Hüseyin Balkir is Free!

On December 4 Hüseyin Balkir was released from prison. He has returned to France. Balkir had been arrested last September while on an authorized visit to West Germany and held by West German authorities for extradition to Turkey, despite his political refugee status in France under the UN Convention and the various West German and international legal conventions which forbid the deportation of a political refugee to certain death. During the four months Balkir was in a Cologne prison, France, Balkir's country of asylum, issued several formalistic protests. But an outcry against this crime and an outpouring of support for this revolutionary arose in many countries around the world, raising the potential political cost to the Western bloc of deporting Balkir at this point to a very high level. Supporters reached by phone in West Germany noted that there was especially strong support from within the "belly of the beast," that head of the bloc, the U.S.

Even with Balkir's release, there has been considerable exposure of West German (and "socialist" French) justice and their imperialist efforts to contain and stamp out the threat of revolution. The West German press, which following Balkir's arrest tried to keep this case out of the spotlight, gave considerable attention to his release. This news was also widely broadcast in Turkey, where the U.S.-installed junta had made a big deal about getting their hands on Balkir and other revolutionaries.

So far, West German authorities have made no official statement about Balkir's release, nor even to explain the grounds on which they decided they could no longer hold him. His release went like this: suddenly and without warning a official told Balkir he was free to go and he was hustled onto the street faster than a hot potato. All in all, things have turned out rather badly for the imperialists and their flunkeys and rather well for the international proletariat and its allies.
We have just received word of a significant development in relation to Bob Avakian's case, for political refugee status in France. A hearing before the appeals commission has been scheduled for January 12. (This is the hearing to resolve the initial denial of the demand—a denial that was issued perfunctorily and immediately after his papers for political refugee status were filed in March 1981.)

This comes as rather surprising news, since only recently lawyers representing him in this case had been informed that the commission was still processing appeals for cases that had been filed in 1979! Can it be that the notoriously slow French bureaucracy has suddenly made a miraculous transformation?

On second thought this latest development is not so surprising after all when one takes into account other recent actions of the French government. As reported in R.W. No. 184, "As the Dust Settles," the French government recently made a number of far-reaching concessions on the question of political refugee status. While France has in the past chosen to present a hard line, insisting on the right to deny asylum and easier to extricate political people by introducing an official category "the type of political and legal system of the state demanding extradition." While the question of political refugee status is technically a different category, determined by criteria set by the U.N. and not the French government, we need look no farther than the U.S. to see how governments apply their own criteria to the question of political refugee status. While France has in the past chosen to present a slightly different face than the U.S., in these matters both to further its own interests and in accordance with its particular role within the Western bloc, these latest policy changes indicate yet another face in the furtherance of these same aims.

In light of this, in R.W. No. 184 we also reported on the recent news sent to the appeals commission by the OFPRA (French Office for the Protection of Refugees and Countryless Persons), which had originally denied Bob Avakian's demand for political refugee status, informing them, rather belatedly, of the dropping of the legal charges against Bob Avakian in the Mao Defendants case last June. Apparently the U.S. is one of those countries where the legal system functions properly. This is quite consistent with one of their main approaches to this demand for refugee status—to distort the evidence presented in favor of this demand so as to ignore all facets of government repression including massive surveillance, Secret Service manhunts, numerous death threats, etc., except for the legal charges in the Mao Defendants case. Now the argument goes, these charges no longer stand so Bob Avakian is in no need of political refugee status. Of course they attempt to ignore the fact that both the government prosecutor and the judge in that case on more than one occasion must have clearly that the fact that Bob Avakian had gone to France and applied for political refugee status was a major difficulty in proceeding with that case and was a major factor in the decision of the U.S. government to resolve the case as they did in June 1982.

While it has been clear from the very beginning that the French authorities have not been favorably disposed toward Bob Avakian's demand for political refugee status, it has also been clear that they were presented with a case that, by the terms of the accords on political refugees, could not easily be brushed aside as having little merit in light of all the compelling evidence that has been presented to them. These latest developments, in particular the scheduling of the hearing at this time, signal a further escalation and acceleration in their efforts to deal decisively with the matter of Bob Avakian's demand for refugee status, hoping that the special attention they now seem to be giving this case will go unnoticed as they establish their new policies as "normal and routine."
A decision as Cowardly as It Is Vicious

On Monday, December 20, at 4:00 p.m., Judge Gerald E. Ragan of the California Superior Court handed down his decision in the famous legal kidnapping of the daughter of Tina Fishman, Mao Tseng-Dinmg, and supporter of the Revolutionary Communist Party. And the chief distinguishing characteristics of this decision from its Honorable "No Politics Here" can best be summed up as cowardly as it is vicious. Faced with rather broad and compelling outrage at the legal kidnapping of Tina's daughter, which was entirely based on her revolutionary political activities from the word go, Judge Ragan ruled out of one side of his mouth that there was no "emergency" and on the other side that he was going to "delay" the legal kidnapping. From the testimony of Tina's daughter away into the clutches of her reactionary father, was illegal. But quickly, out of the other side of his mouth, Ragan proceeded to "delay" the decision, County court which he was threatened in court — "to stretch the jurisdiction law even more" — and he extended the so-called state of emergency for another 6 months until July 1983, while carefully instructing Ted Fishman to go ahead and pursue his mission to take permanent possession of his daughter.

The very first sentence of the decision is the classic lament/ threat of the liberal call for an "independent" judiciary: "We find that Browning rendered his decision, from the testimony of the leaders of the Black Panther Party, the Revolutionary Union and other revolutionaries. Readers of the philosophy and respective beliefs will have no bearing on the decision rendered..."

This was the classic sentence that Browning issued the original kidnapping order in July of 1981, an openly political decision based on the fact that Tina Fishman faced charges in Washington, D.C. as one of the Mao Tseng-Dinmg Defendants. Then, after openly conducting this kidnapping on political grounds, Browning disqualified himself from the permanent custody hearing, in an attempt to facilitate the final verdict by "depersonalizing" the case. During the final hearings, Judge Ragan played his part well, ruling that politics were not allowed in his court. But he was the one to pick and choose what was "political." It was not political when the ex-husband's lawyer probed into Tina's political activities, her work in support of the RCP in particular. But when Tina testified what was really at stake in this case, the court not only ruled that out of order but threatened to seal the kidnapping if she did not "discontinue her behavior." This is precisely the sort of politics that Judge Ragan has continued in his decision, and he has also attempted to do this in the underworld and backstabbing ways which characterized his attempts to cover up the role of the state during the hearings, and to try to cool the political winds which have exposed his "independent" judicial ass on the hot seat. Thus, Judge Ragan, while fully agreeing with the spirit of Browning's decision, was forced to point out that it was illegal, at the same time as he searched for ways to continue the kidnapping. And before examining his reactionary ruling further, we must point out that this underhanded ploy has done the ruling class a bad turn by dragging out of this case for another six months and into other courts — a situation in which the consequences of such a ploy are to put out only widespread.

In his decision, Ragan finds that according to the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction Act, no emergency existed which would allow Judge Browning to claim jurisdiction in California by July 1981. (Where there is no emergency, i.e., immediate danger to the child, the custody of a child to be returned to the custodial parent, which is still Tina.) Ragan also finds that Ted Fishman, who wrote to Tina that he would return her daughter Rivka, after he had already filed a court action to get this legal kidnapping underway. So there is no emergency, no jurisdiction, and Ted's a liar. Now, here a naive person might imagine that the whole case would be thrown over and Rivka returned to her mother. But Judge Ragan is too sympathetic and creative a fellow to do this.

He finds that Judge Browning is not holding a "full sympathy" with his reasons for doing so and hastens to add his own admittedly "imaginative and innovative interpretations" of the law. In this respect, we must delve into another kind of decision, where the political attack on the RCP and women who dare to be revolutionaries is continued under the guise of "Not the least of his problems was the decision by his predecessor from the "independent" judiciary Judge Browning (known for his prosecutions of draft resisters during the Vietnam war and COINTELPRO investigations against the leadership of the Black Panther Party, the Revolutionary Union and other revolutionaries). Readers of the political agenda. D
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Andropov Deploys Medium Range "Zero Option"

Setting his intercontinental peace role aside, the Soviet leader decided to spawn the weapons grade plutonium in an underground reactor, a move which the West has branded as "nuclear blackmail." The move would accomplish two objectives: it would undermine the U.S. confidence in its anti-ballistic missile system and it would add to the Soviet arsenal, potentially putting it in a position to launch a first-strike attack. The move also demonstrates the Kremlin's determination to gain an advantage in the arms race with the West.

The U.S. has been caught off guard by the move. Officials in Washington are scrambling to come up with a response. The U.S. has already deployed a new anti-ballistic missile system, but the move by the Soviets has made it clear that more is needed. The U.S. is now considering deploying a new missile defense system to counter the threat.

In the meantime, the West has been left with only one option: to negotiate. The U.S. and its allies have been in talks with the Soviets for weeks, but progress has been slow. The West is hoping that the move by the Soviets will force them to the negotiating table.

The move by the Soviets is a clear indication of their determination to gain an advantage in the arms race. The U.S. has been trying to negotiate a limit to the number of nuclear weapons each side can have, but the Soviets have refused to budge. The move by the Soviets is a clear indication of their determination to gain an advantage in the arms race.

The U.S. has been caught off guard by the move. Officials in Washington are scrambling to come up with a response. The U.S. has already deployed a new anti-ballistic missile system, but the move by the Soviets has made it clear that more is needed. The U.S. is now considering deploying a new missile defense system to counter the threat.

In the meantime, the West has been left with only one option: to negotiate. The U.S. and its allies have been in talks with the Soviets for weeks, but progress has been slow. The West is hoping that the move by the Soviets will force them to the negotiating table.

The move by the Soviets is a clear indication of their determination to gain an advantage in the arms race. The U.S. has been trying to negotiate a limit to the number of nuclear weapons each side can have, but the Soviets have refused to budge. The move by the Soviets is a clear indication of their determination to gain an advantage in the arms race.
Following is an interview with A. Pine, a leading member of the RCP in the cultural sphere.

RW: "A United Front Under Its Leadership Is The Proletarian's Strategy For Revolution" to quote directly from the RCP's Programme. How does this relate to the party and artists?

A. Pine: Artists are a strata of the petty bourgeoisie and as such they are part of a class that is a strategic ally of the proletariat. Some people say that if they are working in some factory or such, they are not really artists but are "worker/artists" or something like that. But I think that if they are working in some factory or such, unless this is to supplement their income for art, then they are not really artists! They might be aspiring artists. But the situation will resolve where you will either start making a living with your art or you will essentially give it up. There are "revolutionary" artists who actually try to keep working in a factory or such and they think that this is really revolutionary but it is just begging the question.

This is an important distinction because if you take the problem on further down the road of the revolutionary process into socialism itself, you can see that, for example, there is a big difference between people who are principally workers making art, making it and so on, and people who are principally artists periodically engaging in manual labor because of the context of the struggle to break down the mental/manual labor contradiction. There is a big difference here and so you can't go over in any way at all to going to practicing revisionism in this regard. There is a division of labor that has arisen on the basis of class society and it's going to be a tremendous and conscious struggle to deal with this. You can't say everyone who is an artist has to also work in a factory because the people want art that meets their standards and you won't have it if they have to work at some other job all the time. And you sure can't say the working class can stop production and engage in politics and art all the time. There's much more analysis and struggle to do that. Basically, it's going to take actually fighting through to communism to fundamentally alter the division of labor built on the foundations of exploitation and you can't beg that question or do away with the problem with gimmicks. Artists are part of the petty bourgeoisie. That is what they are and there's no shame in that. It's only if you have a "revange" line, if you think the revolution is about you getting yours, for even "oppressed people getting theirs", that you think there's shame in it. And I have to say that some workers who are revolutionaries, also think that way and everyone ought to cut that out.

In the Soviet Union [they always called artists "civil servants"] as though the word "artist" were dirty. Even among genuine communists, revolutionaries who want to and mainly are struggling to turn the world upside down, you hear this term "cultural workers." They aren't that. They're artists, pure and simple. What's wrong with that?

RW: Do you think there is a "special role" for artist in the revolution?

A. Pine: NO. Absolutely not. Stalin called artists "Engineers of the Human Soul" and I think he was wrong. That is the view that you see in art, music or movie or something "gets to you" in a way nothing else can do, and that art manipulates people's emotions.

Art does provide something nothing else does, and I am not being facetious, that is ART. People really need art. It's a socially and historically created need. Now Mao Tsetung was the first真正imately get at this when he said, "Although man's social life is the center of its existence and art and is incomparably livelier and richer in content, the people are not satisfied with life and art and demand literature and art as well. Why?" Because, while both are beautiful, it is reflected in works of literature and art and can and ought to be on a higher plane, more intense, more concentrated, more typical, nearer the ideal, and therefore more relevant, than actual everyday life." (Talks at the Yenan Forum on Literature and Art.)

Revolutionaries have had hard admitting that this is the case, and so they have turned art into "education" or "propaganda" or "agitation" or anything but what it is.

I think that as an overall relationship it's people's politics that determines what kind of art they demand, and not that determines their political art. An art that signifies characters and/or contradictions that are characteristic of the class structure and objectively promotes principally the ideology of the revolutionary proletariat does not think that any art is "true", but in a much more profound way than some might think! What interested me, even people who are advanced but not fully class conscious, see something that signifies their own movement for art, it makes it even more difficult for them to go with the common revolutionary art that dominates in any capitalist or feudal country. They want to fight for this art also, and for the artists who create it, because they know, or sense that such things are often very dangerous to the ruling classes.

So it is not just a matter of people being "educated," or even interested, in this or that question or issue in any given work. Given this background I've mentioned, one degree or another, the class relations are a question and this is not so obvious.

RW: Most "authorities" think that art manipulates people's emotions. Could you go more into why you think it doesn't do that?

A. Pine: There are all kinds of devices used in art that are supposed to make you laugh, or cry, or laugh, etc., etc., they are a certain and limited extent they do. But fundamentally in and of themselves they don't! Depending on what you've experienced and think about the world, you either don't catch or listen to certain things you don't like, or if you do, you will laugh when you are supposed to cry or vice versa. Sometimes in such things that I know beforehand I'm going to have to go into, just do子弹s to do something to the enemy.

The Green Berets on the late show and me and my friends were laughing out loud at a number of these as this when we were supposed to feel patriotic.

There's a fundamental philosophical question involved here and I support the biological question too, and that is, are the brain, heart, or whether the nervous system separate from the thought process of the brain? don't think you can separate "feeling" of the heart from knowing of the brain! You can't think you can separate visceral or "emotional" response from what you know about what is being typified.

RW: Could we go back now to the problem of "Engineers of the Human Soul"?

A. Pine: Well, this is a very lofty sounding phrase but actually, what it leads to is confusion in the role of art and artists with the role of education, propaganda, agitation and the party itself. In the process of all that, it creates an art which I would characterize as "soap opera with socialist content."
Mahatma Gandhi: New Look at the Father of Nonviolence

The following article, which we are reprinting with the permission of the author Howard Foon, originally appeared in the November 1982 issue of the Abalone Almanac newspaper It's About Times. The author does not endorse the views of the RCP, but believes in friendly dialogue between progressive. His forthcoming book, Nonviolence and Class Bias: From Mahatma Gandhi to the Anti-Nuclear Movement, will be published by the South Asia Publications, Ltd., New Delhi, and the Folklore Institute, Cupertino, California, in Spring, 1983.

Mahatma Gandhi, the "great soul of one," Liberador of the Indian people, father of nonviolence, originator of mass civil disobedience.

In the years since his campaigns for civil rights in South Africa and Indian independence from the British, Gandhi's political methods and motivations have inspired many social movements, not the least of which is today's anti-nuclear movement. Does Gandhi really deserve such praise and respect? And even if the answer is yes, do his methods deserve emulation?

A careful look at Gandhi's life and political career might surprise those who think he lived, sat in, occupied and agitated in his name. Though Gandhi was indeed a social visionary beloved by millions, he did more to liberate the landlords of India than its poor.

As perhaps no popular leader before or since, Gandhi was a man haunted by contradictions. On the one hand, the whole of his being lay firmly with the suffering masses of India and he devoted himself selflessly to their needs. On the other hand, his elitism and loyalty to the Indian ruling class led him to keep the struggles of the Indian people within sharply limited bounds.

The South Africa Years

Gandhi was born in 1869 in Porbandar, a prosperous port town in western India where both his grandfather and father served as princely ministers. Like many young Indian men of his background, Gandhi was sent to England for higher education. In 1891, with a law degree in hand, he went to South Africa. Gandhi arrived unprepared for the second-class treatment he received as an Indian in South Africa, and refused to tolerate it. Immediately he began organizing to improve the status and protect the civil rights of the Indian community. It was in the course of these efforts that Gandhi developed the tactics of passive resistance, or satyagraha.

The civil rights campaign dragged on for years. Gandhi led large numbers of Indians in demonstrations, marches and mass refusals to register as aliens. Many of them, including Gandhi, spent time in jail. Finally in 1913, the campaign reached a climax. Tens of thousands of indentured Indian coolie laborers went on strike against a new and tougher Immigration Bill, and several of them were shot.

At the same time, a large strike by European railway employees was underway, a strike so serious that the government had declared martial law. Here was an opportunity for whites and Indians to break through the race barrier and join forces in a common struggle.

But Gandhi wasn't interested. Instead of offering cooperation, he suddenly cancelled a planned march, saying he did not wish to embarrass the government or exploit its predicament. The South African government was delighted. The office of General Smuts, which had already negotiated on several agreements with the Indian community, praised Gandhi for his "self-imposed limits of courtesy and charity."

The following year, the South African government did agree to some of the reforms the Indians had been demanding. Unfortunately, their overall conditions remained much the same. But Gandhi, feeling his mission in South Africa finished, set sail for India via England.

In Support of World War I

During Gandhi's first years in India, he led struggles by tenant farmers, peasants and textile workers. These were also the years of World War I, and Gandhi became a "recruiting sergeant" in support of the British war effort, believing this would appeal to the hearts of Britain and rulers and thereby influence them to grant self-rule to India when the war was over.

The contradiction between Gandhi's theory of nonviolence and his recruiting activities was questioned by both his admirers and detractors. Some years later: he had opposed annexation of the land of the Poles to Poland and disbelief in war was as strong then as it is today. But one position of a body, like every other possession necessitates some violence, is ever so little. The fact is that the path of duty is not always easy to discern amidst claims seeming to conflict with one another.

That Gandhi recognized the need for flexibility and acknowledged that nonviolence was not always possible might be considered admirable. But Gandhi was ever more flexible in taking up arms on behalf of the ruling classes than on behalf of the oppressed.

Even before World War I, many wealthy Indians realized that they were construct ed by the yoke of British imperialism. They had sought self-governing powers by making quiet appeals to the British, mainly through the Indian National Congress. Their appeals were ignored. After the war, at Gandhi's urging, the Congress shifted to mass organizing and protest.

In 1919, the British-run Indian government introduced the notorious Rowlatt Bills which outlawed anti-government literature and most forms of dissent. Marches and protests were brutally repressed. In April, government troops fired on a peaceful gathering at Amritsar, killing 379 people and wounding 1200.

The country was furious. A campaign of noncooperation against the British was launched in September 1920 by the Congress, which put full authority for the movement in Gandhi's hands. Under his leadership, the Congress became involved in organizing nonparticipation in government bodies and institutions, withdrawal of children from schools and colleges, boycotts of foreign goods, and hartals (closing of businesses, usually for one day). Violence was expressly forbidden.

The people responded enthusiastically to the call of the Congress, and India was swept with unprecedented resistance. The British again cracked down in late 1921. Movement organizations were declared illegal, political meetings were suppressed, some 30,000 activists and prominent leaders were imprisoned. In spite of the arrests, thousands more volunteered and agitation continued undaunted.

The nationwide resistance of 1919-1922 war by no means limited to opposition to the British. Economic conditions were inadequate wages and working conditions, rising rents and taxes — had fueled a wave of strikes and peasant uprisings. Gandhi's charismatic leadership of the non-cooperation movement uniquely gave further inspiration to the workers and peasant revolts.

As in South Africa, Gandhi did not seek to strengthen and unite these struggles. Instead he said they should work with the anti-colonial effort of the Congress. Rather he argued at the growing strike wave and
Gandhi led the independence movement with extreme caution. Several times he postponed plans for mass civil disobedience after incidents of violent protest. Finally, he agreed to begin a civil disobedience campaign, a tax strike, in the small district of Bardioli. Here, Gandhi, felt, had sufficient "non-violent discipline" to act under his guidance. But even this limited battle was called off after police fired on a procession in Chauri Chaura, a little village near the Himalayas. After exhausting their ammunition, the police moved forward to their place of work where they were attacked by the angry crowd. The police station was burned, and the 32 policemen inside were killed.

Learning of the police deaths, Gandhi cancelled the entire program of civil disobedience, substituting a "constructive program" of home spinning, temperance and educational activities. "God has been abundantly kind to me," he wrote. "He has warned me the third time that there is not as yet in India that non-violent and thoughtful atmosphere which alone can justify mass disobedience."

Gandhi's fellow Congress members were shocked and angered by his decision; the country was totally demoralized. "To sound the order of retreat when public enthusiasm was reaching a boiling point," observed Tipu Chandras Bose, a long-time figure in the Indian National Congress, "was nothing short of a national crime."

Gandhi's reaction to Chauri Chaura was another refrain of a theme that sounded consistently throughout his career. Nonviolent resistance was a method uniquely his, a method that went far beyond what Gandhi and his colleagues had in mind. Leaders of the Indian National Congress again refused to support the demands of the countless worker and peasant struggles that emerged. In March 1931, with the country mobilized to near revolutionary proportions, Gandhi, the people moved forward to negotiate a provisional settlement with the British. The meager concessions gained from the agreement constituted a clear betrayal of the Indian masses. There was no independence. Beyond modification of the opposition salt laws, there was nothing that would improve the lot of India's poor.

The Second World War

The war years saw widespread anti-imperialist sentiments, yet Gandhi and other national leaders refused to call for a mass independence struggle. With the country in a military mood, they rightfully judged that an open fight against the British would turn violent and would likely spark revolts against Indian employers and landlords as well.

Rather than risk that, the Congress pursued negotiations and offered cooperation in the war in exchange for independence. With the country in a war footing, Congress launched civil disobedience protests led by Gandhi in 1941. The protests, however, were restricted and largely symbolic, and were easily crushed by the government.

After the war, as Indian leaders continued attempts to negotiate for independence, the people moved forward on their own. The years 1945-46 saw mass agitation against British rule and a series of protests, some involving armed resistance.

The country's leaders remained aloof from these events or opposed them outright. Without backing from the national organizations, the protests remained scattered and without a coherent strategy.

Still, this spontaneous militancy had its impact on the British. In addition, communal battles spread across the country in late 1946, touched off by a bloody three-day riot in Calcutta. It was the general state of turmoil that prompted British Prime Minister Atlee's surprise declaration on February 20, 1947 regarding the transfer of power to India. Britain's motivation was suggested by Alan Campbell-Johnson: "India in March 1947 was a ship on fire in mid-ocean with ammunition in the hold. By then it was a question of putting out the fire before it reached the ammunition. There was in fact no option before us but to do what we did."

The Price of Independence

Government power was finally transferred into Indian hands on August 15, 1947. Richard B. Gregg would write, "After twenty-six years of nonviolent struggle against the British rulers with Indian capitalists, Gandhi's leadership, India won her political freedom from Britain. It was the first time in the history of the world that a great empire had been persuaded by nonviolent resistance to grant freedom to one of its subject countries.

The notion that "nonviolence worked in India" has become a standard reference for advocates of nonviolence. But surely the nature of India's freedom or the conditions under which it was achieved critically changed.

When Indian self-rule was granted, it was largely on Britain's terms. The agreement with Congress leaders guaranteed that British businesses and investments would be left untouched. Britain's continuing powerful role in the economy of India would be ensured.

Most crucial of the British terms, however, and most devastating for India, was the obligatory partition of the country to prevent the Muslim minority from gaining power. Some 40 million Muslims made their homes in predominantly Hindu parts of India, while 20 million Hindus lived in the Muslim majority areas. The partition thus promised to exacerbate the already serious communal problem.

Recognizing that a divided India would continue to be easily exploited, Britain based its agreement on the idea of the "muslim area" as a condition of independence. The Congress had bitterly opposed this, arguing that the Muslim community should have a separate state if it wanted one, but that this option should be made freely by the Indian people and not be a requirement of Independence.

But when the car of full Independence was finally driven before Congress, there was barely a murmur about the provision for a divided India. Even Gandhi agreed.

The partition gave impetus to communal rage, the likes of which India had never seen. In some areas violence between Hindus and Muslims reached civil war proportions. For fear of their lives, millions of Muslim refugees poured into the newly-formed Pakistan, and as many Hindus and Sikhs fled to India. An estimated 500,000 people were killed within the year; untold millions of refugees were left hungry and homeless in the most massive migration in history.

The division of the India and the blood bath that ensued might have been prevented if national leaders had put together the communities in battle against their common opponents. For example, Hindu and Muslim sailors fought alongside each other in armed battles against the British government forces during a Navy mutiny in 1946. An emerging unity was also visible in the massive demonstrations and strikes in support of the sailors. Gandhi, however, had preferred to contain it. "Strikes are the order of the day. They are a symptom of the existence of labor strikes for such a purpose."
The Soviet Union—Socialist Or Social Imperialist?

A Conference and Debate On the Nature and Role of the Soviet Union In the World Today

In May 1982, the RCP issued a call for a debate over the nature and role of the Soviet Union. The call was met with great enthusiasm and controversy. In fact, the idea for the debate proved nearly as controversial as the question itself. No one denies that this is a burning question, but could a high level and substantive debate be organized around the two lines — socialist or social imperialist? Would such a debate be a diversion from more accessible or even more important questions? But this wrangling and the general excitement stirred by the call has produced fruitful results. Numerous individuals and organized forces from various countries have come forward with their support, suggestions, and positions. The letter of support printed here is but one indication. The basis for a sharp and timely debate now exists and we urge all those who see the importance and urgency of these questions to build for and take part in the conference and debate which will be held in

New York City, May 1983

For further information and to become part of the organizing committee write:

Soviet Union Conference
P.O. Box 924
Cooper Station, New York, NY 10276
or call (212) 685-3120
Funds are urgently needed
(Checks should be made payable to "Soviet Union Conference")
A Letter of Support for the Proposed Conference on the Nature and Role of the Soviet Union Today

Last summer, the Revolutionary Communist Party initiated a call for a conference on the nature and role of the Soviet Union, focusing on the question “The Soviet Union: Socialist or Social Imperialist?” Few other controversial political topics today so concentrate profound theoretical questions about mankind’s future and are so intimately intertwined with basic practical political choices throughout the world. The question of the Soviet Union pushes itself to the fore in any debate over the possibilities for radical social transformation and over the nature and potential of the developing international situation.

Does the state-owned and centrally-planned nature of its economic system mean that it is inherently a social advance over capitalism, or does it simply reflect the encasement of capitalist relations of production in a more collective ownership form?

Is the Soviet Union a progressive force in the world today, or an imperialist superpower, like the United States, compelled by its nature to wage a war of world redivision?

Is it a natural ally of oppressed nations, or is it one more in a series of aspiring exploitative powers?

While we ourselves hold widely differing views on these and related questions, we agree that the development of world events powerfully demands serious investigation and principled struggle over them.

The framework proposed for this conference has the potential for encouraging such struggle. It is planned to engage the energies and experiences of diverse political currents: from academia, from political organizations and mass movements, from among immigrants and circles of political exiles — and to have the conference culminate in an actual debate between major representatives of opposing views intended to sharply bring out the bases for their differences and the implications that flow from them.

This represents a welcome challenge to grapple with the controversies surrounding Soviet society, its nature and its international role, and to do so in a serious and thorough-going way. To that end, we encourage people to support and take part in this conference and its debate.
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Albert Szymanski

Trident Nein
Nine anti-war activists, members of the Atlantic Life Community. Recently sentenced to federal prison for damaging a U.S. Trident nuclear submarine at the General Dynamics Electric Boatyard in Groton, Connecticut.

Cornel West
Assistant Professor of Philosophy of Religion, Union Theological Seminary. Author of Prophecy Delivered: An Afro-American Revolutionary Christianity (1982).
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It was early morning of June 17 when dozens of federal and Washington state agents surrounded the tiny Indian-fishing village of Cook's Landing on the Columbia River. Dozens of agents brandishing rifles and shotguns surrounded the few houses and sheds while more stormed inside, a plane circled overhead and 3 boats awaited offshore. For those who might have harbored the plan to race down Highway 14 that morning it could have very easily seemed an unusual occurrence. Traveling along the Columbia as it thrusts a passage to the Cascade Mountains in a final push to the ocean, it is easy to overlook Cook's Landing on a normal day. You must pull off the highway and cross the railroad tracks to really see the Indian houses, the nets hanging up, the sheds for drying salmon and the boats pulled up on the sho. But on June 17, the seeming serenity was punctured by a small army of government pigs.

In fact, this raid marked only one of the most recent episodes in a prolonged and vicious campaign waged by the government against tribes who have fished the Columbia River for salmon. The June skirmish at Cook's Landing was followed by a federal grand jury finding indictments against 19 people, mainly Yakima and Warm Springs Indians, on federal charges of "illegal fishing." Well over 60 separate state charges have been filed in Washington and Oregon as well. Rumors of still more federal indictments to come are accompanying the government's new offensive against Indian fishing rights. In February, the 19 facing federal charges were scheduled to go to trial in Tacoma, Washington in what is certain to be an important battle. The government is again taking aim at a tradition that has traditionally served as a centerpiece for the economy and culture of Indians in the Northwest.

The "Usual and Acustomed Places"

130 years ago, Isaac Ingalls Stevens, the governor of the newly-created Washington territory and the region's first superintendent of Indian Affairs, arrived with the mission of securing this land for the relentless westward expansion of the U.S. A part of the U.S. plan was to drive the 14 tribes which inhabited most of what is now Washington and Idaho into reservation in the Yakima Valley. It was a plan that was first met with suspicion, and soon with open revolt. Although Stevens worked with driving energy in negotiations which gave the U.S. title to all of Washington and large parts of Oregon, Idaho, and Montana, it was not until 1855 — three years after initial treaty negotiations — before the area was "pacified" by the U.S. Army. As they had everywhere in their westward march, the troops came rounding up all who did not manage to escape or hide and herded them onto reservations, this time to Fort Simcoe, built in the heart of the Yakima reservation as a standing threat to the peoples who were forced to live there.

But as governor Stevens had underestimated the resistance he would meet, he did not understand one thing—the importance of the salmon fishery to the way of life of the tribes in the entire Northwest. Salmon was a staple of the diet, fishing a major source of food, and a central part of the Indian cosmology and religion. The U.S. at that time was not particularly interested in stealing the land, only the land — and so each treaty with the Northwest tribes specifically reserved the right of the Indians to "all usual and accustomed places." For Stevens and the others negotiating the treaties, it was a fait accompli, a given, a guaranteeing the Indians' access to their traditional fishing rights. But what neither Stevens nor the U.S. government ever realized was that there would never be agreement with the treaty.

But, typically, this right was no sooner guaranteed than broken. Whites soon crowded into the new territory and often attempted to interfere with the Indians' journeys to their traditional fisheries. Soon a commercial fishing industry sprang up and the Indians were increasingly locked upon as an unwelcome competitor; by the turn of the century the states were arresting, harassing and jailing Indian fishermen. For the descendants of those 14 tribes, and for the other Indians with treaty fishing rights on the Columbia, this is much more than just history. David So Happy, Sr., a Yakima fisherman who lives at Cook's Landing (and is a central target of the government's current attack), remembers his grandparents telling how they were herded to Fort Simcoe by the army, and though they spoke no English they knew very well the provisions of the treaty that claimed to guarantee their right to fish. And though most had been forced off their native rivers, the importance of fishing to the life of the tribes still ran strong 100 years later.

Nowhere was this more evident than at Celilo Falls, or Wy-a-m as it was originally known. Here, where the Columbia River formed great falls and rapidly as it raced toward the Pacific, the salmon would swim through narrow channels and leap up the falls as they returned upstream to their spawning grounds from the ocean. For centuries this was a major fishing site for tribes throughout the area, which in turn became one of the greatest trading centers on the West Coast of North America. Indians came from the Rocky Mountains, Vancouver Island and California to barter for the prized salmon. And though many things changed, the Indians had never relinquished one promise: none of the 50-mile stretches were many miles from the Columbia lived at Wy-a-m year-round and many others would come in the spring and spend the entire fishing season there. Until 1957.

In that year, the gates to the newly-constructed Dalles Dam closed. Six years later Wy-a-m was under water. The Dalles Dam was not the first along the Columbia. Many Indian families had conditional fishing sites flooded out when the Bonneville Dam was completed in 1938. The Bonneville Power Administration, the Federal agency operating the dams, claimed that new sites would be constructed to replace those flooded. Few of these promises, needless to say, were ever kept. Some of the locations which were pledged as Indian fishing sites became state parks instead and boat launches were used for pleasure boats and white sports fishermen. Promised improvements — like hot water and sheds for drying fish — were never built.

All these giant hydroelectric dams along the Columbia — built around World War 2 and after — were constructed principally to generate power for war-related aluminum processing. By the time construction started on the Dalles Dam, the Korean War was underway. The Federal government did not even initiate negotiations with the tribes which had fishing rights in the area until after construction on the dam had already begun. Once the negotiations had begun it was predictable that many on the tribal councils would echo the government's
Fishing Rights

Yakima while on leave recovering from wounds he had received in Vietnam was arrested and convicted while fishing near Cook's Landing on the Columbia.

Counts and Hacks

In 1965 the U.S. Supreme Court delivered its famous opinion in one of the most important fishing rights case ever decided by any court in the U.S. The court ruled that fishing rights under the Constitution were much more extensive than those now enjoyed by Indians. The opinion, in the U.S. v. Washington case, was a landmark decision that set the stage for all subsequent fishing rights cases.
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The ruling on the appeals was not long in coming. The court confirmed that the Indians had a right to fish, and that the state's regulations were unconstitutional.
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Language of Nothing to Lose

Continued from page 1

ing arrest?" How often have "bulges" been the bloody excuse? How many 317 magnums have "accidentally discharged"? How many times, in other words, has a young black man been shot down—like Nevel—just for holding his hand over a .389? Reaction was swift, furious and righteous. Around the arcade youth yelled at the streets and began picking up and tossing police cars parked nearby. Rocks and bottles were showered on squads of cops who spread out from every direction. The police were quickly surrounded and outnumbered. When three homicide cops "investigating?" the shooting were trapped by an angry crowd inside the arcade, it took an assault by three SWAT teams in combat gear and the entire shifts from the central and south police precincts to free them.

As the SWAT teams and other riot police tried to clear the streets and set up a ten-block cordon, word spread of the shooting and street battle and more and more people poured into the area. One report stated that most "booting" was confined to gas stations and at least one gun shop. Press accounts state that there were a number of weapons taken from patrol and undercover cars and turned against the cops. Police were physically pushed back by and their original lines.

The very authority which systematizes and sanctifies the murder of black people like Nevel Johnson was brought to bear—only now one-hundred fold. But the shrug, machismo, and phalacies of "law" police were greeted with contempt! News footage captured throns of Black youth and others on foot—and on bicycles—rushing in from every direction. The police were quickly pushed back beyond their original lines. More, they have shown again that murder of Nevel Johnson wasn’t the accident of some lone, renegade cops. They brought in a whole battalion to make the point. More, they have shown again that the vicious national oppression of Black people in this country is enforced by the bourgeois state and its detachments of mass armed proletarian revolution.

As the cold-blooded murder of Nevel Johnson opened up a new year, if you’re righteous. Around the arcade youth spill—"We want to get to the 'root' of the problem: Brother, the muh is rig for us. We can unite. But you’re going about it the wrong way." A second class of Nevels, who believe in themselves that "these people" just haven’t learned the falsity of such outlaw thinking, don’t appreciate the fine points of anti-Reaganism, got no patience in grass-roots reform, and gcd them, it act like they got nothing to lose.

Then there were the predictable demands for investigations. And, lo and behold, by Wednesday afternoon no less than five separate "investigations" into Nevel Johnson’s shooting had been launched. How familiar all that must sound in Miami. A local "investigation" brought the cops who killed Arthur McDuffie to trial in Florida nearly three years ago. They were found innocent and set free. A federal investigation reindicted one of these cops (“violation of McDuffie’s civil rights”). He was tried in San Antonio and set free. Miami revolution, yet another "investigation" resulted in the trial and conviction of 3 Black youth on murder charges. Needless to say—the cops who murdered 18 people in Liberty City weren’t even "investigated" the time around.

But even while the locals and the feds promise investigations, more reports of mass arrests came into Overtown, and the National Guard is put on alert. Another man was reportedly killed, but police refused to give any information about his death. They don’t restore "law and order" with promises, but with shotguns, teargas and troops. They have proven, for one thing, that the murder of Nevel Johnson wasn’t the action of some lone, renegade cops. They brought in a whole battalion to make the point. More, they have shown again that the vicious national oppression of Black people in this country is enforced by the bourgeois state and its detachments of armed bodies. They are trying to teach a lesson, but while what they are teaching is that more is required (and we don’t mean more Black cops’), what is required is mass armed proletarian revolution—and this means revolutionary leadership, understanding, organization and all-around preparation for the opportunities this truening presents—and when it will be possible to wage a real struggle for power and win.

As the cold-blooded murder of Nevel Johnson opens up a new year, if you’re Black and from Miami, you know with some pride ‘cause more is certainly required; such a revolution ain’t a bad place to start.

The EPA’s Latest Spill

On Monday, December 20, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) released a list of the 418 most hazardous toxic waste dump sites under its jurisdiction.

The compilation of these sites and their proposed clean-up are part of a $1.8 billion program begun two years ago in the wake of the outrage at revelations about Love Canal. As it turns out there are quite a number of toxic dump sites beside which Love Canal’s noxious fumes pale. In fact, Love Canal is far down the list—not even in the ranks of the 50 most dangerous sites. Before it appear such poisonous sink holes as Fridley, Minnesota, where for 20 years a plant producing ordinance for the U.S. Navy pumped trichloroethylene, a suspected carcinogen, several hundred feet upstream from a drinking water intake pipe for Minneapolis. Also high on the list is the site in Atlantic County, New Jersey where chemicals have seeped into the aquifer supplying Atlantic City’s water. Or there are the dump sites in the northern Marianas and the Pacific Islands Trust Territory for PCB—this extremely dangerous substance producing chemicals is a common ingredient in ordnance production. Though the compilation of the sites was generally hailed as a first vital step in controlling the problem, at this point—a two years in-to the five year program—only three of the 418 sites have been cleaned up. The vast majority haven’t been touched, and, what’s more, these are the only dangerous 418 chosen from an estimated 14,000 abandoned toxic waste dump sites containing everything from arsenic trichloride and benzene to radium.

But there’s more. In what was practically an aside, the EPA noted that only abandoned dump sites are included in its clean-up program. Not a single active poison depositary is any concern of the EPA’s tireless efforts. Nor are any toxic waste dump sites on federal grounds included—especially those containing nuclear waste material. One official estimated there are hundreds and hundreds, perhaps more such sites. The government is not really all that worried about this problem, however; the head of the EPA, blithely announced, once funds for the clean-up program run out in 1985, they saw no need at all to renew them.

A letter to Unkle Sam

Dear Chump,

Your national monument to Vietnam Veterans is a disgusting attempt to justify the war itself. It is a monument to glorify the idea of “serving America” right or wrong; to honor those who were used like pawns to napalm and massacre, to rape and murder, for your profit. You must be pretty fuckin’ desperate to try to burn the truth about Vietnam: the fact that Charlie kicked your ass righteously, and inspired your own soldiers to mutiny, fray and desert and oppose everything you stand for. We did indeed respect and honor those who turned their guns around, who joined the “enemy,” and who returned to throw their medals in your face.

We know what you’re up to. Your attempts to rename the past have everything to do with your plans for the future. Unkie Sam, you have terminal cancer, and you need a quick fix. You’re hoping to march us off the sheep, to all and the line pigs in a global Nuke-War Bloodfest with your Soviet lookalike bulls. FUCK YOU . . . we will fight side by side with our brother and sisters wherever they rise up, Palestinians in Lebanon, El Salvador, Poland, Brazil, Paris, and Africa, Iran, you thought you had trouble in the sixties. WELCOME TO THE EIGHTIES.

Your truly, Future Freepers

This banner, which was taken by revolutionary youth to “The Compound” a hangout in San Francisco’s Mission District — had a certain appeal.
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On November 18th the political police visited the house of New York City, and in its draughting of political activists, set in motion in the aftermath of the attempted Brinks expedition. On October 18th, the 9th the RICO-Federal Grand Jury in New York City, which has been conducting an investigation of the Weather Underground, returned a new federal indictment. The indictment lays down charges and as far as we can tell, the political police have been up to all along: silencing and jailing a section of revolutionary nationalists and their supporters. Significantly broadened in the indictment is the number of people directly under attack. Further, it represents an escalation and intensification of the type and scale of attacks both charges being levied—one carries a political police sentence. This being laid to go after and draft even more people.

The RICO indictment was returned against 11 people: Dr. Muriale Shukar, head of a Harlem acupuncture clinic. Shukar was formerly one of the Panther 21; Chui (Cecil) Ferguson; Jamal (Edward Joseph); Bilal Sunni-Ali (William Ferguson); Assata Shakur-Crumb was outraged and quite clearly stunned, members of the Weather Underground, were floated in the press. Thus it appears to be no surprise that a year later the political police have put down an “indictment confirming” their own scenario.

Count One: The racketeering conspiracy charge was brought in connection with the earlier Brinks incident in New York City. A criminal conspiracy began on September 21st. Court papers indicate that the defendants have been charged as members of the “terrorist” are 11 indicted. But that is not all. The indictment also states that the “terrorists” are also implicated “co-conspirators’ the 7 people already charged in the Brinks incident. They are also indicted for aiding the argument.”

The indictment charges that this grandiose criminal conspiracy began on January 15th 1980. We have opened the door to draw more links between more people. Already the indictment names two of the defendants, Assata Shakur in 1979 from a New Jersey prison where she was convicted of murder. Another criminal conspiracy in order to round up any number of political activists. In short, the indictment is simply a relic of the courtroom. The following is a partial list of the defendants, including individuals “associated in any way” with the conspiracy. It is very interesting that the political police have suddenly “new evidence”, as they claim, to support the allegations in the indictment. At the time of Assata Shakur’s freeing the bourgeoisie was outraged and quite clearly stunned, not knowing how or what had hit them. Police reports at the time gave different versions of what actually happened, and they them all traveling east and west at the same time. Court papers indicate that the defendants were picked up and held on a million dollar bond. The prosecution had to drop its blatantly phony charges, as they knew anything that had been with them at the time of the robbery.

The indictment holds that the necessary two acts or threats to commit racketeering activity in order to count as racketeering activity need only to have occurred within 10 years of each other. The indictment actually opens up the possibility of further investigation back to 1966, and press accounts over the last year the FBI, have kicked up a number of similar charges. Fears of something similar to this period are born.

The indictment is very broad and includes individuals “associated in any way” with the Brinks incident. The following is a partial list of the defendants, including individuals “associated in any way” with the conspiracy. It is very interesting that the political police have suddenly “new evidence”, as they claim, to support the allegations in the indictment. At the time of Assata Shakur’s freeing the bourgeoisie was outraged and quite clearly stunned, not knowing how or what had hit them. Police reports at the time gave different versions of what actually happened, and they them all traveling east and west at the same time. Court papers indicate that the defendants were picked up and held on a million dollar bond. The prosecution had to drop its blatantly phony charges, as they knew anything that had been with them at the time of the robbery.

The indictment returns the case to the original indictment. Assata Shakur was brought before the grand jury in New York City to plead guilty. Rierson, appeared under heavy guard in the New York courthouse in New York City, scuffling with the police who had attempted to shove them away from the front of the courtroom. The courtroom was stacked with the police lines, large crowds, etc., with many supporters then prevented from entering. When the judge read the charges to the male defendants, all of the defendants and their attorneys protested, refused to participate, and walked out of the courtroom — an indication and calling out the police force.

We believe all art is political, whether the artist(s) are conscious of this fact or not. We understand all art to be analyzable as either art for art’s sake, art as progress or reaction, or as a backwash or reactionary. And there is no such thing as “communist art.” What is revolutionary art? A political act which it is political sense complete to the proletariat as a class in historical and must on account of the contradictions in the world.

RIW: Is art that communists produce or “create” not “communist art”?
A. Pine: I think it seems that a communist who is also an artist would be able to create art that is not political and does not try to effect a change in society. But I have to qualify that by pointing out something Mao Tsetung pointed out, that “Marxist art is a social phenomenon, but cannot replace a real critical attitude and social awareness, in the lives of the masses and to hopefully correct the errors of the artist as well. We also welcome criticisms of art by all means, whether it be correct or not accept what is in question.

Also, there are issues peculiar to the artistic world, questions of method and style, the vainness of the project, people on some questions and not on others and we have, I would like to say, for the most part, the problem from revolutionary and progressive artists with regard to some major line questions concerning culture. We don’t believe in the concept of “progressive art” and we think this covers for revisionist art.
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Dear RW,

I was wondering if this is the place to send a statement concerning my treatment in the U.S.A. and the Walpole State Correctional Facility in XX. She's been in the torture chamber for about a year now and has been waiting for a hearing on her freedom. She is very serious and interested to learn what is really the extent of how deep oppression really is.

I am presently held captive in a political prison (herein after referred to as D.S.U). The day before my trial I was teargassed, maced and had my face cut to the bone by leg shackles. I received a black eye and gouges on my face and numerous bumps and bruises. I was placed in D.S.U. while waiting trial for murder and armed robbery.

I would repectfully request that the U.S.A. (and its police terror, psychological coercion and repression of the poor and deprived of certain earned "good time") and the Texas Department of Corrections (hereafter referred to as CDC) to confiscate Comrade Avaklan on political frame - up charges would be the equivalent of signing his death certificate.

I am asking you on behalf of this sister to please inform the Recipients of these needs and deeds of the Walpole State Correctional Facility in XX. She's been in the torture chamber for about a year now and I have been waiting for a hearing on her freedom.

Thank you,

Sincerely,

Sioux Falls, S .D.
It is with confidence and pride that we are calling on you to participate in a major fund drive for the RCP over the next several months. Many deeds cry out to be done. Large sums of money are needed to help strengthen the revolutionary communist trend internationally; to help build the party and deepen and spread the influence of the Party into all the diverse streams of rebellion and protest; to further address the burning questions of our time, including its own party press; to counter the constant attacks by the state — in short, to hasten the process of revolution worldwide.

We are asking you to contribute as much as you can; help publicize the fund drive (including sending letters of support to the RWP and others); and initiate or be part of special fundraising activities.

From this time that I was fairly young, I have always felt the need to see a thorough revolution — you know — a complete change from the kind of society people go through now. In seeking a way to not only think about this idea, but to act to bring it about, I joined the Young Communist League in 1933. One year later, I joined the Communist Party, USA. At that time, I did various political work in organizing workers in the various industries such as the waterfront, warehouse, and restaurants. This Communist Party later betrayed the interests of the proletariat and took the low road of capitulation. I was not very conscious of how this happened, but one thing that made me think that something was wrong with that organization was that they never trained politics. Everything from the working class seemed like they had things set up so that the masses would be denied the accessibility to being trained in Marxism-Leninism — so that an elite class within the party could run things their way. At the same time that I was involved in the ‘30s and ‘40s and into the ‘60s, there were some of us in China who looked to Mao Tsetung as a great revolutionary leader and when people talked about revolution — it was equated with China and the achievements made in creating a whole new society after the defeat of the foreign imperialists which had China backward for many years. But China during the time of the Cultural Revolution was much different from the China of today — which is the same kind of rotten capitalist system that exists right here in the U.S. The Revolutionary Communist Party’s analysis of this reversal in China in boldly upholding the banner of Mao Tsetung and never come out. The Four were members of collective party organizations, yet all I heard was that every problem was being blamed on them. Even a sailor from China comes in frequently. Like I said before about the CPIUSA, they didn’t train people in this way. I guess sometimes we lose sight of how precious such a weapon is to raise people’s rights to what is going on in the world and sensibly train people and step up preparations for the final overthrow. In summing up my relationship with the RCP, USA, I would like to say that while a correct line is being applied to changing the world makes all the difference; we must be able to discern our friends from our enemies, real Marxism from phony Marxism, and advance on a path that is really going to get us there. And it is truly only this party that has shown this. I would like to encourage all who want to see a complete change to worthwhilely contribute to the RCP’s major fund drive. We cannot just tidy dreams away but such a revolution — and must actively work to make it happen. Perhaps you can talk to your friends about this and see if they are going to — and encourage them to look into what the RCP is all about! Before I end, I would like to say one more thing — the realists are definitely in deep trouble throughout the world — so we can take advantage of that — but we will be a struggle to defeat them on a world. But, we should not get discouraged — “The road is long, the future is bright”.

Contribute to the RCP’s major fund drive now!

A retired Chinese worker
San Francisco

This is why I am contributing to the special fund drive and becoming a sustainer to the work of the Revolutionary Communist Party:

I have been active in movement politics for 20 years now. The civil rights movement of the early 60s and the racist reaction against it made me realize that our so-called democracy was a myth. I became peripherally involved in the civil rights movement as a student. When the Viet Nam war began to heat up in the mid-60s my anger demanded more than occasional marches and petition gatherings. I became active in S.O.S., draft resistance and other militant movements of the 60s. Since the end of the war, I have worked on environmental issues and for nuclear disarmament. Over the years I have taken part in numerous sit-ins, demonstrations and Greenpeace actions and direct actions against the military. And, during those years I have seen numerous Marxist organizations come and go. Most of them were very theoretical and dogmatic and didn’t seem grounded in reality. The RCP, however, is different.

I don’t agree with all their policies nor do I think the revolution is imminent here in the U.S. But, they are dedicated to fighting and exposing imperialism both here and abroad. Unlike so many other Marxist groups who criticize everyone who isn’t a party member, the RCP supports and encourages all progressive groups struggling against sexism, racism, and the war machine. And their paper is an excellent source for information about struggles both here and abroad.

— Seattle

Contributions, including anonymous donations, can be addressed to: RCP Publications, P.O. Box 3486, Merchandise Mart, Chicago, IL 60654