the U.S. that they have learned quickly about life in this country and want no part of it, regardless of the conditions in Cuba which they were trying to get away from.

Two Cubans recently arrived in Miami on charges of an attempted hijacking and were fined $1,000,000 bail, typifying the conditions of thousands of refugees in the United States. Many have been repatriating Cuban refugees who wish to return home. So far their efforts have been in vain. However, the government is beginning to realize the magnitude of the problem as the U.S. has no expectation of anything but a stiff jail term. Two months ago, the administration of president Nixon, who is dominated revisionist neocolonialist, with some two-bit "hurry for the red, white and blue" backing, proved a breeding ground for the illusion that the imperialists of the U.S. and Britain and the poor and unskilled refugees with riches—with anything but abuse and contempt, especially once their purpose as propaganda ploys was ended or felt.

Now, the United States has assigned top level State Dept. "trouble shooters," William Bowler, to negotiate with Cuban officials to "devise an orderly method for the further repatriation of those who wish to return home." So far their efforts have been in vain. However, the government is beginning to realize the magnitude of the problem as the U.S. has no expectation of anything but a stiff jail term. Two months ago, the administration of president Nixon, who is dominated revisionist neocolonialist, with some two-bit "hurry for the red, white and blue" backing, proved a breeding ground for the illusion that the imperialists of the U.S. and Britain and the poor and unskilled refugees with riches—with anything but abuse and contempt, especially once their purpose as propaganda ploys was ended or felt.

Finally, J.R. ended up in the hospital for a week. Four days later, during an easy work-out, J.R. Richard dropped to the ground on the astroturf and nearly died. Suddenly the public balking of J.R. Richard took a new turn. In an August 2 story, Ed Fowler endeavored to dispel the myth about the possible return of J.R. Richard. The reason was a Maybe question of the championship. No doctor would allow J.R. Richard to pitch under supervision with hopes the blockage might have been cleared by the surgery. "Hell," said Frank Joele, an eminent physician in sports medicine and orthopedics, found in J.R.'s case, "It's naturally (unlike most blacks—rah! rah! rah) was right, because he was acting during the game/weekend which he was accidentally/physically hit in the head by a baseball and immediately/physically fell to the ground. This year he was zero for four in the four-inning All-Star game. Following the game he went to a hospital in Houston, but was discharged July 3rd, not better Saturday night. He improved from 'dead' to 'tired'! If his condition was any indication, it's something that stopped a rope from being thrown. The comrade has taken up distribution of the RW and regularly sells 50 newspapers a week. His reference to a letter he received from the Obama administration about the suffering of students and others to discuss the draft New Program and Constitution, a task he has set upon.

LONG LIVES PROLETARIAN INTERNATIONALISM

Dear Comrades:

With this letter I'm sending you $90, $27 is for RW's and $10 for the Revolutions, the rest of it is for a Viet Nam prisoner. Please send your letter and it really made me happy. We'll try to answer you when the school starts. We'll try to do our international duty toward the oppressed in the U.S. and the world. It is not really much of a doing, but I'm proud to do this.

Page 4—Revolutionary Worker—August 22, 1980

Black Pitcher Feels Master's Whip

Prisoner Writes "Punishment Censorship"

We recently received this letter from a revolutionary prisoner in the east.

My name is X, at present I'm imprisoned in... Reading is a large part of almost every prisoner's routine and what he/she reads is important as it may affect how he/she views, him or herself, society, the world and politics. This can be very powerful depending on what you "choose" to read— if you are gaining knowledge it be political, social or to how to bake a cake, you are advancing yourself, which is one of the things that the prison system wants to achieve in its efforts to "rehabilitate" an inmate. The capacity for the prison system to "rehabilitate" the "oppressed" is so minimal that it is laughable. It is a tool of control and oppression, it is a tool with its roots back to capitalism. It is not so that you are gaining knowledge but is that your mind is controlled. It is a tool to prevent the oppressed from learning about control and manipulation of the masses. It is a tool to prevent the oppressed from learning about the power of the masses to change their lives. By reading one letter you can see that the system is not concerned with your mental health, but with your physical health.

"Punishment Censorship" means that the prison system is going against the First Amendment. "It's your right to receive and send information". The system is denying you the right to receive such literature. In my case because It's political, social, and religious information. It is a tool with the system to control the prisoner. It is a tool with the system to prevent the prisoner from learning about the power of the masses to change their lives. It is a tool with the system to prevent the prisoner from learning about control and manipulation of the masses. It is a tool to prevent the prisoner from learning about the power of the masses to change their lives. It is a tool to prevent the prisoner from learning about the power of the masses to change their lives. It is a tool to prevent the prisoner from learning about the power of the masses to change their lives. It is a tool to prevent the prisoner from learning about the power of the masses to change their lives. It is a tool to prevent the prisoner from learning about the power of the masses to change their lives. It is a tool to prevent the prisoner from learning about the power of the masses to change their lives. It is a tool to prevent the prisoner from learning about the power of the masses to change their lives. It is a tool to prevent the prisoner from learning about the power of the masses to change their lives. It is a tool to prevent the prisoner from learning about the power of the masses to change their lives. It is a tool to prevent the prisoner from learning about the power of the masses to change their lives. It is a tool to prevent the prisoner from learning about the power of the masses to change their lives. It is a tool to prevent the prisoner from learning about the power of the masses to change their lives. It is a tool to prevent the prisoner from learning about the power of the masses to change their lives. It is a tool to prevent the prisoner from learning about the power of the masses to change their lives. It is a tool to prevent the prisoner from learning about the power of the masses to change their lives. It is a tool to prevent the prisoner from learning about the power of the masses to change their lives.
Israelis Attack Palestinians in Lebanon

August 19. Israeli armed forces conducted their biggest raid into Lebanon since 1978, and their third attack within a week. Involving some 300 troops when marched in supported by artillery and air attacks, the attack was not justified by any of the usual talk about defense or retaliation. Rather, it was characterized by Israeli's director of military intelligence as a "preventive measure" to keep the Palestine Liberation Organizations (PLO) "busy with their defense instead of planning attacks against us." And Israeli further announced that it would continue to "take the initiative" and attack whenever it saw fit. This is not at all a new policy, what is new is simply their open admission—arrogant boasting, in fact—that they are pursuing a policy of aggression.

On the one hand, the U.S. expressed "concern" over the raid, with the U.S. embassy in Beirut denouncing it as "contrary to Israeli public assurance" that it would respect Lebanon's sovereignty, with an official in Washington cynically worrying over whether U.S.-supplied arms had been used.

On the other hand, the day after the raid Secretary of State Muskie broke off his vacation and rushed to the UN in Beirut. After three hours of talks with UN Secretary General and Secretary of State for Lebanon, he announced that it would continue to "take the initiative" and attack whenever it saw fit. This is not at all a new policy, what is new is simply their open admission—arrogant boasting, in fact—that they are pursuing a policy of aggression.

But in these recent events it is the "bad cop" role which is coming through more strongly. Muskie's "bad cop" image is a sign of this, and it certainly outweighs the remarks of his "good cop" role. But besides this, we have to ask what the meaning of is Israel's greatly open aggressive posture on policy, especially in Lebanon. In the words of Prime Minister Begin, there is "the barbarian enemy comes to our cities—We go out to confront him and we hit him at any time and at any place. . . . There are definitely internal problems in Israel, and the Arab reaction to these problems makes it appear that we are pursuing a certain kind of political policy which is detrimental to the interests of the Palestinian people.

Revolution Reprints

The King Legacy: Reformism and Capitalism. $0.50.
Class and Class Struggle. $0.50.
Proletarian Dictatorship vs. Bourgeois Democracy. $0.25.
How Socialism Wipes Out Exploitation. $0.25.

Cassette Tapes

Look to the Future for Revolution. Speech by Bob Avakian. Two tapes. 120 minutes. $6.00.
This System is Doomed. Let's Finish It Off. Speech by Bob Avakian at May Day rally, May 5, 1979 in Washington D.C. 90 minutes. Good technical quality. $6.00.

Periodicals

Revolution: Organ of the Central Committee of the Revolutionary Communist Party, USA. $10.00/10 issues.
Revolutionary Worker, Weekly newspaper of the Revolutionary Communist Party, USA. $0.10/issue.
Government Rushes Railroad

Speaking Tour Planned for UN 2

The government is wasting no time in its efforts to put the UN 2, Steve Yip and Glenn Gan, back into prison to serve out one year and one day of hard time for their��"connected war moves"of exposing and opposing the war moves of the two superpowers. No sooner was the transcript of the trial completed than the appeals division notified defense lawyers to file their appeal brief by September 12th. U.S. attorneys have up to one month to respond and the Court of Appeals has indicated that it will begin to review the case during the week of October 27th.

This rush to the appeals is a continuation of the political railroad of the UN 2 begun the instant the U.S. imperialists recovered from the shock of red paint splattering the faces of the American and Soviet representatives in the United Nations. On the eve of Revolutionary May Day 1980, these two brothers ripped the diplomatic shroud off the superpowers war moves. Shouts of "Down with the U.S. and Soviet War Moves, Our Flag is Red, Not Red, White and Blue" rang out. This political exposure was an occasion of uplifting joy for millions of people around the world.

The UN 2 were charged with outraging the political superpower. A non-convicted in short order. In sentencing the UN 2, Judge Robert Ward laid down the bourgeois's gauntlet making it clear that the connection was "an intended offense for their vicious crime. Over 9,000 people signed the statement of support, outraged at the political repression heaped upon the UN 2. Letters of support for their action poured in from around the country and from other countries as well, and piled up on Judge Ward's bench. Active GIs, here and in Europe, political activists, workers, professionals and others expressed their solidarity with the UN 2. Many throughout the country wore red armbands on the day of sentencing. $10,000 was raised to place a half-page ad in the July 15 edition of the New York Times featuring some of the inspiring and striking letters that had been received.

One year's hard time, five years probation, and a suspended sentence on parole. But the government is wasting no time in putting the UN 2 into prison to serve out one year and one day of hard time for their political "crime" of exposing and opposing their superpowers war moves. No sooner was the transcript of the trial completed than the appeals division notified defense lawyers to file their appeal brief by September 12th. U.S. attorneys have up to one month to respond and the Court of Appeals has indicated that it will begin to review the case during the week of October 27th.

To propel the struggle forward, Steve Yip and Glenn Gan will embark on an extended cross-country speaking tour soon. As the politicians race from one city to the next beating the war drums, the UN 2 are stepping forward and standing with those who oppose the imperialists' plans to step forward and stand with the UN 2. To propel the struggle forward, Steve Yip and Glenn Gan will embark on an extended cross-country speaking tour soon. As the politicians race from one city to the next beating the war drums, the UN 2 will be issuing the call of the international working class in revolutionary opposition.

Activities such as Flo Kennedy of the Black Women United for Political Action, Yuri Kochiyama, veteran activist of the Asian and Black peoples' movements, Betsy Olson West, president of the National Consumer Coalition in New York City, Tolu Lamumbe, the African Support Committee in Boston and others have already endorsed and are sponsoring this tour. A call has been issued by the Committee to Free the UN 2 for others to join in sponsoring this tour.

I wish to state my support for the UN 2, Glenn Gan and Steve Yip, for their daring political act at the UN Security Council on April 30th. In making such an indelible statement, they are dedicated community activists from the late '60s and early '70s who are aware of the consequences of political expression. I salute the UN 2 for risking their future in making such an indelible and overt statement!

Yuri Kochiyama
New York, N.Y.

1980 ELECTION BALLOT

I was the system is putrid, I don't believe in any of its candidates! Send one of these ballots to the Revolutionary Communist Party and we will find something dramatic to do with it yourself on election day.

COMMUNIST PARTY, P.O. BOX 3486 MERCHANDISE MART, CHICAGO, IL. 60654

Check Box

□ DEMOCRATIC PARTY
□ REPUBLICAN PARTY
□ INDEPENDENT CANDIDATES & OTHER ASSORTED SAVIORS

THIS WHOLE SYSTEM IS PUTRID, I DON'T BELIEVE IN ANY OF ITS CANDIDATES! CITY

MAIL THIS COPY OF THE 1980 ELECTION BALLOT TO THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST PARTY, P.O. BOX 3486 MERCHANDISE MART, CHICAGO, IL. 60654

KEEP THIS ONE AND DO SOMETHING CREATIVE WITH IT YOURSELF ON ELECTION DAY.
New York City. Fed up with what's going on in this country and the whole 4 year election farce, thousands took to the streets in New York to march on this year's meeting of the Democratic donkeys. A broad range of people and organizations from anti-draft and anti-nuke organizations to welfare rights organizations and numerous organizations built around fighting for various reforms participated in a march of 10,000 to the site of the convention on the Sunday before the convention began. A series of demonstrations and other activities took place throughout the week highlighted by an anti-war rally of several hundred on the night Carter was nominated. It is significant that large numbers came out to participate in these activities. It is a real example of how the deepening crisis in this country and the rapid moves towards war are impelling people into motion to take this shit head on, even while there are many questions about how to do this and what the way forward is.

The Sunday march was sponsored by an umbrella organization called the Coalition for a People's Alternative in 1980 which had held a two-day "people's convention" the previous year. While many had come to take some kind of stand against what was going down with the Democrats and the whole political system in general there was a number of forces in actual leadership of the Coalition for a People's Alternative who had quite the opposite intentions, however. They pushed at every turn to channel the sentiments of the thousands there back into the system, back into being a tail on the ruling class that were able to penetrate the fig. Certainly many who had come to the Alternative Convention on the days before the march drawn by the desire to discuss the way out of this mess and find some real answers did not know exactly what to make of the fact that the various sessions and workshops were tightly controlled and kept on the very narrow path of each person or group speaking about what particular issue they were into and how everybody should support what everybody else was into. This sort of interest group politics is in many ways reminiscent of the kind of stuff that goes on in the Democratic Party itself. In fact, Bronx Congressman Bud Billiken, a Kennedy backer, had arranged for tour buses to take delegates from the Democratic Convention past the site of the counter-convention and a real big deal was made about a letter of support to the counter-convention by Congressman John Conyers. Right in line with all this was the constant theme that people had to unite against the attacks of the "new right" and fight for any reforms that could be won in these "hard times." Implicit in this was that liberal can and should support what everybody else was into. In addition to performances such as this, people were treated to a constant barrage of electoral politics with such ex-citement that it was hard to talk about anything else. Needless to say many were not too thrilled by this routine and had to settle for the few snatches of real opposition to the ruling class that were able to penetrate the fig.

Shine the Light of Revolution Behind the Prison Walls

Contribute to the Prisoners Revolutionary Literature Fund

The Revolutionary Communist Party receives many letters and requests for literature from prisoners in the hell-hole torture chambers from Attica to San Quentin. There are thousands more brothers and sisters behind bars who have refused to be beaten down and corrupted in the dungeons of the capitalist class and who thirst for and need the Revolutionary Worker and other revolutionary literature. To help make possible getting the Voice of the Revolutionary Communist Party and other Party literature and books on Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tsetung Thought behind the prison walls, the Revolutionary Worker is establishing a special fund. Contributions should be sent to:

Prisoners Revolutionary Literature Fund
166 Merchandise Mart
Chicago, IL 60654
"Officers Acquitted in Shooting," "Tatum Jury Clears Two, Deadlocks on Third," read the headlines. The trial was the first time in 8 years that LAPD had carefully managed an 8-day stage show shooting, "the trial of three pigs on Third," read the headlines as the trial began. The system was trying to sucker-bait the public into believing that "the system works." In fact, the trial did prove that the system works—it also proved who the system works for.

The shooting was more typical than unusual for the LAPD, the nation's foremost murderers in blue. Tatum had worked as a gas station attendant in Watts that had been robbed several times, including on the afternoon of January 27, 1979. So, that very night he decided to carry a shotgun at work for protection. As he crossed the gas station lot to the store, three cops each cruised by. Seeing a Black man with a gun, they came out of their cars blasting away. Of 11 shots fired, 4 struck Tatum, one of which pierced his spinal cord—leaving him in a wheelchair for the rest of his life.

For months before the trial no charges were filed against the LAPD, but then the District Attorney's office filed felony assault with a deadly weapon charges against three of the cops involved. It's really no mystery why. Tatum lived to testify that no, the path of entry actually proved that Tatum had been shot first. The cops who shot Tatum were nuns—with long hair, dressed in old clothes and driving unmarked cars. They jumped out of their cars and ran at Tatum, blasting away. Yet the defense attorney testified that Tatum had turned and aimed the shotgun at them, forcing them to shoot out of "fear for their lives." The LAPD "bulletproof experts" who only days earlier had testified that the bullets' path of entry proved that Tatum had been standing up and reaching when shot, returned to court to testify that no, the path of entry actually proved that Tatum had been crouched down when shot.

After three days of deliberation, the jury acquitted two of the cops. The third, Norman Nelson, whose four shots actually hit Tatum, got a mistrial—9 to 3 for acquittal. Nelson's superior accuracy may perhaps be attributed to the fact that the shooting of Tatum was the third "officer involved shooting incident" he'd been in over a 3-week period in January, 1979. Of course, Officer Nelson might have been working under stress at the time—there is currently a $10 million lawsuit against the City of Los Angeles and the LAPD alleging that Nelson assaulted and raped a 25-year-old woman while on duty in November, 1978.

After the verdict had been announced, the jurors, in a very unusual move, called a press conference. It was evident that they had been frustrated by the whole course of the proceedings and were compelled to issue a very naive but very revealing statement on the whole case: "We wish to unambiguously express our concern and dismay with the actions of the officers. We do not believe that in the actions related to the shooting of Mr. Tatum, the police officers conducted themselves with due concern for the lives and welfare of persons who could have been injured...If the actions of these experienced officers are examples of the training they receive, then all citizens should be concerned." One juror interviewed by the press also said that he felt that a "stronger prosecution" would have made "a definite change in my mind and the mind of other jurors...my gut feeling is that they were guilty." What the jurors understood (a better description would actually be amnesty) was that something was rotten. But they were prejudiced by the notion of "equality" in the courts and were thus constrained by the limits set on the issue by the prosecutor, defense attorney, judge, etc. The issue had become whether or not Tatum aimed the shotgun. The actions of the cops were never really in question. This is what the jurors did not see.

In a situation which is developing rapidly on our streets, the moment takes by the advanced section of the proletariat is of decisive importance. "They will not be held in small parts, they will not see the differences in all the way when the conditions get down and the opportunitie for the masses to act is there to seize. These moments, particularly in a country such as that, are now in hand. Its time for them to seize it...At a profound influence on history, but were, even decades, to become. Those who do understand what is going on and choose not to act are con- fronting to the postponing of this destructive and decadent role of imperialism...This programme is a declaration of war, and at the same time an call to action and a battle plan for destroying the old and creating the new. It was the time to seize the hour. Today the words of Mao Tsetung ring out with full force.

"Seize the Day, Seize the Hour."
Russell Means' Attack On Revolutionary Marxism

It is a sign of both the advances and the still remaining backwardness of the developing revolutionary movement in the U.S. that we are forced to reply to a recent speech made by Russell Means, for some time a well-known figure in the struggle of Native Americans. The occasion for his tirade was the 1980 Black Hills International Survival Gathering held from July 18-27 on a ranch outside the Black Hills of South Dakota which drew an estimated 10,000 people. Participants were mostly activists from the anti-nuke movement, but the even also drew some Indians and some local ranchers. This area, the location of the Lakota Pine Ridge Reservation, has been the focus of a great deal of struggle as reported in the RW in the past. It is a key source in the U.S. of uranium, the mining of which has left behind a lethal legacy of contaminated water, a rate of cancer and other causes of death and disease to the Indian people.

Means spoke on behalf of the Lakota American Indian Movement and his speech was billed as the keynote address. It digressed literally hundreds, left thousands with a sour taste in their mouths, and in addition to certain strong-arm tactics pursued by some of those gathered around Means, has been the source of widespread controversy within the Indian movement and more broadly since the event concluded.

The heart of Means' speech is an attack on revolution in general and revolutionary Marxism in particular. He attempts to trade on his reputation as an "American Indian leader" (despite the obligatory false disclaimers of "Lakota" and "American Indian") to advocate a program of capitulation to the enemy for both the struggle of the American Indians—a struggle which is gaining in intensity and has been the object of vicious government reprisals—as well as the movement more broadly.

Means' speech is a sort of inadvertent admission of the truth and again noted in various ways by the great leaders of communism, from Karl Marx to Mao Tsetung, that for it to be a revolutionary movement, there must be a revolutionary theory. Therefore, Means' speech is principally ideological. He is well aware that political activities from various spheres of social life are searching for answers, searching for a way out of this mad-dog capitalist system. He at least senses the renewal of revolutionary riples in the social fabric of this country and senses that these may well develop into mighty waves in the not too distant future. But rather than welcoming these developments for the promise they hold, he fears getting washed away—like beach debris in the tides. He has thus assigned himself the task (and we are not yet prepared to say that he has been assigned the task) of concentrating the most backward ideas which have arisen particularly among some anti-nuke and Indian activists into a worked out polemic against the most advanced ideas represented in the political struggle in this and other countries, ideas which are today gaining a beginning but significant influence in the struggle of American Indians—the ideas of revolutionary Marxism.

To accomplish this task, Means adopts the pose of the "noble savage," fighting to resist the corruption of "European" or "industrial" society. His thesis is that the idea of revolution, the idea of the distinct separation to which Indians have been subjected by European civilization and culture, industrialization—-even material progress itself—-is the enemy, independent of what class commands it. Means sees white everywhere, warning Indians to reject "European culture" and return to the "natural" ways of the Indians. He says: "It takes a strong effort on the part of an American Indian not to become Europeanized. The strength for this effort can only come in the struggle, in the traditions of what our elders taught us. It must come from the hoop, the individual seems detached from the natural world of the fisherman, with whom Smith and Ricardo identified..."

And further, notes Means, when we say "Indian" we mean American Indian, which as every American Indian knows, his speech might appropriately be entitled "It's the same old story, the same old song throughout. "I should be clear about something here, because there seems to be some confusion about it. When I speak of Europeans or mental Europeans, I'm not allowing for false distinction. In fact, I'm trying to lump together the byproducts of a few thousand years of genocidal, reactionary, European intellectual development which is bad, and on the other hand there is some new revolutionary intellectual development which is good. I'm referring here to the so-called theories of Marxism and anarchism and 'leftism' in general. I don't believe these theories can be separated from the rest of the European intellectual tradition. It's really just the same old song.

"Indeed, there is nothing all that new in a "song" which attacks Marxism, even in the ever-so-slightly adapted "natural" garb in which it is dressed here. And could the "confusion" noted by Means indicate that the general intent of his speech is a feeble but very "theoretical" attempt to drum revolutionary Marxist ideas out of the heads of any young activists, or for that matter, any other idea with a revolutionary thrust? Evidently, this is his intent, because what follows are the introductory statements in an argument which insistently tries to lump together capitalism and communism, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, reaction and revolution. And this is combined with demagogic but almost bankrupt appeals to quit fucking with mother nature.

And while all this may well have had some influence among people who view the atom as the enemy, a fact that we will not go into now, it is also important to note the widespread sentiment of some concerning Means' speech, common with the widespread tradition in the Indian movement: "The food is trying to take us back 250 years." Actually, there is even more truth in that comment than this comrade may have realized. For this idea of the "noble savage," the supposedly natural man who has not been corrupted by the artificialities, hypocrisy and destructive capitalist enculturation—-which is very much the case, this idea is not the original creation of Russell Means or of the American Indians or of "progressive men," but rather has its origins in Europe some 250-300 years ago. The expanding bourgeoisie and their ideologists of that time idealized the American Indians and other indigenous peoples with whom they were aggressively coming in contact, purporting to find in them all the virtues which their own burgeoning civilization so obviously lacked. And as Marx pointed out, this particular ideological creation was not just accidental, nor was it what it appeared to be on the surface, but rather it had definite roots in the growing bourgeois relations of production.

The individual and rural settler or fisherman, with whom Smith and Ricardo begin, is one of the unimaginative fantasies of eighteenth-century romances à la Robinson Crusoe, which by now means expressly a reaction against over-refinement and a rejection to a misunderstood natural life, as cultural historians imagine.

"This is an illusion and the merely aesthetic illusion of the Robinsons, great and small. On the contrary, it is the anticipation of "civil society," [capitalism], which begins to evolve in the sixteenth century and make giant strides towards maturity in the eighteenth. In this variety of free commodity, individualism as a concept, as an individual seems detached from the natural world of the fisherman, with whom Smith and Ricardo identified..."
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Questions

Continued from page 10...

...for there are more than a few such workers right now, right here in the U.S.A. Over this very same period of the last 15 years in the U.S. there has been a steady rise in the number of workers actively involved in or at least strongly influenced by political action, revolutionary struggle, including revolutionary organizations, especially the Black and other minority workers, and these workers are certainly not the only ones who are "awakening" to the immediate problems today, there are again many workers who, often "out their own", not only take interest in books and pamphlets, get involved in discussion, but... That of course, does not mean that such workers are all of a sudden major representatives of the broadest degree of class-consciousness "all on their own". Precisely this requires the leadership of the Party and the very near future, especially with the revolutionary movement. And in this regard, the question is: what Lenin insisted on, in *What Is To Be Done?* and elsewhere: these advanced workers have political needs of their own distinctively different from the "average workers." And as Lenin put it, only great harm can come to the revolutionary class and to our own work when we allow the workers to ask and demand for themselves the questions that have arisen on this basis. And it is also because in striving to influence and activate broader ranks of the workers, we must fully and critically understand the nature of the questions which arise from the workers' political life, and the contradictions in this country and the world as a whole—crisis, growing danger of world war and its outlook they shrink in fear from this and scramble to "at things metaphysically (viewing them superficially, on the surface—crisis, growing danger of world war and its outlook they shrink in fear from this and scramble to...
Correspondence Critical to Revolutionary Press

Lenin On Picking Up the Pen

Three weeks ago, our Party issued the call to all revolutionary-minded people to step up and join in a battle to distribute 100,000 Revolutionary Workers' weekly by the end of September—"for the 2,000 conspirators". This is a plan with a purpose—the most concrete possible step we can take today in preparing class-conscious workers and all others ministering to the needs of a battle distribution of revolutionary publications; but this involves more than only selling the paper. It means building the Revolutionary Worker as the rich bloodline of the revolutionary movement. To develop a newspaper in this way, as the key to the thing we have in mind for revolution, a paper which, as the Russian revolutionary workers said of the revolutionaries against the Czar’s autocracy—"as the only salvation"—all this too requires the active all-around political contributions of all Party members, revolutionarily-minded workers and others who support the cause. In addition, in order to win the three weeks, such people should write for and correspond with the RW and truly work to develop it as their weapon of revolution. Only in this way can we forge a truly powerful, truly revolutionary Party and revolutionary movement with its finger on the pulse of the situation in a revolutionary, internationally.

Below we have printed some sections from articles by the Russian

We now appeal to all comrades to give us all the support they can. We shall conduct the organ on the understanding that it is the organ of the movement in Russia, not of any émigré circle. This requires, first and foremost, the most vigorous "literary" support, or rather literary participation, from Russia. We shall publish articles in italics and inverted commas in order to draw attention from the first to its specific, its "literary" nature. It is a misconception that is very common and highhandedly to the detriment of the cause: it is a misconception that writers and only writers (in the professional sense of the term) can write the revolutionary newspaper; on the contrary, it will be vital that not only for five leading and regularly contributing writers there are five hundred or five thousand contributors. One of the shortcomings of the old Iskra, one which I always tried to rid it of is that it has grown to monstrous proportions. Our aim is not to suppress, not to prevent. We are not writers, but everyone who has the ability or inclination to write, about the state of propaganda and agitational work, about the concrete actions of the party, and among the youth: above all, to write about any dissatisfaction the workers have with the Social-Democratic newspaper the organ of the whole movement; to see the workers’ paper and the Social-Democratic newspaper fused in one. This can only be realized, not only by the editorial committee and the secretaries, but simply by a comradely kind.

Our aim is that everyone has the opportunity to contribute, and especially the younger, to Party workers, to "central circle", to other groups, even the smallest, to have the most active support of the working class. With comradely greetings, N. Lenin from "A Letter to the Comrades (With Reference to the Forthcoming Publica-

Let us take one of the conditions for the success of this plan—that the newspaper be assured a regular supply of correspondence and other material from everywhere. Has riot history shown that at all times when there has been a resurgence of our revolutionary movement such a purpose has proved possible of achievement even in respect of papers published abroad? If Social-Democrats working in various localities come to regard the Party newspaper as their own and consider the maintenance of the paper to be their most active support of the movement, the whole movement in its battle for May First, when a significant number of revolutionary workers wrote, sent letters, and otherwise communicated with the Revolutionary Worker about their beliefs and questions not only about May First, but the overall revolutionary struggle. This beginning, this seed of the future must grow rapidly now. We need to hear from you.
Poland

Poland's backward agricultural sector has been an important factor in the food shortages and rising food prices in the country. Since 1973, Poland has imported a significant amount of wheat to meet its needs. In 1974, Poland imported 20 million tons of wheat, which increased to 40 million tons in 1976. This reliance on imported wheat has increased Poland's foreign debt and has slowed its economic growth.

Poland's agricultural sector is highly mechanized, with the majority of farm workers using tractors and other agricultural machinery. However, the efficiency of the sector is hindered by the limited use of modern farming techniques and the lack of investment in agricultural research and development.

Poland's agricultural sector is also facing challenges from the Soviet Union's agricultural policy. The Soviet Union is波兰的合作伙伴, who purchases a significant portion of Poland's agricultural products. This dependence on the Soviet Union has made Poland vulnerable to changes in the Soviet Union's economic policies and has limited Poland's ability to diversify its agricultural exports.

Poland's agricultural sector is also facing competition from neighboring countries, particularly from Eastern Europe. The countries of the Eastern Economic Community (COMECON) are Poland's main trading partners, and the economic integration of these countries has increased competition for agricultural products.
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Revolutionary Infighting: How Best to Attack Mao?

As the RW reported in July (issue No. 52), Hu Yaobang, who is currently General Secretary of the CCP and Deng Xiaoping's "right-hand man," blazed against the revisionists and their anti-Mao rhetoric. The revisionist campaign, which has been led by Hu, is based on the argument that China under Mao was a "bourgeois" society. This charge, according to the revisionists, is supported by the "Gang of Four," who are accused of "capitalist restoration" and "bourgeois radicalism." The revisionists' campaign has been met with resistance from the Maoists, who are determined to defend the legacy of their late leader.

The recent gearing up of attacks on Mao comes at a time when the Chinese political system is facing serious challenges. The death of Mao, who ruled China from 1949 to 1976, has left a vacuum in the leadership, with no clear successor. This has led to deep rifts within the ruling clique, as different factions vie for power and influence.

The revisionists have been pushing for a democratic system that would allow for free elections and a multi-party system. This has put them at odds with the Maoists, who see Mao as the only true leader and have resisted any attempts to challenge his legacy.

The ongoing struggle between the revisionists and the Maoists is a reflection of the broader struggle between the forces of capitalist restoration and those who seek to maintain the socialist legacy of Mao. The outcome of this struggle will have significant implications for the future of China and its role in the world.
Continued from page 9

Not as arising historically but as posited by nature, because this individual was in consciousness the product of their idea of human nature." Karl Marx, Introduction to A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy, 1859.

Considering Means’ incessant chatter about the “glories of Euro-American intellectual tradition,” he obviously feels it’s best to have his own intellectual revolution first.

The Marxists have no need for such obfuscation, because they believe that materialism did indeed evolve out of the philosophies of the radical bourgeoisie of the 19th century, out of the dialectics of Hegel and the materialism of Feuerbach. With the dialectics of Hegel, Marx and Engels were able to leap beyond the idealism of fakers and to discover the metaphysics of the latter to discover the true nature of human materiality in history. 

And just in case anyone thought the metaphor of “bourgeois” was ancient and unwieldy, Means finds it necessary to pretend that he has something to hide.

Because he has something to hide.

Russell Means’ speech is bogus. He has no more intention of leading a back-to-nature movement than he has of abandoning plans to mine uranium in the Black Hills.
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Imperialism in Focus in S.F.

Hotel Strike

Three days after the month-long struggle, San Francisco hotel workers were over, everything that the strike, Fairmont Hotel on Nob Hill looked like it was over. The key feature was the regal pattern on the carpet, the ornate red and black lobby where uniformed bellboys, doormen, and clerks worked. As usual were the pretend customers the tourists, a mix of Asians and whites. The strike was hard fought. Picket lines were made up of Chinese, Latinos, Filipinos, Koreans, West Indians, Blacks and whites. On the fifth day of the strike, 40 workers were hurt by the San Francisco Police Department Tactical Squad outside the Hyatt Regency Hotel at a mass rally defying police orders to “stop noise and swearing.” By the end of the strike nearly 70 workers faced charges. And San Francisco was out nearly $10 million from its biggest industry, with several conventions cancelling, including the 12,000 delegate American Chemical Society that switched reservations to Las Vegas.

The story of this strike really started in Kingston, Jamaica, in the West Indies islands of Granada and Saint Lucia, in Taiwan, Hong Kong and Manila. It is the story of thousands of workers driven from their homeland by the boot of U.S. imperialism—driven into the world, because this is the base of capitalism.

The hotels run on raw, undisguised national oppression—a central issue of the strike. On the bottom are the maids, immigrants and minorities who scrub toilets and make beds for a little more than $2 a room—rooms which bring in more than $100 a night. Of course, there are also the specialty rooms, formal dining rooms for top executives and other VIPs. There, the prerequisite for waiting on tables is simple—you have to be white. Then there is the Tonga Room at the Fairmont Hotel where the qualification is being Asian and male—to fit in with the tropical surroundings. This is the kind of degradation and discrimination that workers rebelled against reflected by the key demand for hotel-wide seniority for promotion. And many of the relatively more privileged, higher paid workers saw the fight against the oppression heapsed on maids and others as pivotal to this strike. Said one: “I came out of the hotel on account of the maids, and I’m willing to stay out.”

Ultimately, the contract demands of the workers were defeated. For many the struggle had brought into focus the experience of people under the heel of U.S. imperialism around the world, including here. One Black man, an activist in the strike, said, “The people, they understood what was happening, they understood very well—but they didn’t realize that it could happen in America. But like I told them, I said, ‘this is the worst, this is the pits. You think you come here to be free, but there ain’t a damn thing here free. Nothing.’ And a Korean girl told me: ‘I thought I had left all of this stuff back home, I thought I came here to be free—but we go through the same thing.’

One maître d’ pointed to what led him to support this strike. “My country has been under U.S. imperialism for as far back as I can remember—since I was a little kid. Because conditions are bad here, they force you to come here. But a lot of people find they are squeezed as much as they were at home.”

And it was clear that he had been thinking beyond the strike as well when he added: “If there was ever a revolution here, it would have a tremendous influence and the shock waves would carry across the world, because this is the base of capitalism.”

Scenes from the strike.
Yip, one of the UN2, who denounced the war moves of the two superpowers and read a section of the Pledge of Internationalism authored by the Revolutionary Communist Youth Brigade.

When an addle-brained army recruit came up waving an American flag, the crowd pulled him in, grabbed his flag and smashed his pole. He had to be rescued and escorted to safety by a ring of cops. Then a second flag was produced and put to more fitting use as people ripped it into little pieces and set them afire. People spit on it, stepped on it, and a steady resounding chant broke out, "Revolution, revolution."

Faced with a real political challenge to the system, it was no more Officer Friendly. Out came the helmets, horses and other riot gear as the reinforced pigs began attaching a hose to the nearest fire hydrant. Fearing that things were getting a little out of hand or that burning the flag was going beyond the bounds of respectable protest, some of the rally leaders tried to calm things down. One speaker said, "We don't want anybody to get hurt. If you want to do civil disobedience, that's okay, but..."

But as someone at the rally put it, "There's no time to bullshit around. Not with what's coming up in this decade." He was part of a group that sat down in front of the Garden, blocking the whole intersection of 33rd and 7th Avenues. Twenty of this group were arrested.

It is precisely this growing sentiment that must be brought forward and developed a thousand fold and it is exactly this sentiment which certain people are trying to grab onto in order to pull it back, deflect it, or turn it around all serving to prolong the rule of the bourgeoisie.

That such opportunist forces can take a number of guises was aptly demonstrated by the Communist Workers Party throughout the Democratic Convention. While they made a big show on the final night of the proceedings with a "heroic charge" on the convention with such grandiose pretensions as "stopping the elections" and other such demagogic rantings, the great bulk of their activity during the four days was to circulate a leaflet and other literature calling on people to unite behind the supreme patriotic goal of uniting with them to save the country. CWP's antics will be analyzed more in the RIV in the near future. But it can be said that in true fashion their outward militance on the final night was a mere cover for their real message expressed in the headline of their leaflet: "Extreme times require extreme measures to save the country."

In sharp contrast to the "make the system work" line pushed by some of the leadership of the People's Alternative Convention stood actions like this one: August 13—a patriotic flag waver waded into the midst of an anti-draft demonstration being held across the street from the Democratic convention. The crowd tried to rip the flag from his hands, but police managed to rescue him and his flag while it was still in one piece. While police guarded the lone fool (top) another American flag was found and torn to pieces to the cheers and chants of the crowd. Once in shreds the trash was burned (bottom).

Order from: RCP Publications
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Revisionist Infighting: How Best To Attack Mao?

Continued from page 13

Why 1977? For a year after the coup, Hua built himself up as the "true upholder" of Mao and the Cultural Revolution. It wasn't until 1977 that Deng was officially rehabilitated and named vice-chairman and the premier. Can the criticism of Zhou indicate a movement toward the continuation of the Cultural Revolution? Deng and his bunch, who have the upper hand, feel that all out and open attacks on Mao are required to really push through the revisionists' programme. Hu, Ye, Xu and some others are one of their positions to Mao. They believe that by the time of Zhou's death, he was fit enough to manage some self-criticisms (like Hua). When some people suggested earlier this year that Mao's body should be removed from the mausoleum, Ye is reported to have said he didn't object but please do it after he dies.
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This rebellion of workers in the heart of the Soviet imperialist's empire also has great significance for the international proletariat. Any action of the working class and masses of people that weaken their own class, the class of the imperialist superpowers, and in any way bring closer the day of their overthrow and destruction, serve the interests of the international proletariat. But even more concretely, this rebellion of the Polish workers has to be seen as a sign of the potential ability of the workers of the East or the West, and even in the superpowers themselves, to rise in revolution and thus prevent an imperialist-sponsored nuclear war, or to accomplish this revolutionary goal in the course of such a war.

It is these factors that give the Polish workers' strikes their progressive character and call for the support of progressive and revolutionary people everywhere, despite the fact that some of their most disgusting mouthpieces and servants of U.S. imperialism are also proclaiming their support, while the imperialists look on silently but approvingly in hope of taking advantage of their Soviet rival's troubles.

Price Hikes Spark Strikes

The current turmoil began when the government announced hikes of from 30% to 90% in the price of meat on July 1st. Edward Gierek, Secretary of the United Polish Workers' Party (PPR), also announced that other food and consumer prices would have to be raised. The response of the workers was almost immediate. On July 2nd 17,000 struck the huge tractor factory at Ursus, near Warsaw, a center of the workers' strikes against government attempts to raise prices in 1976. In the following days the strikes spread to other cities. 20,000 auto workers shut down the huge Zeran auto plant near Warsaw. Electronic workers at the Rosa Luxemborg factory in Warsaw struck. By mid-July the strike spread to the Lublin region. Trains were paralyzed, service disrupted, milk deliveries cut off. There were work stoppages in the construction industry and in the public utilities.

The strikers' demands were for wage increases and the retraction of the price hikes. The government stated its determination to stick with the new prices, but moved to try to negotiate the wage increases. So far they have granted at least $1.1 billion in wage demands. But while the Polish ruling class offered these small increases, they also prepared the stick by strengthening troop displacements and paralyzing the workers at the Rosa Luxemborg factory in Warsaw. 

People line up to buy meat in Warsaw. Price hikes of 30% to 90% for meat provided the spark for the strikes that have thrown the country into turmoil.

Strikers occupy the Lenin Shipyards in Gdansk, armed with a
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The government was forced to admit to some of the most obvious signs of mass. Among many workers the constant shortages are a particular irritant. For real workers and others, although they have relatively high wages, they just aren't the consumer goods. This is compounded by the fact that there are stores that generally have full supplies. It is these factors that give the Polish workers' strikes their progressive character and call for the support of progressive and revolutionary people everywhere, despite the fact that some of their most disgusting mouthpieces and servants of U.S. imperialism are also proclaiming their support, while the imperialists look on silently but approvingly in hope of taking advantage of their Soviet rival's troubles.
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On August 14th, however, the situation in Poland was on the verge of collapse. The Polish government was forced to announce the cancellation of a planned visit to West Germany in September, and the government's position was further weakened when Gierek made his first public response to the strike. The demands of the striking workers included: the guarantee of the right to strike, the abolition of censorship, the strike committee, which they announced would be the only voice of the striking workers. The joint committee issued a list of 16 demands that had to be met before the strike would end. The demands included: the guarantee of the right to strike, the abolition of censorship, the release of all political prisoners, the end of special privileges for the police, and, most outrageous as far as the government was concerned, the formation of "Free and independent trade unions" instead of the government-established trade union councils. The government immediately cut all lines of communication between Gdansk and the rest of the country. Gierek cancelled a planned visit to West Germany and delivered an "apology to the Polish workers and people" over nationwide television and radio. Radio Gdansk declared that "the climate of discussion in the country is suddenly becoming alarming." On August 18th, Gierek warned "There are limits that must not be stepped over by anyone!" The next day the Soviets made their first public response to the months of upheaval, backing up Gierek's warning that "Poland can only be an independent country under socialism!" Of course, since another Gierek nor the Soviets were talking about real socialism, these words could be more accurately translated as "Poland can only be independent under our social-imperialist domination." Soviet press reports also sought to add strength to Gierek's stand that "actions that are aimed against the basic foundation of the socialist system will not be tolerated and nobody can count on compromise on this issue!" In addition to the Soviet announcement that Warsaw Pact troops, 40,000 strong, would hold exercises in neighboring East Germany in September, transfers recently arriving in Sweden from Poland have reported that Soviet as well as Polish troop movements have been sighted in northern Poland.

Despite the reopened talks, however, it seems that the government is still trying to negotiate its way out of its crisis. Calling in Polish army troops could only worsen the situation as they see it now. As one recent visitor to Poland told the R.W., neither the Soviets or Gierek's government can be sure which way the bullets will fly if they try to mobilize the Polish army against the strikers.

**Political Demands**

Responding to the call of workers throughout the region, angry about the false announcement, the Lenin Shipyard workers announced that they were maintaining on strike and would continue to occupy the yards. In addition, 21 factories from the Gdynia-Sopot region declared that they had formed a joint strike committee, which they announced would be the only voice of the striking workers. The government immediately cut all lines of communication between Gdansk and the rest of the country. Gierek cancelled a planned visit to West Germany and delivered an "apology to the Polish workers and people" over national television and radio. Radio Gdansk declared that "the climate of discussion in the country is suddenly becoming alarming." On August 18th, Gierek warned "There are limits that must not be stepped over by anyone!" The next day the Soviets made their first public response to the months of upheaval, backing up Gierek's warning that "Poland can only be an independent country under socialism!" Of course, since another Gierek nor the Soviets were talking about real socialism, these words could be more accurately translated as "Poland can only be independent under our social-imperialist domination." Soviet press reports also sought to add strength to Gierek's stand that "actions that are aimed against the basic foundation of the socialist system will not be tolerated and nobody can count on compromise on this issue!" In addition to the Soviet announcement that Warsaw Pact troops, 40,000 strong, would hold exercises in neighboring East Germany in September, transfers recently arriving in Sweden from Poland have reported that Soviet as well as Polish troop movements have been sighted in northern Poland.

Despite the reopening of talks however, it seems that the government is still trying to negotiate its way out of its crisis. Calling in Polish army troops could only worsen the situation as they see it now. As one recent visitor to Poland told the R.W., neither the Soviets or Gierek's government can be sure which way the bullets will fly if they try to mobilize the Polish army against the strikers.

**Behind the Current Crisis**

Behind the current events in Poland is the crisis of that country's capitalist economy, and its relation to the big imperialists—mainly the Soviets, but also those of the West. While there has been expansion in recent years, chickens are coming home to roost. Poland's national income, agricultural production and capital investment have all shown a negative growth rate for 1979 and prospects look worse for 1980. Its industrial production has declined to an annual growth rate of 2.8%. Since 1971, Poland has fallen more than $20 billion in debt, $20 billion of which is its hard currency debt to the Western European and U.S. banks, and it is forced to continue borrowing just to make the yearly service charges on the outstanding loans. Currently Poland has to come up with $7.8 billion, $3 billion of which is for repayment of the principal and the rest for the interest.

There is only one way to understand Poland's sorry plight: the capitalist economic development enforced by its revisionist rulers and the thorough economic, political and military domination of Poland by the social-imperialist Soviet Union. For the most part, the Soviets' economic and political exploitation of Poland has been carried out under the cloak of "Mutual socialist aid," "international division of labor," "economic integration" and a host of similar sweet sounding phrases. Their main instrument in this plunder has been the Communist for Mutual Economic Assistance (COMECON).

For Poland, membership in COMECON has contributed heavily to the devastation of its economy. The basic operating principle of COMECON is the Soviets' infamous international "

---

**Notes:**

1. Polish workers and people burst into the Lenin Shipyards in the Baltic seaport of Gdansk joined the strikes and occupied the yards, in addition, 21 factories from the Gdynia-Sopot region declared that they had formed a joint strike committee, which they announced would be the only voice of the striking workers. The joint committee issued a list of 16 demands that had to be met before the strike would end. The demands included: the guarantee of the right to strike, the abolition of censorship, the release of all political prisoners, the end of special privileges for the police, and, most outrageous as far as the government was concerned, the formation of "Free and independent trade unions" instead of the government-established trade union councils. The government immediately cut all lines of communication between Gdansk and the rest of the country. Gierek cancelled a planned visit to West Germany and delivered an "apology to the Polish workers and people" over national television and radio. Radio Gdansk declared that "the climate of discussion in the country is suddenly becoming alarming." On August 18th, Gierek warned "There are limits that must not be stepped over by anyone!" The next day the Soviets made their first public response to the months of upheaval, backing up Gierek's warning that "Poland can only be an independent country under socialism!" Of course, since another Gierek nor the Soviets were talking about real socialism, these words could be more accurately translated as "Poland can only be independent under our social-imperialist domination." Soviet press reports also sought to add strength to Gierek's stand that "actions that are aimed against the basic foundation of the socialist system will not be tolerated and nobody can count on compromise on this issue!"

2. In 1970, widespread strikes throughout Poland (above: shipyard workers) were met by fierce repression including intervention by the Soviet army (left) in which over a hundred workers were killed. Today's rebellion, even more than the events of ten years ago, takes on great significance in the light of the suppressors' push towards World War III.
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occasion allowed their female infants to die—a practice viewed by some of the ancients as a moral duty. Indians were beaten frequently, and although it was not usual for them to be killed outright, it was not uncommon for a husband to be permitted to beat his wife to death with no punishment at all. There was, in the development of society on this continent, a continuous and often vicious struggle between what one might call classless tribes, tribes that seemed to lack class consciousness until the introduction of the white man.

Classless tribes, indeed, don’t actually apply to relations between tribes. He converses with the white man, who has been introduced as an outgrowth of a social order in which men are divided into classes. Yet in the classless society, which is just the opposite, the idea of class is in the mind of the individual. What is the classless society? It is a society in which all are free individuals. "In a classless society, one doesn’t have to be afraid of being exploited."

The division of society into an exploiting class and an oppressed class developed long before the means of production were displaced by machines. The division of society into an exploiting class and an oppressed class has been a prerequisite for the development of the productive forces and products which is now the inevitable accompaniment of social production. The division of society into two classes is the expression of the social productive forces. Their political and intellectual development at this point in time—after all, most Euro-

"The division of society into an exploiting class and an oppressed class developed long before the means of production were displaced by machines. The division of society into an exploiting class and an oppressed class has been a prerequisite for the development of the productive forces and products which is now the inevitable accompaniment of social production. The division of society into two classes is the expression of the social productive forces. Their political and intellectual development at this point in time—after all, most European conflict between being and gain-... being a spiritual preoccupation."

Continued on page 21
Russell Means' Attack

Continued from page 20

Well, if Russell Means wishes to reduce the Indians to the status of the "haves"—"economically and politically, we have nothing more to lose than our dignity."

"Europeans.

As with religion, so with other aspects of the cultures of the American Indians—no matter how -it was a historical creation, but many aspects which have contributed to the survival of the Indian tribes created out of the historical conflict between capitalism and the pre-capitalist, primitive communal society of the Indians.

In fact, the tribes that were most successful in resisting and delaying their eventual defeat by U.S. imperialism were the Lakota tribes of which Means is a member, who were among the most advanced of the granite workers. They adopted the method of fighting involving a field commander giving direct tactical and strategic direction to the troops, as opposed to a "generalissimo" who moves off them. Instead the new proletarian state, under certain overall guiding principles, will be encouraged as well to enforce these principles. This will mean that policies related to local affairs as well as policies related to the Indian communities might be under autonomous control, while at the same time the Indian tribes might be encouraged to take a full part in the overall affairs of the nation. We do not wish to make a distinction between " técnicales"—such as medicine—" which will not be done for the barbarism has the impossible and undesirable tradition of progress backward in time, but rather because it is a crucial part of moving forward to classes society.

In this, particularly, will certainly not be a new chapter in the history of oppression of the Indian peoples—forcing them onto reservations and creating the type of "reservation" when they move off them. Instead the new proletarian state, while favoring this process, as well as the intellectuals will ensure these formerly oppressed peoples' right to autonomy as part of the whole process of unity between nations and peoples. (New Democratic Revolution, Drafts for Discussion, pp. 62-63).

This great historical advance can only come as part of the general process of the existing social order and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat—a period still marked by the existence of classes and class struggle. The transition to socialism and communism from "Ivan Vasilyevich Babushkin, An Obituary"

The name of Ivan Vasilyevich Babushkin is near and dear not only to the working-class democrats, intellectuals and friends, but also to some of the Indian peoples. Babushkin loved and respected him for his energy, his avoidance of phrase-mongering, his devotion to the people, his quest for a life of freedom and spirit and fervent devotion to the cause. He was a hard working, tireless fighter for the working class, always ready to help others. He never imagined that he could make the Indian tribes disappear. In fact, the resistance was so fierce that the government not only amended their "forced assimilation" schemes, but also supported the government's "cultural revolution" program by sending its own cultural workers to the tribes. Babushkin's fight for the Indian peoples was a part of the broader struggle for the Indian peoples' right to autonomy, which is the policy of the proletarian state—what the Leninists call the "policy of the Indian peoples." The Leninists believe that the Indian peoples will be encouraged to develop their own culture against the onslaught of imperialism.

+++ Lenin On Picking Up the Pen
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