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"And while they got rich off the gains of war, what in the hell were you fighting for? A silly-ass medal, a stupid parade — for all those innocent people you slayed."

From "World War Three," by Melle Mel, 1980

U.S. troops in Saudi Arabia in February.

Three Main Points
by Bob Avakian
Chairman of the RCP, USA

What do we in the Revolutionary Communist Party want people to learn from all that is exposed and revealed in this newspaper? Mainly, three things:

1) The whole system we now live under is based on exploitation — here and all over the world. It is completely worthless and no basic change for the better can come about until this system is overthrown.

2) Many different groups will protest and rebel against things this system does, and these protests and rebellions should be supported and strengthened. Yet it is only those with nothing to lose but their chains who can be the backbone of a struggle to actually overthrow this system and create a new system that will put an end to exploitation and help pave the way to a whole new world.

3) Such a revolutionary struggle is possible. There is a political Party that can lead such a struggle, a political Party that speaks and acts for those with nothing to lose but their chains: The Revolutionary Communist Party, USA.

This Party has the vision, the program, the leadership, and the organizational principles to unite those who must be united and enable them to do what must be done. There is a challenge for all those who would like to see such a revolution, those with a burning desire to see a drastic change for the better, all those who dare to dream and to act to bring about a completely new and better world: Support this Party, join this Party, spread its message and its organized strength, and prepare the ground for a revolutionary rising that has a solid basis and a real chance of winning.

Subscribe to the RW

- One year — $40
- 3 months — $12
- 1 year, U.S. institution — $52

Indicate which language edition:

- English
- Spanish

Name
Address
City
State
Zip

For office use only; Date rec'd
Amt rec'd
Expires

I want to receive copies per week.

Write to: Box 3486, Merchandise Mart, Chicago, IL 60654

Contact the Revolutionary Worker
Box 3486, Merchandise Mart, Chicago, IL 60654

In your area call or write:

- California:
  - Los Angeles: c/o Lenin Revolution, 312 W. 8th St., Los Angeles, CA 90012 213/488-1303
  - San Francisco: Watch the 799 for new location


- Florida:
  - Miami: c/o Revolution Books, 1015 NE 2nd Ave., Miami, FL 33132 305/237-7308
  - Orlando: c/o Revolution Books, 3901 N. Orange Ave., Orlando, FL 32803 407/845-0903

- Georgia: c/o Revolution Books Outlet, 483 Moreland Ave., NE., Atlanta, GA 30307 404/577-4656

- Hawaii: c/o Revolution Books, 2567 South King St, Honolulu, HI 96828 808/941-3126

- Illinois:
  - Chicago: c/o Revolution Books, 3449 N. Sheffield, Chicago, IL 60657 312/528-5353
  - Rockford: c/o Revolution Books, 1330 E. State St., Rockford, IL 61104 815/397-9970

- Indiana:
  - Indianapolis: c/o Revolution Books, 1536 N. Meridian St., Indianapolis, IN 46202 317/246-3709

- Iowa: c/o Revolution Books, 714 W. 14th St., Des Moines, IA 50309 515/247-5034

- Michigan:
  - Detroit: c/o Revolution Books, 4715 Cass Ave., Detroit, MI 48201 313/831-3430

- Minnesota:
  - St. Paul: c/o Revolution Books, 2301 S. 7th St., Minneapolis, MN 55404 612/482-8721

- Missouri:
  - St. Louis: c/o Revolution Books, 3740 Market St., St. Louis, MO 63110 314/771-1800

- New York:
  - New York City: c/o Revolution Books, 95 Varick St., New York, NY 10013 212/388-1344

- North Carolina:
  - Greensboro: c/o Revolution Books, 828eu Boulder Rd, Greensboro, NC 27407 919/393-0535

- Ohio:
  - Columbus: c/o Revolution Books, 2021 E. Broad St., Columbus, OH 43215 614/442-6666

- Oregon:

- Pennsylvania:

- Texas:
  - Austin: c/o Revolution Books, 515 W. 17th St., Austin, TX 78701 512/485-8186
  - Houston: c/o Revolution Books, 2021 T. E. Main St., Houston, TX 77002 713/529-6358

- Washington:
  - Seattle: c/o Revolution Books, 515 S. 8th St., Seattle, WA 98104 206/525-9165

- Wisconsin:

The Revolutionary Worker (ISSN 0193-3485) is published weekly except for the 4th week of December and the 4th week of July. By RCP Publications, P.O. Box 3486, Chicago, IL 60654. Second-class postage paid at Chicago, IL. Subscriptions and address changes should be sent to RCP Publications, POB 3486, Chicago, IL 60654. Subscriptions are $40 a year; $12 for 3 months in the U.S., Canada, and Mexico ($52 for institutions).

Postmaster: send all changes of address to Revolutionary Worker, P.O. Box 3486, Chicago, IL 60654.
What to the Slave Is Your Fourth of July?

In 1852 Frederick Douglass, a former slave and a leader in the fight against slavery, wrote:

What to the American slave is your Fourth of July? I answer, a day that reveals to him, more than all other days in the year, the gross injustice and cruelty to which he is the constant victim.

To him, your celebration is a sham; your boasted liberty, an unholy license; your national greatness, swelling vanity; your sounds of rejoicing are empty and heartless; your denunciation of tyrants, brass-fronted impudence; your shouts of liberty and equality, hollow mockery; your prayers and hymns, your sermons and thanksgivings, with all your religious parade and solemnity, are to him mere bombast, fraud, deception, impiety, and hypocrisy—a thin veil to cover up crimes which would disgrace a nation of savages.

There is not a nation on the earth guilty of practices more shocking and bloody than are the people of these United States, at this very hour.

Go where you may, search where you will, roam through all the monarchies and despoticisms of the old world, travel through South America, search out every abuse, and when you have found the last, lay your facts by the side of the every-day practices of this nation, and you will say with me, that, for revolting barbarity and shameless hypocrisy, America reigns without a rival.

Frederick Douglass, July 5, 1852

“What to the Slave is the Fourth of July?”

WHAT TO THE SLAVES IS YOUR WAR IN THE GULF?

We Didn’t Support Your War and We Won’t Celebrate Your Victory!
South Africa

Apartheid Abolishes Itself?

DON'T BELIEVE THE HYPE!

by Michael Slate

Every time I hear another news item about how the South African regime is taking steps to end apartheid I think about a conversation I had with a young Azanian comrade during my last visit to South Africa. We were sitting inside a shack in the Eastern Cape squatter camp known as Soweto by the Sea discussing this issue. The young comrade stamped his foot on the patch of Umlendo covering the dirt floor, sort of like he was killing a cockroach, as he told me, "It is system that you have to deal with. And, like everything that is system, you have to smash it, kill it directly. If you don't, it will kill you dead!"

On June 17 the South African Parliament repealed the notorious Population Registration Act. This law, enacted at the beginning of the apartheid regime, classified everyone born in South Africa into racial categories based on their background and skin color. There were four major racial categories—white, Indian or Asian, Coloured or mixed race, and African. From the very moment of birth, literally everything about a South African's life—where they live, where they work, where they go to school, who they talk to and how, who they love, who they marry, how they travel, where they play sports, where they dance, where they piss, what hospitals they go to, what political rights they had, and where they could be buried—was determined by the racial category assigned. Under apartheid, whites occupy the top of the society, and that position and everything that goes along with it is based on the systematic oppression of the rest of the Azanian people—especially the Africans who are the vast majority of the population and the indigenous people of the country.

The Population Registration Act was the last major legal pillar of what is called "grand apartheid" in South Africa—the four key laws of the apartheid setup. Earlier this month the Groenfontein Group set up segregated living areas, and the Land Acts, which legally enforced white ownership of 87 percent of the land in South Africa, were repealed. In the Fall of 1990 the Separate Amenities Act, which legalized segregated public facilities, was taken off the books. When the South African Parliament repealed the Population Registration Act, F.W. De Klerk declared that apartheid, and all of the oppression based on it, was a thing of the past. Addressing a special joint session of the white, "Colored" and Indian Houses of Parliament, De Klerk stated, "Now everybody is free of it. Now everybody is free from the disengagement and denial...and from the moral dilemma caused by this legislation, which was born and nurtured under different circumstances in a departed era."

But the apartheid constitution still stands—Black people have no real say in the government, and even when many of them do, they are a notorious collaborator with the apartheid regime, not only privately with the Bush government, but also with the Soviet Union and other countries.

The repeal of the apartheid legislation was not an insignificant act by the racist rulers of South Africa. But the significance of these actions lies mainly in the fact that the white minority is not at all. Just a few years ago no one would have dreamed that all of these laws would be repealed by the apartheid regime itself.

There were a number of factors that played into the South African regime's decision to get rid of the apartheid laws. For one thing, the collapse of the Soviet imperialisim and the opening of the African National Congress (ANC), including their rush into trying to work out some kind of negotiated settlement with the regime, gave the apartheid government an opening it wasn't expecting. But mainly, it was the struggle of the African people themselves and the threat of that struggle developing into something with the potential of bringing down the whole apartheid setup that made the government act while it still could. The repeal of all these racist laws and the whole attempt to negotiate out a new form of government in South Africa is not the result of some sudden enlightenment of the oppressors in South Africa. Instead, these are desperate maneuvers of a vulnerable imperialist system to avoid the real rule of the black people of Africa.

The African people will get a few benefits as a result of these changes. Also, all of the security legislation, the Internal Security Act, the preventive detention laws, the rightless of political prisoners, and the whole repressive apparatus used to keep black people down will be abolished. Imperialist governments around the world applauded De Klerk and praised the birth of a new South African. Olympic officials are discussing the possibility of South Africa once again participating in the Olympics, possibly as soon as the 1992 Summer games. In the U.S. the Bush administration and the Congress actually began talking about rewarding South Africa by lifting the economic sanctions that had been placed against South Africa in 1986. And on top of this, Gisela Buschedel, the so-called "Free Angela" and erstwhile collaborator with the apartheid regime, not only privately with the Bush government, but also with the Soviet Union and other countries.

The legacy of the Soweto rebellion is very important at this moment in history. The struggle in Azania is a critical point. The liberation of the De Klerk regime in South Africa reflects the desperation of the white minority rulers, and of their backers in U.S., London and down on Wall Street, to keep their death grip on South Africa.

We should be clear that apartheid is nothing but a stepchild of U.S. imperialism. White minority rule is the way that the imperialists keep the people of Azania from exploiting them. So the setup in South Africa is in deep trouble. It's desperately trying to come up with some way to hold down the African masses. And when your enemy is in trouble, you don't up and negotiate with them; you break his neck!

Human freedom don't come from getting to sit at the negotiating table with the oppressors. It ain't going to come to South Africa because they integrate the stores and restaurants. Or because they say Black people can buy back some of the land that was taken from them centuries ago. Liberation can only come about in Azania through the revolutionary overthrow of the white minority government and through continued attacks on the revolution and every foul thing associated with it. The African people have already shown that they are ready to get down for real.
This is particularly true for the small but growing black middle class. But even that will be limited, as many of these black mid­dle class people will find out when they attempt to move into white neighborhoods or send their kids to all-white schools. When you get right down to it, though, the end of legal apartheid will have very little real effect on the conditions facing the vast majority of Azanian people. This is true even on the surface of things. The repeal of this legislation isn’t just a trick, but is not a sudden blooming of integration, quality and acceptance on the part of the white settlers and their governments.

I was in Azania when the Separate Amenities Act was repealed. It was big news that black people could no longer be barred from using public facilities simply because they were black. However, most black people who tried to begin exercising these rights—like going to libraries or public swimming pools in white areas—very quickly found out that they had to come up with hundreds and sometimes thousands of Rand to buy a membership in the libraries and pools. Likewise, the move by the regime to grant release of political prisoners showed what these reforms really mean for the people. Of the 15,000 political prisoners, only 1,000 were released. More than 90 percent who applied for release were denied political prisoner status and were kept in jail classified as “common criminals.”

What difference is the repeal of the Land Act going to make to the millions and millions of Azanian peasants whose land was long ago stolen from them? While it is no longer the law that black people can only own land in 13 percent of the country, the fact is that 87 percent of the land is now owned by whites and this is the most fertile and valuable land in the country. By law all people will now have access to the land if they can pay the price and if they can find someone to sell it to them. But what difference will this make to the peasants I spoke to in KwaZulu, who were literally slaves on white-owned plantations? And what about the black peasants I spoke to who were forcibly removed from their ancestral farms and dumped in the Ciskei ban­tustan 15 years ago? The farms that once belonged to these peasants have been turned into valuable white farms while these peasants are starving out in the remote and barren areas of Ciskei. And what difference will it make to the youth I spoke to in squatter camps all over the country who, with the repeal of the Group Areas Act, are now free to buy a house in a white suburb or a white section of the city—that is, if they meet the “norms and standards” required by the white neighbor­hood. These people aren’t living in ten and cardboard shanties just because of a few apartheid laws. The Azanian people are forced to live in these squatting camp­ions—often in defiance of the law—because they have absolutely nothing and this is the result of the super-exploitation and oppres­sion that comes from a whole system based on the oppression of African people, not just a few laws. This system is backed up and enforced by the armed power of the regime and their army and police. As Max­im Tsvetin said, “political power grows out of the barrel of a gun.”

No one is more aware of this reality than the rulers of South Africa. The South African authorities themselves have unwi­tingly admitted that not all that much is going to change for the majority of the Azanian people. Herman J. Kriel, the Mini­ster of Planning and Provincial Affairs, recently talked about the real effect of the repeal of the Group Areas Act. According to Kriel, black inner­townships and squatter camps will not only remain on the scene but will increase due to a combination of strict housing codes enforced in white areas, economic factors, and a shortage of hous­ing built for black people. While Kriel stressed that this situation will have “nothing to do with race,” he predicted a growth in black “informal housing” around the major cities. In the middle of all this talk about the birth of a “new South Africa,” the South African government also made it clear that the bottom line of brute military force maintaining their rule and the oppres­sion of the Azanian people still remains—and will remain—in effect. Just a couple of weeks before the repeal of the Population Registration Act, South African para­troopers launched a mock invasion of Soweto as part of a military exercise.

For the Azanian people the bottom line also remains the same. No matter how many laws the South African regime repeals, this maneuver will not bring about the liberation of the Azanian people. Neither will the hammering out of a new constitution—that grants black people some form of political rights—bring an end to the oppression of the Azanian people. This oppression rooted in and serving the interests of the imperialist system and the white South African settler state in­trusted to it. There is only one solution to the oppression of the people of Azania and only one path to genuine liberation—the path of a Marxist people’s war and all-the-way revolution. Only a “new democratic revolution”—to overthrow the apartheid regime, break free from imperialism, and move on to build a genuine socialist society—can bring na­tional liberation to the Azanian people. The Azanian youth who talked about the need to “kill system dead” put it this way, “South Africa is a black country. The whites took the country first and then made their laws. And this is one act that they will never repeal. This is my law, South Africa is a black country. The whites took it with guns and we must do the same to take it back. Only then, when we have our black country at our own, will we be able to end our suffering.”

by Carl Dix, National spokesperson for the RCP,USA

youth of Soweto had a saying, “For free­dom we shall lay down our lives!” What they have needed is leadership that is based on the science of revolution, Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, and is ready to lead the kind of all-the-way revolutionary struggle that is needed to get free. To be clear, that comes down to people’s war, fought in a way that is fitted to the conditions of Azania and is aimed at nothing less than totally destroying the current system in Azania and building something new and far better in its place.

And that’s what we need here too. We don’t need a trickle of pseudo leaders, Black mayor or governors, cause while we send them to the doghouse once the sun goes down, we still end up in the doghouse. Getting an education ain’t going to get you free. Suicide is not the answer to the pressures they’re being put up under. It’s time to press the people rising up to get rid of them and their system. People who want to do just that have gotta get a hold of our paper, the Revolutionary Worker, and get down with their party to organize, mobilize and get out to the People’s National Party, and get ready for revolution, so all of us can get free, in Azania, in the U.S. and all over the world.
INS Concentration Camp Fighter
WINS COURT VICTORY

An important victory was won in the first political trial of the concentration camp fighters—those arrested in spring of 1990 in the struggle against the Los Angeles Police Department barricades and an immigration and naturalization service "detention center" in the Pico-Union barrio of Los Angeles. On June 3 a jury acquitted a young Latino immigrant who was attacked and brutalized by LAPD cops at a demonstration on May 26, 1990, and charged with two serious felonies. He was facing a possible sentence of five years or more in state prison.

This case was one of the two felony cases arising from the concentration camp and a half of struggle in Pico-Union that spring. The other felony case also involves a Latino defendant. Many others are charged with misdemeanors. A total of seven separate felonies were filed off of the demonstrations, involving 32 defendants and 76 charges.

Four Days of Struggle in Pico-Union

From May 1 through June 30 last year a series of powerful demonstrations took place in Pico-Union, the largest Central American barrio in the United States. The LAPD had put up barricades in this neighborhood under the guise of the "war on drugs." This was the first place in LAPD's Operation Police State—an attack on oppressed communities intended to create Nazi-style ghettos behind concrete walls and iron gates. And unknown to the people, the INS had set up a "detention center" to lock up immigrants marked for deportation. Hundreds of Latino protestors together with students, artists, professors, religious activists and others protested to oppose the concentration camp and the barricades.

They exposed a network of such concentration camps across the country and brought into being a nationwide movement against them. These actions, often in the face of violent attacks by the LAPD, led to a whole new level of resistance among the people.

In mid-May 1990 the Coalition in State Down INS Concentration Camps put out a call for Four Days of Struggle during the Memorial Day weekend. The May 26 protest took place at the corner of 76th and Alvarado outside Damian Garcia (formerly MacArthur) Park, four blocks north of the INS concentration camp. When the riot erupted, at an hour only half of intense political confrontation in the streets followed. Hundreds of immigrants in the area expressed their anger. It was the fiercest struggle between the people and the powers in L.A. in many years. The LAPD responded with brutality. They beat, chased, and broke the area of proximation, and threatened and attacked. Those they thought were organizers. The immigrant brother who was just on trial was one of those arrested.

A Very Political Trial

At the trial the defendant testified that he came to the protest after getting a leaflet from the Coalition. He was set upon by a group of cops—the "swarm technique" which the LAPD used on Rodney King. At least four cops beat and kicked him dozens of times, handcuffed him, and threw him into a police van. A witness saw the cops beating him again inside the van.

The immigrant was charged with battery on a police officer (for allegedly drawing a punch that broke a cop's littlefinger) and Penal Code Section 69. The little-used but politically charged Section 69 outlawed any attempt to use "threat or violence" to "derogue an executive officer." The law has been used in other political cases to convict people for simply being near what a California appeals court called an "insurrection against the authority of the police." Section 69 was used to jail followers of Malcolm X who were arrested after the LAPD raided a Muslim temple in 1962, killing one man and wounding several others. Other Black activists have been charged under this law. Unlike the more commonly used "resisting arrest law," Section 69 is a felony.

Two cops were the only witnesses for the prosecution in the government's attempted railroad of the Latino immigrant. The cops tripped all over their own and each other's lies. Cop 1 said the arrest took place 50 yards inside the park—Cop 2 said it was on the street. One imagined the imaginary punch to the plaintiff was a left hook—the other said it was a right cross. The other cop agreed on was that they had used the swarm technique.

After claiming that the defendant was placed unharmed into the police van, Cop 1 was forced to identify a booking photo of the defendant that clearly showed laceration and swelling in his face. The cop also swore for two hours that he never drew his club, but when confronted with testimony that he did use his club he started reworking his whole story. The judge even had to call a recess so the witness could try to get himself together.

Aside from the blatant attempt to frame up the immigrant, the trial was also a very political attack against the Revolutionary Communist Party. The first prosecution witness started off the testimony with a series of outrageous lies and standers about PCP, which he supposedly heard from the watch commander at the morning roll-call briefing the day of the demonstration. The cop said on the stand that he was told the RCP was "violent," that "RCP members" had "assaulted" police officers during several demonstrations that month, and that "numerous" cops had been injured. He claimed that "RCP members" had piled tires next to the INS concentration camp and that "burn marks" were found on the building, which is a documented fire trap with hundreds of immigrants inside. The witness admitted he had not seen any of this take place—and neither had anyone else of course, since the lies about the RCP were all made up!

Supposedly the courts under this system are required to rule against allowing such broad and sensational testimony. And the prosecution did not even claim that the defendant had been at the earlier demonstrations—the cop lied about. But the judge allowed this mountain of lies to come out in court and specifically ruled that it was not hearsay. The introduction of these lies in open court has serious implications beyond the attempt to railroad one defendant. Such fabrications can be used as justification for a broad range of repressive actions—from police spying or grand jury fishing expeditions to covert assaults on activists and "unofficial" actions like those of the El Salvadoran death squads operating in L.A.

These lies did not just come from some watch commander at a local police station. Such attempts at political setups have been heard before, and they have come from the political police, like the now-disbanded Public Disorder Intelligence Division (POID). But throughout the trial the state denied that any police spying organization had any files on the concentration camp demonstrations—including the Anti-Terrorist Division (ATD) which succeeded the POID and is headed by LAPD Chief Daryl Gates' brother. Even though an ATD sergeant was present at the May 26 protest and other concentration camp demos, the state of the secret police was covered up.

While permitting the outright pig lies, the judge barred testimony from the spokesperson for La Resistencia, a national peasant-political action group. The spokesperson had offered to testify on the politics of the protests at Pico-Union, about how people from all walks of life participated, and about the unprovoked police attacks.

Whenever the oppressed stand up against the state they face the full weight of the powers' repressive machinery. In L.A. those in power are especially concerned with the connections between the masses of Latino people and revolutionary politics and organization. In 1980 RCP member Damian Garcia was murdered in an East L.A. housing project—after he was targeted by the LAPD for the role of a political-police official, "in charge of recruiting Latins for the revolution." The freeing of the immigrant is a victory, but it was not accomplished by relying on the courts. Ten thousand fact sheets on the case were distributed widely to lawyers, at churches and universities, and at demonstrations against LAPD brutality. A press conference at the courthouse was covered by three TV stations and the Spanish-language daily La Opinion. Many people wrote letters to the judge and came to support the defendant at the trial.

This is the first case in the series of attempted raids on the concentration camp fighters. At the same time the LAPD is stepping up attacks on the basic people, including constructing permanent barricades in oppressed areas in preparation for putting entire neighborhoods under total police control. Defending the concentration camp fighters is an important part of the struggle to defeat the enemy's clampdown.
It was over 600 years ago that Mt. Pinatubo, a 4,800-foot volcano 55 miles north of the Philippine capital, last erupted. But earlier this year scientists noticed enormous pressure building up in the volcano—eruption was just a matter of time. As the volcano—erupting violently. A series of powerful explosions have spewed out enormous columns of volcano ash, rock fragments and hot gases miles into the sky. An area hundreds of square miles around the volcano has now been covered with ash.

More than half a million Filipinos are forced to move within 25 miles of Mt. Pinatubo—the most dangerous zone around the volcano—and millions more live close enough to be seriously affected. Peasants in the area had their crops buried under as much as three feet of volcanic ash and rock. “There is nothing left,” said one man who had to abandon his small farm. “It is all ash and sand now. The roof of my house collapsed from all the ash.” Many buildings, including some used as evacuation centers, collapsed from the weight of the ash. A typhoon that hit the Philippines at the same time turned rivers into torrents that washed away bridges and the ash on mountain slopes into mudslides that swallowed up houses. Hundreds of thousands of people have been forced to evacuate their homes, many traveling on foot and carrying little more than the clothes they wear. At least 300 people were reported dead as of June 21.

Meanwhile another kind of evacuation was already under way. Thousands of miles from Mt. Pinatubo, the Clark Air Force Base run by the U.S. Air Force takes up 100,000 acres of Filipino land. It is one of the biggest U.S. military bases overseas, and thousands of military and civilian personnel are stationed there. As soon as the volcano began to erupt, the U.S. military organized a hasty retreat out of Clark. Within a few hours most of the 16,000 Americans living and working at Clark were evacuated to Subic, a major U.S. naval base further south and out of the immediate danger zone. In a few days the rest, a coastal crew of Marines, were also evacuated, leaving the base guarded by Filipino troops. To put it in a few words, the U.S. troops ran like scared rats. Some news reports called it the “great American retreat.”

The way this escape was carried out concentrated the unequal and unjust nature of the U.S.-occupied Philippines. While the U.S. military organized a super-efficient evacuation, Filipinos were given no help to fend for themselves. Several days after the air force base was abandoned, the 300,000 residents of Angeles, the “base town” right next to Clark, had not even received any evacuation order. Only a few Americans died in freak accidents during the whole evacuation, while hundreds of Filipinos were killed or injured and many tens of thousands lost their homes and possessions. The Philippines became a U.S. colony at the turn of the century after a brutal war in which more than 200,000 Filipinos were killed while only a few thousand U.S. troops died. It was an early version of the U.S. massacre of the Iraqi people. After World War 2 the Philippines became formally independent, but it continued to be dominated by foreign powers, especially the U.S. And the huge U.S. bases at Clark and Subic (and a number of smaller bases) have been a key part of this domination. The bases have been important for the U.S. in “projecting power” into Asia and beyond. During the war against Iraq, Subic and Clark served as important refueling and supply centers for ships and planes carrying troops and material to the Persian Gulf. The U.S. pays hundreds of millions of dollars a year “rent” for the bases, but this money does not benefit the masses of Filipino people. A large part of it goes to the Philippine military which protects the interests of the ruling elite and the U.S. imperialists. Even the funds directed at so-called “development assistance” only serve to prop up this system. The roads that are built help the military in fighting armed insurgents, and “food aid” means that surplus U.S. food production is sold at low prices by the Philippine government, helping U.S. corporations and undermining local agriculture. Millions go into the pockets of corrupt officials.

Around the bases there are cities that are going to be completely destroyed. Peasants in the area have been forced to evacuate their homes, many traveling on foot and carrying little more than the clothes they wear. At least 300 people were reported dead as of June 21. The Anti-Bases Coalition in the Philippines reported that the U.S. authorities had called the bases “open” and allowed U.S. citizens and troops to move freely into and out of the bases. The government of Corazon Aquino has tried to maintain some kind of a “nationalist” cover by coming out with a “hard” negotiating position, especially over the amount of money for rent on the bases. But it was clear that the Aquino regime was going to sign the treaty in the end. The reports before the volcano eruption indicated that the new treaty formally returned the bases to Philippine control, but the U.S. still kept “access rights” to them as well as “freedom of movement” for its nuclear weapons on Philippine territory.

The Pinatubo eruption has focused attention on the question of U.S. nuclear weapons in the Philippines. The Manila Bulletin, a U.S.-funded newspaper, reported that the U.S. authorities had called a “nuclear alert” at the Clark air base shortly after it was evacuated of U.S. personnel. In a classic example of imperialist double-talk, a U.S. embassy spokesman in Manila said about the Guardian report: “We neither confirm or deny that we have nuclear weapons, but we can assure you that no nuclear weapons system is in danger.” If fact it is assumed that nuclear-armed cruise missiles are stored at Clark. According to some news reports, the cruise missiles went into action in the event of being transferred out of Clark and therefore were not in the deepest underground bunkers usually reserved for them.

The Anti-Bases Coalition in the Philippines said that while there might have been any radioactive leakage yet, there was potential for serious contamination by highly radioactive materials such as plutonium if the weapons storage areas are damaged by lava flows. The Coalition pointed out that the hasty evacuation of the air force base suggested that the U.S. authorities were implementing a contingency plan designed for nuclear accidents at Clark or Subic. The contingency plan, which was previously leaked, includes detailed instructions such as a sample press release by the U.S. embassy which contains no mention of nuclear materials and talks only of a “serious incident.”

There is talk now that the Pinatubo eruption will affect the negotiations over the bases in a major way. Clark air base is said to be too essential for the U.S. at this point, and the clean-up and reconstruction costs from the damages caused by the volcano will be very high. The Subic naval base, however, is crucial for the U.S. since it is the main maintenance, support and storage base for the Pacific Fleet and the most convenient “full-service” port for Navy ships in most of the Indian Ocean. So there is some speculation that the U.S. may abandon Clark while holding onto the Subic base.

The Pinatubo volcano made the U.S. military turn tail and run from Clark air base. However, the destruction caused by the volcano through a people’s war to drive the Yankee imperialists completely out of the Philippines.
IN THE AFTERMATH OF THE PERSIAN GULF WAR, MORE ON

PROSPECTS FOR REVOLUTION

EXCERPT #2: NECESSARY CONDITIONS

BY BOB AVAKIAN

Recently some comrades had an opportunity to interview Comrade Avakian. In the aftermath of the Persian Gulf war and the victory of the U.S. side over Iraq, they posed a number of important and probing questions concerning revolutionary struggle in imperialist countries like the U.S. and in particular the possibility of waging revolutionary war against such an imperialist power, right in its "homeland." The full text of the interview will soon be available in a new book, and the RW is proud to present a series of excerpts from this interview. This is the second excerpt.

Well, I'd say this. First, to argue for waiting like that is essentially to argue for waiting forever and for giving up the goal of revolution, and I think that's wrong. Wrong, first because we can't give up the goal of revolution—revolution is what's needed. That's what the people of the world need. That's what the people in the U.S., the proletariat and the oppressed masses need, revolution, and in an overall and historic sense the majority of people in the world need revolution and certainly the great majority of people in the world need revolution, proletariat revolution. But it's also wrong because it's not necessary to wait for conditions like that. It's not the case that we can't win unless we get conditions where the government is basically bogging us up on its own. That's on the one hand. On the other hand, a point our Party has made a number of times, and that is dramatically emphasized by this recent war, is that particularly at the very beginning of the revolutionary war, when you'd just be bringing your own armed forces into being, you wouldn't want to go up against the imperialists in a situation where they were in a very strong position, where they were not in any kind of crisis, and their military power was not only intact but was in "high gear," so to speak. Coming out as a revolutionary force, you'd be starting out by definition with nothing or next to nothing in the actual military sphere itself, so you'd want to make your moves—launch an insurrection—when the other side was weakened and in crisis. This is a point our Party has stressed over and over, and for good reason.

Now, having said that, it is also very important to emphasize that things you've done leading up to the launching of the armed struggle would count for something. In the case of countries like the U.S., this means a period of political work and political battles and preparing public opinion, preparing minds and organizing forces for the next step, organizing a broad-organized ties with the masses—all these things count for something. They count for a great deal in fact. So you wouldn't literally be starting with nothing. That in terms of actually having an army in the strict sense you'd be starting with basically nothing. So two things: first, you wouldn't want to go up against the full power of the imperialist armed forces right away; and two, you wouldn't want to go up against an imperialist regime when it has a serious crisis in society. In the "Could We" article you referred to I pointed out that you have to have a serious crisis in society in government. In other words, it's not enough to just have a generalized kind of mistrust, a kind of chaos, upheaval, economic crisis, political crisis, where people are also having a serious economic or political crisis. In other words, when the middle classes are more or less solidly behind the ruling class, when the basic people are not in a fighting mood or don't see the possibility of revolution—that's not when you want to launch a revolutionary war against the system. You'd want things to be the opposite of that. When people are in a combative mood, when they've been fighting the powers-that-be, when they see the chance of standing up and delivering some real blows, when in fact they've been doing that where they've been building up your own organized forces, when the party's been built broadly and deeply among the masses, when other revolutionary forms of organization among the masses have been developed, when the middle classes are splitting and many of them are losing their allegiance to the system: that's the situation you'd want to be in. And you do want to have crises in the system—you not only want to have crises in the system, you have to have crises in the system.

In the "Could We" article you referred to I pointed out—it doesn't say to someone who says "you're just going to have to wait until you have this or that"—that, when you've been building up your own organized forces, when the party's been built broadly and deeply among the masses, when other revolutionary forms of organization among the masses have been developed, when the middle classes are splitting and many of them are losing their allegiance to the system: it's a situation like that that you'd want politically in order to be able to then go over to launching an insurrection. And you do want to have crises in the system. And you want to be able to act in conditions where you're not just waiting, you're not acting out of a sense that you're waiting. This will definitely be a case of trying to do something that hasn't been done to someone who says "you're just going to have to wait until the conditions are right, until you're acting on the brink of collapse, until it is more like the conditions that situations, where only a small number of people get things started and you can take your side right at the beginning."

New Book To Be Published This Summer

IN THE AFTERMATH OF THE PERSIAN GULF WAR

"COULD WE REALLY

BY BOB AVAKIAN

Revolutionaries, especially Marxist revolutionaries, are famous for the view that "the power of the people is greater than the Man's technology." That was a spirit that marked the '60s in particular—with the struggle of the Vietnamese people being an important and inspiring example. But the U.S. war against Iraq, with massive "high tech" deployment, has posed new challenges to this view. How could a revolutionary army hope to defeat the modern imperialist powers? In this interview Bob Avakian explores this question, and concludes: the power of the people is still greater than the Man's technology. But he argues that to make it so requires combining the decisive thing—the revolutionary energy of the masses—with a scientific doctrine and strategy for people's war. With that combination, he concludes, once the necessary conditions emerge, a people's war could have a real chance for success—even in a country like the U.S.

HELP GET THIS BOOK OUT SOON!

Send contributions to: RCP Publications, P.O. Box 3486, Merchandise Mart, Chicago, IL 60610

Bob Avakian, Chairman of the RCP
would then be seen as a reckless adventure.
And then you might very well get a real crisis in government. You would need something like that—that is one of the necessary conditions for launching an armed insurrection in an imperialist country.

You'd want this in an overall sense and also more particularly because this would be reflected in the imperialist armed forces. I'm not saying they wouldn't be able to fight at all, but you'd want to have as much turmoil and division as possible in the ranks of the enemy, including within their armed forces. The launching of an armed insurrection is the first step in a revolutionary war in a country like the U.S. would have to be based to a large degree on political and social conditions like this. You'd have to have these kinds of conditions. This is the first necessary condition spoken to in "Could We." It doesn't say you can just go off and start the armed struggle in a country like the U.S. whenever anybody wants to. In fact it criticizes that view, it starts right out criticizing that view and says you have to have certain necessary conditions. And the first one it mentions is a serious crisis in society and in government.

You do have to have these necessary conditions. But, on the other hand, you don't have to have a situation where the ruling structures are ready to topple on their own.

Excerpt 3 next week.

Imperialist countries have been rocked by major crises over the past century.

This interview further develops the thesis in an earlier work by Bob Avakian, "Could We Really Win? The Possibility of Revolutionary War." It does so through a serious examination of the military strengths and weaknesses demonstrated by the imperialist side in the Gulf war—comparing and contrasting their forces and way of fighting to the potential strengths of the people.
Abortion Banned

The attacks on women's right to abortion continue to pick up. Last month the Supreme Court ruled that all federally funded clinics are prohibited from giving any abortion counseling and cannot even mention the "A" word. Now Louisiana has passed the most restrictive abortion law in the country.

According to Louisiana's new law, all abortions will be outlawed except when necessary to save the life of the woman or in very narrowly defined cases of rape and incest. There are no provisions for a woman whose health is threatened by her pregnancy. And in cases of rape, the woman will have to make a police report within seven days and have to be examined within five days by a doctor other than the one who would perform the abortion to determine whether she was pregnant before the rape. This law prohibits virtually all abortions in the state. And the penalties for breaking this law are harsh: anyone performing an illegal abortion could be sentenced to a prison term of one to ten years and fined $10,000 to $100,000. Amendments to this bill were introduced—one would allow abortions in cases of tubal pregnancies and in the case of fetuses with life-threatening deformities, and another would have given women who had been raped 30 days to report to a doctor and 45 days to report to the police. But all these were soundly defeated.

After state legislators passed this law, the governor of Louisiana, Buddy Roemer, vetoed it. But only days later, for the first time this century, the Louisiana legislature overrode a governor's veto and the bill became law. The anti-abortionists even came law. The anti-abortionists even came law. The anti-abortionists even came law. The anti-abortionists even came.

COURT GIVES GREEN LIGHT TO STATE MOVES AGAINST ABORTION

In July 1989 the Supreme Court ruling in the case of Webster v. Reproductive Health Services gave states the right to restrict women's right to abortion. And Louisiana is only one of a number of states that have since this ruling proposed bills and enacted laws to make it extremely difficult for a woman to get an abortion. A number of these laws have been legally challenged and are headed toward the Supreme Court. And of these cases could be used by the court to overturn Roe v. Wade, the 1973 Supreme Court decision that made abortion legal.

Pennsylvania law now requires that women notify their husband that they intend to get an abortion. They must undergo a 24-hour waiting period and receive "counseling about fetal development. This law was found unconstitutional by a Federal District court last year and was argued before a Federal appeals court in February 1991. It's now possible this case could go before the Supreme Court in its next session, beginning in October.

A law was passed in the U.S. "trust territory" of Guam that allows abortions only when the pregnancy poses a great risk to the woman's health or endangers her life.

The state of Utah now bans most abortions, providing exceptions only in cases of grave risk to the mother or the woman's health. Enforcement of this law has been delayed because of a lawsuit now in Federal District Court.

Supreme Court Upholds Global Anti-Abortion Rules

On June 3 the Supreme Court refused to hear a challenge to a Federal policy cutting off family planning grants to overseas organizations that spend money on activities related to abortion.

The U.S. regulations on family planning funding for other countries stems from a policy statement announced by the Reagan administration at the U.N. International Population Conference in Mexico City in 1984. This statement established new terms for all grants and agreements between the U.S. Agency for International Development (AID) and organizations that support family planning services in other countries. Since 1973 Federal law had prohibited Federal funds from being used for providing abortions overseas. But the 1984 "Mexico City Policy," as it became known, took this anti-abortion regulation even further. It basically said that no funds would be given to any family planning organization that was involved in providing abortion services, counseling or information about abortion or lobbying against restrictive abortion laws—even if these services were provided with separate funds.

This has been a major blow to family planning organizations around the world. AID oversees U.S. government foreign aid programs in the Third World and is the major source of family planning funds in the world. The $220 million it spent in 1990 accounted for 40 percent of all such spending in the Third World.

The move by the Supreme Court to let this policy stand came only ten days after its anti-abortion decision in the case of Roe v. Sullivan. In this case they ruled that federally funded clinics in the U.S. are prohibited from even talking about abortion with patients. This means that literally millions of women, especially poor women and women of color, will be denied the right to abortion—and even the right to get information about abortion to help choose how they want to deal with their pregnancy.

The overseas funding is even more restrictive. Federally funded clinics in the U.S. can still provide abortion services if they use different funds and set up offices and facilities that are administratively and physically separate. But according to the regulations on overseas funds, organizations that provide any kind of abortion services will have their Federal aid cut off even if they segregate the facilities for these services and use separate money.

Today some 200,000 women a year die in Third World countries from illegal abortions—one woman every three minutes. And the anti-abortion foreign policy by the U.S. government greatly contributes to this murderous situation.
ATTACKS ON ABORTION RIGHTS AIMED AT OUTLAWING ABORTION

With a number of state abortion laws being legally challenged, the Supreme Court can choose various approaches to how it will continue its attack on women's right to abortion. The Pennsylvania law puts various procedural obstacles in the way of women getting abortions but does not actually put a flat ban on most abortions. So the Supreme Court could hear this case and only decide on narrowly, using it to impose more restrictions on abortion. But they could also use this case to make a much broader ruling and overturn or significantly alter Roe v. Wade.

According to legal experts, the Guam or Utah case could also lead to broader Supreme Court rulings on Roe v. Wade. But only the Louisiana law, which does not make an exception for women whose health is endangered by a pregnancy, would absolutely force the court to address the fundamental issue of women's right to abortion. And anti-abortion forces, in this country are hoping that this would be the opportunity for the court to outlaw abortion altogether.

The Louisiana Attorney General said he was anxious for this case to reach the Supreme Court as soon as possible. He held the press. "We believe that this law will be found to be constitutional and Roe v. Wade will be overturned."

If the Supreme Court does use one of these cases to overturn Roe v. Wade, this would not mean a new federal law would go into effect governing abortions. The Court's decision would instead give states the right to pass their own abortion laws, using the high court's decision as guidance and backing. And even if none of these cases is used to actually outlaw abortion, there is clearly an ongoing movement in this country to put harder and harder restrictions on abortion and, for all practical purposes, to outlaw abortion for more and more women.

LAW PROMOTES "UNBORN CHILD" LIE

The Louisiana bill also is an attempt to write into law the reactionary political and religious ideas of the anti-abortion movement. The law states that "life begins at conception" and says that the state has a compelling interest in "protecting the greatest extent possible, the life of the unborn from the time of conception until birth."

This is the view that's being used to make it seem like abortion is about killing "unborn children." And this wording is meant to set a legal precedent for future to be treated as human beings with "equal rights."

Last month's Supreme Court ruling preventing federally funded clinics from giving abortion counseling also explicitly referred to fetuses as "unborn children." a number of times. All this is meant to make women feel defensive and guilty about abortion. And it's used to play on people's emotions and justify treating women like incubators. But this is a lie! Fetuses are NOT children and abortion is NOT murder! And a woman should never be apologetic about choosing an abortion for whatever reasons she may have.

The "life begins at conception" wording also opens the door to other measures aimed at controlling women's reproduction. For instance the American Civil Liberties Union has pointed out that the Louisiana abortion law could bar doctors from prescribing certain contraceptive methods. The intrauterine device or low-dose birth control pills work by stopping a pregnancy after conception. So technically, the law could make it illegal for doctors to give women these contraceptives. In response to this claim by the ACLU, the Louisiana Attorney General refused to rule out the possibility that doctors could be prosecuted for prescribing such contraceptives.

WOMEN'S LIVES COME FIRST!

Terri Bartlet, the executive director of Planned Parenthood of Louisiana, said, "The truth hidden in this bill is that men don't trust women and don't think we are capable of making our own decisions.

Norma McCorvey, who was "Jane Roe" in the 1973 Roe v. Wade Supreme Court case, said, "I don't understand why people still can't understand this means nothing except that women will be butchered. They won't stop even if they are women die from it." And this is exactly what this law will mean if it is upheld by the courts. And in fact this is exactly what these restrictions on abortion will mean: more women's lives threatened, many women's lives ruined, many doctors arrested.

Esther McCain, director of the Delta Women's Clinic in Baton Rouge, reported, "We actually had one patient in tears asking us how she could abort herself. That is what this law is all about, humiliating women and denying them to use safe actions."

The Evil Wind blowing against women in Louisiana must be stopped and defeated. As attacks on abortion continue to pile up, there is an urgent need for a mass, militant response from the masses of women (and men) who are outraged at these attempts to turn women into nothing but breeders and incubators. Women must have the right to choose, and all these attacks on abortion must be defeated!

Deadly Facts

The following statistics are from a report by the Worldwatch Institute, a private, non-profit policy research organization based in Washington, D.C. The author of this report is Jodi L. Jacobson:

• One million women will die and 100 million will be maimed this year in a "global epidemic of reproductive health problems."

• Reproductive health problems claim the lives of 10 times more women than AIDS does of men, women and children combined.

• Only 25-30 percent of women throughout Africa and Asia receive prenatal care and the majority of women in developing countries (outside of China) are denied access to safe abortion services.

• Complications of pregnancy, childbirth and unsafe abortion are the chief killers of women of reproductive age throughout the world.

• Pregnancy-related problems account for less than one percent of deaths among women between the ages of 15 and 49 in the United States and Europe. But throughout the developing world, pregnancy-related problems account for 20 to 45 percent of all deaths of women of childbearing age.

• Only $1.50 invested per woman per year would enable most nations to reduce maternal deaths by more than 60 percent.
When the "welcome home" parade marched through downtown Cleveland on June 15, the largest, most dramatic sight was a huge protest banner which read in bold black and white lettering: "100,000+ Iraqis Dead in Desert Slaughter. We Didn't Support the War, We Won't Celebrate the Victory!" Surrounding the banner, like clouds of doom were 1,500 black balloons imprinted with the words: "100,000+ The Human Toll!" and held in bunches by demonstrators dressed in black.

If New York City was the "roughest of all parades," this one was a second cousin. Sponsored by a local TV station, it was part small-town parade with lots of high school bands and tacky local business promotion, and part imperialist military display of marching units and tank drivers giving the "we're Number 1" salute. Spectators lined up two, and three deep were 85 percent white—this in a downtown normally filled with Black shoppers on Saturday. The parade was an alien presence, a gluttonous celebration of the U.S. massacre of the Iraqi people and the "new world order." A young man watching the parade said, "This is just like a Nazi parade—the only thing different is the flag."

A determined group of protesters came together in the weeks before the parade. The coalition of activists, calling themselves "100,000 Black Balloons," were aged 16 to 84 and included anti-war activists, artists, RCP supporters, RCYB members, and Central America activists. They argued against others in the movement who said that it was best just to ignore the parade and not try to organize protests against it. Within the coalition some people had fears of getting physically attacked by reactionaries at the parade, but they still felt strongly they had to take a clear stand on the issue of the U.S. War Machine. News of protests against victory parades in other cities greatly encouraged the people in the coalition.

The demonstrators set up at a major intersection before the parade started. "It's 12 o'clock and we're here to say we won't celebrate a massacre!" said a woman wearing a death mask on the megaphone. Immediately those in front holding balloons and the banner were confronted by a dozen flag-wavers chanting "USA! USA!" and spitting at the protesters. The demonstrators stood strong and shouted back, "The Iraqi People Are Our Sisters and Brothers! We Won't Kill for the Profit of OiLand!" and "From Baghdad to Rodney King, Stop the U.S. War Machine!" At the parade started, protesters yelled "Shame!" and pointed fingers at the military units. Later they moved to a more populated shopping area where lots of Black people go.

Further down the street the RCBY and friends carried out a bold action. Carrying duct tape and a banner reading "Murder on Parade—This Vehicle's Bloody Tour: Vietnam, Grenada, Panama, Iraq...Stop the U.S. War Machine!", they dashed into the street and attempted to attach the banner to the side of a military vehicle. One youth climbed on the side of a convoy truck in the parade. The SWAT team and pigs on horses brutalized the youth and arrested two on charges of aggravated disorderly conduct and resisting arrest. As the youths were dragged across the street, they continued chanting "Stop the U.S. war machine! No matter what it takes" with such determination that TV newscasters that night opened with the scene. After this action more and more people came up for leaflets and some even joined the coalition.

The 100,000 Black Balloon protest brought together a diverse group of people: individuals from groups who had refused to endorse the action; artists who had never come to political protests before; high school youth; attorneys, doctors and...
Hundreds Dis Oakland Parade

"It ain't a welcome home, it's like a protest parade. . . We felt like there were more demonstrators than supporters." 

A Negro who was in the June 14 Oakland victory parade

The powers were determined to put on a successful show in Oakland to celebrate the U.S. victory in the Gulf war. The stakes were high-Oakland has a large Black population, and there are many Black politicians in the government. They wanted to be able to say that in the Bay Area, Black people supported the war—especially after the parade a few weeks ago across the Bay in San Francisco was crushed by protesters (see RW #603). Retired Rear Admiral Toney, the Black president of the Chamber of Commerce and main spokesman for the parade, led the charge. He told the press he wanted to let the country know that despite the Bay Area's "legacy for peace," when "what happens we don't shrink from it."

The parade was held downtown during a weekday lunchtime to ensure an audience. Military officers were let out of work to go to the parade. But all these plans backfired. Hundreds of people joined the 500 to 600 demonstrators in disrupting the parade. The official speeches were drowned out by the protesters' chants, and the parade was disrupted several times. The Oakland protest turned out to be even larger and more powerful than the one against the San Francisco parade.

Oakland is a city where the masses of Black people face harsh poverty and oppression—the city has an infant mortality rate twice as high as many poor Third World countries. There is much anger against the Gulf war and injustices here in this country. A Black protestor told the RW, "I am definitely a protestor. I think America was wrong from the beginning, and what we have to be proud of, I don't see how they can get an African-American or anybody to participate and to be proud of what they done—kill innocent people. Here in Oakland, we're killed on the streets. It's wrong!"

Coming off the successful protest against the San Francisco parade, the anti-war forces were able to organize even more broadly this time. Activists united in the Coalition to Oppose the Celebration of Slaughter. Leaflets went out and word of mouth spread widely. In the days before the parade the media extensively quoted Refuse & Resist! and other groups speaking against the parade. The editorial page ran an editorial admitting that "extreme right-wing groups" were "disrupting" the celebration. The editorial went on to say that while "reasonable people" could agree to "free expression" the editorial warned that demonstrations had no right to disrupt the "order and peaceful celebration" and should make sure that "peaceful" protestors were "non-violent." At the parade site, the Coalition's Black mayor Ethel Harris was a no-show—a Cadillac convertible with a sign bearing his name (which was misspelled) rode on with out him. The cops searched backpacks and ticketed "jaywalkers." A driver who hooked in support of the protestors was pulled over and given a ticket. A protestors drawing U.S. flags on the sidewalk no people would have to walk on them was arrested. Seven people were arrested before the parade even began. Over 30 people were arrested during the day, and three protestors had to be treated at the hospital for injuries inflicted by the police.

But police harassment could not stop the protestors from disrupting the parade in many different ways. As the parade began, two people jumped in front of and under a truck loaded with weaponry. The truck underphased onto the side so the truck couldn't move, and the cops had to pull him off. A few blocks down, a review group went into action. This group included activists from Stop the U.S. War Machine Action Network, Bay Area Religious Peace Activists (BARA), an RCP supporter and Jeff Patterson, the first GI resistor during the Gulf war. The BARA activists formed a line across the parade route. They knocked down and mocked the parade as other activists unfurled a 20-foot banner saying "Stop the U.S. War Machine. No Matter What It Takes" and attempted to secure a chain across the street. Two of the religious activists were beaten up by the police and arrested.

According to an observer, "Jeff Patterson jumped onto one of the M88 tank recovery vehicles and attempted to chain himself to it. The driver popped out from within and grabbed at the chain while two other Marines yelled at Jeff to get off and tried to dump him off onto his head. The Oakland police wrestled him to the ground and put him in a police van while onlookers shouted, 'There's our real hero!'"

Members of the Coalition to Oppose the Celebration of Slaughter jumped into the parade carrying a red and black banner saying "An Amnesty Now for All War Resisters!" and marched for a block until shoved onto the sidewalk. Eggs splattered some of the tanks and other military vehicles. Hundreds of protestors on the sidewalk carried black balloons and pictures of Iraqi children killed by U.S. bombs and chanted "Shame, Shame, Shame." There were youth, students, religious people and activists from the Pledge of Resistance, United Black Arnold, Anti-War, the anti-Nuclear Emergency Committee to Stop the U.S. War in the Middle East, and various other groups. Newspaper review groups where the parade supporters were the thickest, the chants of the protestors were so loud that scheduled speakers just gave up and sat down.

Many people who came out to the parade also took up red and black balloons and black balloons, and the protest went on to over a thousand people. "Too many lives were lost," a Black secretary who was at the protest said while her friend nodded. "Too many children died. I think they should be proud of the victory parades. There's no victory in murder."

A 45-year-old Black man said "This protest is something I can get into. I disagreed with the war even at the start. You know, it's the latest in a long line of moves by the government—Panama, Grenada, Vietnam and on back. It has to stop somehow, sometime. There is no glory in killing innocent people."

At the end of the parade the military vehicles headed for Jack London Square where they were to be on display. Several hundred protestors heading for the area were viciously attacked by the cops when they parked in front of the police station. Several people, including an RCPY member and a student from the City College, were severely beaten. The protestors continued to march and joined up with a group of religious activists who had positioned themselves in front of the tanks at Jack London Square. Some soldiers in camou-
The Pig Execution of Nathan Lackland-Logan

In the early evening of Wednesday, June 5, Boston police executed Nathan Lackland-Logan, a 25-year-old Black man, in the Jamaica Plain neighborhood of Boston. Two while plainclothes officers chased Nathan from his apartment building to the Bromley Heath Housing Project after receiving a call on an attempted mugging in the area. The cops chased Nathan into a deserted hallway. Moments later, Nate Logan lay dead on the floor of the police precinct. The initial report was that Logan was shot in the back of the head. The next day the official autopsy confirmed that Nathan’s family and BHA residents had been correct. Logan was shot in the back of the head, no bullets were found in the police murder.

A team distributing the flyers went to people of oppressed nationalities in Boston and from other countries. The response was overwhelming. Many people said it was good we were there and thanked us. On repeated occasions, we found this sort of support from people from other countries, and that was determined. There were instances of soldiers giving the thumbs-up as they passed by the protest. The police insisted that they were Black, but it was clearly a justifiable homicide.

As the facts of Nate’s killing started to come out, the media jumped to the defense of the Boston Police Department. Two days after the killing, the Boston Globe ran two articles side by side; one highlighting the supposedly rare use of deadly force by the Boston police over the last ten years, the second exclusively devoted to Nathan’s criminal record. The following day the Globe again ran two articles, one detailing how Nathan would have been in jail except for a state law that allows people convicted in a trial by a judge the automatic right to a second trial by jury. Radio talks shows featured reactionaries backing up how Nate was a criminal element and “got what he deserved.”

But none of this has played with the family of Nathan Lackland, the residents of Bromley Heath or the streets of Jamaica Plain. A couple of BHA residents talked about how it is common knowledge that over the last ten years every victim of a police shooting in Boston but one has been Black or Hispanic. And it is also common knowledge that every cop but one who has been in involved in a shooting over the last ten years is back on the street. That one cop was involved in the shooting of a white man in South Boston.

On the Saturday night following the killing, hundreds of people gathered for a candlelight vigil in the project. This was called by Nate Logan’s family, many of whom live in Bromley Heath. Most of the marchers were youth from the project, but there were also a number of older residents. For many of these older people “street crime” is a very big issue—and one that the powers-that-be have used as a wedge between them and the youth and between the poorer black people and the more middle-class people in surrounding neighborhoods. But their presence was an important indication that they aren’t going along with the power structure’s plan to say the police murderers are supported by the community as a necessary part of battling “crime in the streets.” For many Nate Logan’s murder is just another reminder that the cops are the real criminals on the streets. And it’s posed the challenging question of what it is going to take to end this shit once and for all.

Cleveland

Continued from page 12

religious people who came out of a deep sense of moral outrage against the police murder. Friendly photographers and lawyers acted as observers in cases of arrest and police brutality. An antifa was in a Black suit and with yellow ribbons binding his wrists and his mouth was right up in the face of the patriotic yahoos.

A team distributing the flyers was surrounded by rapid reactions and the verbal attack by quietly asking questions about why we were there. She said she was there for her brother, who had been killed by the police.

On the Saturday night following the killing, hundreds of people gathered for a candlelight vigil in the project. This was called by Nate Logan’s family, many of whom live in Bromley Heath. Most of the marchers were youth from the project, but there were also a number of older residents. For many of these older people “street crime” is a very big issue—and one that the powers-that-be have used as a wedge between them and the youth and between the poorer black people and the more middle-class people in surrounding neighborhoods. But their presence was an important indication that they aren’t going along with the power structure’s plan to say the police murderers are supported by the community as a necessary part of battling “crime in the streets.” For many Nate Logan’s murder is just another reminder that the cops are the real criminals on the streets. And it’s posed the challenging question of what it is going to take to end this shit once and for all.

In Cleveland.

Family of Nathan Lackland-Logan issues a statement denouncing the police murder.

Family of Nathan Lackland-Logan issues a statement denouncing the police murder.
Mount Pleasant Revolutionary Communiqué

History was made on May 5th & 6th during the Mount Pleasant Rebellion. Our Latino sisters and brothers rebelled against the cold-blooded attempted murder by the pigs of Daniel Gomez and Black people immediately joined in. The powers-that-be and some others are saying that when Blacks joined in is when the looting and vandalizing of stores jumped off and that this is unrelated to the attempted police murder of Daniel Gomez. This is bullshit! This is a attempt by the powers-that-be to divide and conquer the people. First of all, those in power have looted, vandalized and robbed Africa, Central America and the whole fuckin' world and have no right to speak! In other words: Shut The Fuck Up! Secondly, when they talk about looting and vandalizing, what really upsets them is the fact that the way the wealth is distributed under their pig system was changed a little bit during the rebellion. That is, the people just took and distributed some of the things that ain’t normally distributed to them. Black and Latino people were down with this—and there was nothing your murdering police could do about it because they were too busy running for their lives.

This is very much related to what happened to Daniel Gomez. People from El Salvador are forced to come here because America is robbing and exploiting their country—keeping the people poor and in thrall to conditions and having organized death squads against the people so they can continue to do this.

Black people are here because they were kidnapped from Africa and put in slavery. And the masses of Black people are kept down and poor today because this is a white supremacist system, based on organized greed, and it has weapons of mass destruction to back this up.

We need revolution. We need power! Our people, those of us on the bottom of society—Black, Latino & white—need power, power over the wealth, the economics, politics, media, the military, power over all society. It is only then that we can begin to put an end to the oppression and suffering of the people.

Why did Blacks join in the rebellion with Latinos?

1. Because the pigs shot Daniel Gomez because he is a Latino immigrant.
2. The same thing happens to Black people all the time under this white supremacist system. The police beating of Rodney King in Los Angeles and the pig murder of Frankie Murphy in SE (DC) are just two recent examples.
3. The rebellion against this shit was like a open house celebration where the people were given an invitation to turn the tables on these pigs and take instead of being given a taste of freedom and a little taste of the unity of the people. Now that we got a little taste of freedom and a little taste of the unity of the people, the powers-that-be can not stop the people from beginning to overcome the divisions between the people that your system breeds and it couldn’t stop the people from beginning to direct our anger at you and your funky red, white and blue and yellow system of oppression and murder. They are not gonna let your bullshit of divide and conquer get over on us now.

During the Mount Pleasant rebellion we got a little taste of freedom and a little taste of the unity of the people. Now that we got a taste of it all, we want power and we want all-the-way revolution here and all over the world. The powers-that-be can’t give this to us. We must and will take it.

Right now we want justice for Daniel Gomez and Frankie Murphy. We do n’t want more police! The police, whether Black, white or Latino, are pig enforcers of oppression, exploitation, white supremacy and they serve and protect this pig system of organized greed. We don’t want so-called jobs or whitewash investigations. We want Justice! We want Revolution!

Supporters and Comrades of the Revolutionary Communist Party (RCP), USA

Oakland
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flags fatigues stood on top of cars waving U.S. flags and yellow ribbons while white would-be Rambo’s in the crowd shouted obscenities particularly directed at the women protesters. A few soldiers quietly took the leaflets that Vietnam Veterans Against the War (VVAW) had given to police and their officers.

As the scene got hotter and louder, one Marine sergeant was heard to say, “Men, get ready to get out of here. I am not going to put up with this for another four hours.” The tanks retreated after only 30 minutes on display.

A Black man stood with the protesters and smiled: “I’m against the troops—what about you? They had no business being over there. They killed innocent civilians. I don’t like the crimes this country commits on the Third World, the weaker nations.” A Latino prosterian on a bicycle out riding with his two small sons said, “This protest is good. It was not a war—it was a crime.”

Mount Pleasant rebellion, May 5.
The recently concluded U.S.-led war against Iraq may well prove to be a signal event of the new decade. The imperialists have won their blood-soaked victory, and seized some initiative for the time being. But despite their braggadocio, how history will finally write the balance sheets on this criminal war is far from determined, and the millions worldwide who for a time stormed into political life will have much to say about that. In this sense, the war is not over. Thus this issue contains several articles focusing on the U.S. war in the Gulf...