Showdown: 19 Years After Roe v. Wade

Women Are Not Incubators! Abortion Without Apology!

See pages 3, 4, 5
Word Up for Ice Cube Review

Word up to the RW for its insightful, revolutionary critique of Ice Cube's album and the response of his bourgeois critics. The RW was on the money when it correctly pointed out the hypocrisy of the bourgeois attack on Ice Cube. The real threat that these backward forces are concerned about is the threat to the game plan to have the so-called "stars" of the oppressed communities around the country destroying each other while the government gets fat off the labor and resources of the people. We do not buy the hope that suddenly these mouthpieces for the ruling class are concerned about women's rights as their social structure attacks women's fundamental right to control over their bodies, or that the country, which provided refuge for Nazis after WW2, is concerned about Ice Cube's anti-semitism, or that this country, which invaded Korea and murdered thousands of its inhabitants to increase its profits, cares about Korean merchants.

The real concern for these laggards and running dogs is that a Black youth is getting some political consciousness. That he would want to kill Uncle Sam at a time when the country is trying to foster punishment down the throats of the ever growing unemployed masses and by making criminals ofajuveniles and women who refuse to accept a backward tide to the days of male dominance. As the article pointed out, and as I pointed out in my review of Ice Cube's album in the Black Arts Bulletin, Ice Cube and others like him must understand the contradiction between racism and capitalism, between class domination and racism, and between capitalism and racism. They must continue their political development until they can see clearly the imperialist oppressors as the real source of our oppression. Ice Cube and his fans should hurriedly sign up subscriptions to the RW so that they can get some "science" to go with their developing political consciousness, so that killing Uncle Sam becomes a more possible goal.

Artist in the Struggle, Kenneth Cardoza, Washington D.C.

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 this 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 the 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 the system and create a new system that will put an end to exploitation and oppression and take the road way to a whole new world.

3) Such a revolutionary struggle is possible. There is a political Party that is dedicated to lead such a struggle, and that Party speaks and acts for those who must be united and enable them to do what must be done. There is an opportunity for 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 learn 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 change that is a social and real chance of winning.
SHOWDOWN: 19 Years After Roe v. Wade

A STRAIGHT UP WARNING TO THE PEOPLE: We are at an historic political crossroads over a most fundamental right of women. And the forces of resistance are far from ready to do what needs to be done. This must change—and quickly. A different political line and spirit must come to the fore.

The top powers of this society are determined to deny the right of women to control their own reproduction. And this must be a deep concern of everyone who believes in liberation. Nineteen years ago, on January 22, 1973, abortion was made legal nationwide. And ever since, powerful forces have attacked that legal right of women. This line says that pro-choice forces must remain respectful and respectable. This line argues that tactics must be ultimately geared to helping half-hearted “allies” in the Democratic party win elections. The opponents of abortion rights claim to have “high moral ground.” But their movement sprang from the same “moral ground” as the burning stake of the witch trials and the lynching tree of the KKK. The leadership of this movement claims to be “pro-family”—but the family it wants to impose is a prison cell where domineering men rule. This movement does not “support life”—it is for strangling the lives of women. We need a new line—on the basis of science and solidarity. One recent example: Pro-choice women were actively discouraged from going to Wichita to drive out the reactionaries who had seized the national spotlight there. It was said that confronting these stormtroopers would “alienate” the mainstream. In the months ahead, new outrages are certain. The enemy has moved women—Abortion is a medical procedure that ends a pregnancy. Abortion is not murder. The Class Alignment of the Abortion Battle Needs To Change

The struggle for the liberation of women is too often seen as a “middle-class women’s issue.” If it is contested, women cannot be liberated. And major forms of oppression in this society can’t be overthrown either.

The movement to defend abortion rights must speak to the question that has kept women and the oppressed nationalities from adding their struggle to the battle. Women of color have declared a war on women—now it’s time for the people to go on the offensive. To take these reactionaries on, people need a clear stand of “abortion without apology.” To defeat them, people need a clear line—on the basis of science and solidarity. The Class Alignment of the Abortion Battle Needs To Change
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Statement by Mary Lou Greenberg On the Anniversary of Roe v. Wade

They've Gone Too Far Already! Not One Step Further!

January 22 is the 19th anniversary of the Supreme Court's Roe vs. Wade decision which legalized abortion in the U.S. It is a day that the anti-abortionists and the whole male-dominant crew, from the White House on down, have tried to take away from us. But this year, January 22, Roe vs. Wade Day, must be a day to declare a fresh determination for a powerful new offensive against all the attacks on abortion rights.

We need to strategize, organize, and politicize the masses of women and men on a whole new level. The experience of women who have done serious battle on this front needs to be summed up and shared, and a whole new generation needs to become leaders in this fight. Bread unity needs to be built around meeting these attacks with mass resistance. Schools, communities, workplaces must be part of building the battle, and many new forest must be activated.

As a kickoff to this counter-offensive, we must strengthen women's resolve not to be apologetic or defensive about abortion. Women must not feel guilty about having abortions for whatever reason. Women are not incubators, fetuses are not children, and abortion is not murder. So long as women have the right to control their lives—such as whether or not to give birth—they are in control of their lives. And when we fight for abortion rights for all women, we must fight against the forced sterilization of poor women and women of color, of parental consent laws which put the lives of young women in jeopardy, and there are no abortion providers for women living in vast areas of the country.

By withholding financial aid, the U.S. government has imposed their values on women throughout the Third World. Our stand must be: they've go too far already! Not one step further! We can turn these people down and shut them up. From vicious attacks to enforced purification, to trying to ram reactionary traditional values down people's throats—if a part of the power agenda to keep a lid on the people. Attacks on the right to abortion are a key part of this agenda because the question of who controls the reproductive functions of women is key to the overall status of women in society. And the power that they need this kind of social control—especially in times of economic and political crisis. We must build the battle, and many new forests must be activated.

As a step of this offensive, we must strengthen women's resolve not to be apologetic or defensive about abortion. Women must not feel guilty about having abortions for whatever reason. Women are not incubators, fetuses are not children, and abortion is not murder. So long as women have the right to control their lives—such as whether or not to give birth—they are in control of their lives. And when we fight for abortion rights for all women, we must fight against the forced sterilization of poor women and women of color, for a broader reproductive rights agenda that en- includes the right of women to have children if they wish.

People need to see that the attacks on abortion and on women's reproductive freedom generally are part of a broader reaction against the power of the people. But one can see this year, January 22, Roe vs. Wade Day, must be a day to declare a fresh determination for a powerful new offensive against all the attacks on abortion rights.
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In 1973, nineteen years ago, anti-abortion laws were struck down by the Supreme Court decision called Roe versus Wade. Abortion became legal. This was a concession made by the ruling class after the '60s upheavals and after women had shifted into the workplace in large numbers.

Since then, the battle over who controls reproduction and women's lives has only intensified. Powerful forces have fought a simple parody to turn the clock back to lighter male and government controls on women. There is an open danger that Roe will be overturned in the next couple of years—which would allow states to ban abortion.

Meanwhile, from the highest levels, the ruling powers have been chipping away at the right to choose—piece by piece. Millions of women are already prevented from ending unwanted pregnancies. The powers now allow states and parents special rights to regulate abortions. They have cut off government medical funding for abortion—sentencing countless poor women to forced childbirth, sterilization or both. They have approved red tape and legal harassment of abortion clinics. And they have stepped up legal conditions that would make abortion illegal for young women. According to the Roe v. Wade decision, all major political centers of this system are involved: the Supreme Court, the Congress, the White House, and many state governments.

Here are the high-level legal moves of the last 19 years: First legalizing abortions and then making it harder and harder for women to get them.

1973 Supreme Court Decision: Roe v. Wade

The Supreme Court threw out anti-abortion laws in 23 states. A pregnant woman and her doctor got the legal right to decide to perform an abortion. The Supreme Court argued that this right to choose abortion is part of the constitutional "right to privacy" recognized in 1965.

Although Roe was a historic concession to the struggle of women, this decision did not say that each woman has a fundamental right to control her own reproduction. Roe allows the states to outlaw some abortions—specifically abortion in the last third of a pregnancy. According to Roe there were still situations where the government could enforce the so-called "rights" of unborn humans over the life decisions of women.

1973 Congressional Legislation: The Helms Amendment

Congress said that U.S. foreign aid could not be used to finance abortions or counseling on abortion. Millions of women who rely on federally funded clinics were cut off from reproductive health care. The states went on record against the right to abortion—imposing this reactionary position on U.S.-funded clinics throughout the Third World.

1973 Supreme Court Decision: Doe v. Bolton

The Supreme Court struck down state abortion laws that required state residency or the approval of hospital committees for women seeking abortions.

1976 Supreme Court Decision: Planned Parenthood of Central Missouri v. Danforth

The Supreme Court threw out state laws that required women to get their husbands' permission for abortions. This decision said young women (so-called "minor") had a right to privacy. At the same time, the decision allowed states to set up red tape procedures that posed obstacles for women and the doctors performing abortions.

1977 Congressional Legislation: Hyde Amendment

Congress banned federal funding of abortion. This effectively banned abortions for millions of women who rely on federally financed medical care, including poor women who use Medicaid, women in federal prisons, women in rural areas and women on many military bases. Surgical sterilization could still be performed using federal funds—and so poor women often had sterilization forced on them.

1979 Supreme Court Decision: Belotti v. Baird

The Supreme Court gave states permission to make special regulations on abortion for young women as long as the regulations also gave these women the option of a legal hearing to seek an abortion. This legalized parental consent laws, and made parents the key to get pills, secret abortions. It gave parents—and especially fathers—new powers to control the sexuality and reproduction of young women. And it made it impossible for many young women to get abortions—especially those who can't afford lawyers or use the legal system to defy their parents. States immediately started passing laws requiring parental consent for teenage and restricting abortions for young women in other ways. Today 35 states have such laws.

1980 Supreme Court Decisions: Harris v. McRae and Williams v. Zbaraz

The Supreme Court upheld the federal Hyde Amendment. After this, many states banned abortion funding. Today only 13 states fund abortions.

1983 Supreme Court Decision: Akron Center for Reproductive Health v. the City of Akron

The Supreme Court knocked down some state-imposed restrictions on abortion, including waiting periods, mandatory lectures designed to intimidate women, a requirement that second trimester abortions be performed in hospitals, and special laws requiring special disposal of fetal tissue.

1986 Supreme Court Decision: Thornburgh v. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists of Pennsylvania

Reagan's attorney general openly demanded that the Supreme Court overturn Roe v. Wade and allow states to treat abortion as a crime. By a very narrow vote, the Supreme Court decided not to completely overturn Roe yet.

1988 Supreme Court Decision: Bowers v. Hardwick

The Supreme Court upheld that sex between two men could be treated as a serious felony—even if the so-called "sodomy" was performed in the privacy of their bedroom. Court opinionsters said that the "right to privacy" only existed under conditions of marriage and the creation of children. The essence of this argument was that the bourgeois legal concept of "privacy" is not a right for all individuals, but a patriarchal bourgeois legal concept of "privacy".

1989 Supreme Court Decision: Webster v. Reproductive Health Services

The Supreme Court upheld the right of states to enact sweeping restrictions of abortion. Under the ruling, a state-funded hospital can be forbidden to permit abortions. State-funded medical schools may be required to remove abortion from their curriculum. States may require doctors to examine how long a woman has been pregnant. The decision also allowed Missouri to write a law that said "the life of each human being begins at conception."

1990 Supreme Court Decisions: Hodgson v. Minnesota and Ohio v. Akron Center for Reproductive Health

The Supreme Court upheld that states could forbid abortions to young women who had not notified both their parents—even parents who had never lived with the woman. The ruling also said states could force a special waiting period on young women to give their parents time to pressure them not to have an abortion.

1991 Supreme Court Decision: Rust v. Sullivan

The Supreme Court upheld a White House decree forbidding doctors and counselors in federally funded clinics to even mention abortion to women. This ruling prevented women from getting honest and up-to-date medical advice about their own bodies and their legal options. The Supreme Court said this presidential gag rule was not a violation of freedom of speech. A few months later, the House of Representatives also refused to override the White House gag rule.

1991 Federal Appeals Court Decision Rejects Roe v. Wade

In October a federal Appeals Court upheld key provisions of Pennsylvania's anti-abortion law. The Appeals Court argued that Roe has already been so chipped away by Supreme Court decisions that it has now been undermined to the point of being dead.
Another victory has been won in the trial of the Pico-Union 21. The attempted political railroad of eight Los Angeles activists arrested on May Day 1990 ended last week when the prosecution moved to dismiss all charges rather than obey a court order to turn over secret files and names of agents from the LAPD Anti-Terrorist Division (ATD). This is something for people to celebrate.

The state was forced to retreat because they are desperate to cover up activities of the secret police and their involvement in the clampdown against the people. Since the videotaped police beating of Rodney King last year, there have been almost daily press reports in L.A. of police abuse. However, the activities of the secret police have not gotten much attention. Although they are the tip of a large iceberg, the revelations about the ATD through the Pico-Union 21 case have begun to shed light on the scope of their operations. And this has brought about the basis for further investigation of their dirty work.

The May Day defendants faced 15 misdemeanor charges for defying LAPD barricades and shutting down an Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) concentration camp in the Pico-Union barrio on International Workers Day. The barricades were put up under the guise of the “war on drugs” as the last phase of a plan to turn oppressed communities into Nazi-style ghettos. The protest kicked off a month and a half after the barricades were first put up and a nationwide network of INS concentration camps. Fifty-eight people were arrested during vicious police attacks on the demonstra- tion; the Pico-Union 21 are those who were later charged. The trial of the eight May Day defendants was the second of the several cases involving the Pico-Union 21. Last time the first trial of one of the 21 ended in victory when a Latino immigrant was acquitted of felony assault on an officer.

The government changed the charges in the May Day defendants’ trial seven times to try to find something that might stick. Four Deputy City Attorneys made court appearances. The prosecution had at least 20 separate files to use to try them. After all this, they tucked down rather than reveal information about political spying. The U.S. made a big deal about the fact that the East German Stasi and other secret police in Eastern Europe were forced to open their files by the demands of the people. But when it comes to opening up the files of the U.S. political police, the vaults are locked.

LAPD’s Arrogant Refusal

The stage was set for dismissal last month when the defense subpoenaed all ATD documents relating to May Day 1990, written before or after the demonstration, and the names of agents who were present. The ATD sent in Deputy City Attorney Linda Lefkowitz, the red squad’s long-time lawyer with a history of covering up secret police operations. She denied that the files were protected from release by “government privilege.” But after a closed session in the judge’s chambers, the judge ordered the material turned over.

When the judge finally came to turn over the information, Lefkowitz refused straight up to obey the court order. She even red, either in open court or in the privacy of the judge’s chambers, to make any argument about why the files should be con-

fidential. After the judge said she would tell the jury that the LAPD was hiding things that might prove that all the cops were lying (which would have exposed the cover-up even more), the prosecution moved for a dismissal. One of the defense lawyers commented to the RN, “This is the first time in my life where I’ve just come face to face with the arrogance of the LAPD... when they’ve said, ‘We’ve got power over our selves and we don’t have to answer to anybody.’”

Putting the Heat on the ATD

The ATD is not the only LAPD unit involved in political repression, but the defense focused on it for a number of reasons. Organized in 1963 out of the old red squad, the Public Disorder Intelligence Division (PVID), the ATD reports directly to Chief Pig Daryl Gates, bypassing the normal LAPD bureaucracy. It’s headed by his brother, Steve Gates. During the trial the ATD was often mentioned by other pigs as a direct repository of information, and it was known that ATD personnel were present at least at one demonstration. There was also evidence that the involvement of higher levels of the LAPD. Certain activists like Saba, a woman leader of the Revolutionary Communist Youth Brigade (RCYB), were arrested, brutalized and threatened again and again. Decisions were made at top levels about who to prosecute and for what.

From the beginning of the proceedings over a year and a half ago, the police have had the support of those who face serious charges for their just struggle to turn over the spy files. The defense had a right to all the information they asked for in the course of the legal battle over the police clampdown. The court decision supports the ATD’s Rampart Division, whose area includes Pico-Union, testified that he is frequently involved in head- ing range of demonstrations. A 1984 court case against the secret police was interrupted by many people as forbidding the very kind of political surveillance that this case is designed to protect.

Several cops, including the head of Rampart Division, testified that confessions identified as "RCP demonstrations" were not "political demonstrations," since they had occurred with election-going on. The Revolutionary Communist Party did not sponsor any of the demonstrations Pico-Union, many of the participants supported the party’s political stand. The conditions under which the May Day protestors are being held are more intolerable and the hatred of the system and the police as its visible representatives is growing. The powers are moving full speed ahead with a police-state clampdown, including terror and murder, as well as permanent barricades used to create “ar- cratic communities” where the police control the lives of people’s lives. And as part of this, the powers are making blatant racist and fascist arguments. The West German state was forced to retreat because theu was so exposed as a racist and a Nazi; and most people among the demonstrators were neither. In this situation, further exposure about the ATD that the mayors even bigger problems for the bourgeoisie.

LAPD Backs Down, May First Fighters Go Free

The victory of the May Day defendants has created positive conditions in the struggle to drop all charges against the concentration camp fighters. It also opened up possibilities to step up the struggle against the despairs and militarization of the capitalist state. But felony charges of assaulting police are still pending against Roger and the Latino youth who tried to stop the concentration camp on May Day showing “Free my people” and “Down with the Klan!”

The actions of this brother are a precious example for the youth, and he must be free of all charges.

The Los Angeles Police Department has called on people to pack the courtroom for the hearings on January 21 at 9 a.m., Building, Temple and Broadway. The La Resistenza Defense Committee has called on people to pack the courtroom for the hearings on January 21 at 9 a.m., Division 56, 9th Floor, Criminal Courts Building, Temple and Broadway.

DROP ALL THE CHARGES!

FREE THE PICO-UNION 21!
Geronimo Ji Jaga Pratt Must Go Free!

On December 4, for the tenth time in 20 years, the parole board of California refused parole for Geronimo Ji Jaga Pratt. Geronimo has been held hostage as a political prisoner in Amerikkka for more than 20 years. He spent the first eight years of his confinement in the hole. He is being penalized for being a revolutionary, for fighting the government behind his frame-up, and for refusing to apologize for being a leader of the Southern California Chapter of the Black Panther Party.

In 1971 he was framed for a murder in Santa Monica. This frame-up was part of the COINTELPRO program—a coordinated effort by federal, state, and local police, as well as the courts and news media, to disrupt, neutralize and destroy the Black Panther Party. Much of this political police work was aimed at portraying the Panthers as a common criminal.

During his entire captivity Geronimo has been harassed and tortured by the prison system. The parole board has helped COINTELPRO efforts by painting Geronimo as a heroin addict and denying him as a political prisoner. Over a year ago Geronimo was sent to Tehachapi Prison. Tehachapi is over 400 miles from the San Francisco Bay Area where Ashaki Ji Jaga Pratt, Geronimo’s wife, lives with their two children. And Geronimo’s lawyers have been working on a request for a new trial. People on his visitor list have been denied visits. On April 1, 1991 Geronimo was placed in the hole of Tehachapi Prison in California on the word of another inmate that he had a marijuana cigarette. He spent seven months in the hole and was denied medical treatment for his high blood pressure. All this was done to try and isolate him, keep him in jail and make the point that “we can do this to you if you refuse to submit.”

Geronimo was framed up through the work of federal and local authorities. During his trial FBI wiretaps that proved Geronimo was in Oakland, over 400 miles from the scene of the murder, were destroyed. An FBI informant was the main witness for the prosecution. Informants were placed on his defense team. Geronimo was kept in solitary confinement for two years before and during his trial. His first wife, who was seven months pregnant at the time, was kidnapped off the street, shot in the stomach and head—her body, covered with cigarette burns, dumped along a freeway ramp. The police tried to pin the act on Geronimo as a heroin addict and deny him as a political prisoner.

Geronimo was kept in solitary confinement for two years before and during his trial. His first wife, who was seven months pregnant at the time, was kidnapped off the street, shot in the stomach and head—her body, covered with cigarette burns, dumped along a freeway ramp. The police tried to pin the act on Geronimo as a heroin addict and deny him as a political prisoner. His second wife was put in solitary confinement for two years before and during his trial. Her body was found buried under a pile of dirt.

Geronimo was given the death sentence for him would mean that much of the government’s dirty deeds during the ’60s and ’70s would come to the light of day. In 1979, under the Freedom of Information Act, mountains of FBI documents were released that revealed the frame-up against Geronimo, and his attorneys have tried to get these documents into court. But the courts have used flimsy excuses like saying they would not consider the case because his petition for a new trial was a few days late.
The RW Interview: Susan Faludi on the Undeclared War Against Women

This interview with Susan Faludi was done recently for the RW by Mary Lou Greenberg, spokesperson for the New York Branch of the RCP. Susan Faludi is the author of the best-selling book, Backlash: The Undeclared War Against American Women (Crow, 1991). She works with the San Francisco Bureau of the Wall Street Journal, and her articles have also appeared in Mother Jones and Ms. — Revolutions Worker—January 19, 1992
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MLG: It sounds to me like another example of blaming the victim.

SF: Right. It's a very effective tool when used on women who are taught to blame themselves, to say blame me or everybody else. It's a common technique for keeping women in their place. Blaming women is a very effective tool not just for individuals but for whole communities and societies.
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Ten, their own; and they are not elsewhere in our paper.

seemed to be another agenda here that came up about my wife had an abortion New York several years ago. which some-

"Ask my son who's his boss, and he'll say Daddy. My wife submits to me as I marry them, in some cases. It seemed that what they were really upset about was women exercising their independence and thinking autonomously, so that there seemed to be another agenda here that didn't have anything to do with "saving babies." It had to do with having their own male authority.

MLG: At one Operation Rescue meeting in New York several years ago, which someone infiltrated, a man stood up and said, "Ask my son who's his boss, and he'll say Daddy. My wife submits to me as I submit to God."

SP: I've heard that kind of thing before. They have these little pep rallies before they go out, and that seemed to be the point these ministers would keep on all the time, that this is the man's decision. Almost like it would be okay for abortion to be legal as long as the man could decide when his wife would have one.

MLG: You referred earlier to the Anita Hill/Clarence Thomas hearings. Do you have any further thoughts on that situation? It certainly engendered tremendous anger and outbursts among women about sexual harassment. Of course, there was opposition to Thomas before the sexual harassment charges, but those charges seemed to have sparked a lot of outrage.

SP: I think there's been building frustration among women throughout the decade, and then it just burst forth into public view. If it hadn't been over the Anita Hill situation it would have been over something else. People were just reaching a boiling point. I think the whole hearings were a wonderful microcosm of how the backlash works. As we were talking about earlier, the backlash sets in so early that women are only allowed a brief period of progress, of change, before we get another period of the dark ages. And the hearings themselves were a speeded-up example of that. Where one woman speaks up for her rights and it has this electrifying effect on women across the country who suddenly are emboldened enough to talk about sexual harassment incidents that sometimes they were carrying around for years. And it was so invigorating for so many women, and so exciting to simply speak out loud about these matters. And then in a minute after Anita Hill left the stage the gates came down again. The Senate Judiciary Committee and the White House just went on a rampage. And when they couldn't find anything to pin on her, they just made it up and sent her character through a paper shredder. And that, using this one woman as an object lesson, had a chilling effect on women everywhere. A few days later there were these "glass ceiling" hearings, congressional hearings about discrimination against women in the workplace, and three women pulled out, citing the Anita Hill effect—they didn't want to be raped apart.

MLG: That brings me to one of the last things I want to raise. In the final chapter, you write: "Women have always fought the periodic efforts to force them back behind the curtain. The important questions is not about the current backlash, then, is not whether women are resisting, but how effectively?" What do you think constitutes effective resistance?

SP: First of all, effective resistance has to be political resistance. It requires women working in concert, it's not something like that stupid slogan that one person can make a difference. You know, all you have to do is be one of the thousand points of light and do your little volunteer work or recycle your trash and somehow it turns out fine. We have to band together to make change. If women are to make any progress, we need to do it together. I think a lot of the reason why we fell for the mythology of the abolition movement was because we had very little knowledge to the contrary. There were not counter articles in the press laying out where these so-called studies documenting the evils of women's liberation fell apart. So there needs to be, first of all, more information and knowledge about women, what the realities are about their lives, not what their fantasies are. Finally there needs to be a quality of what I call in the book resilient feminism, that is required of women. I've done some book readings and there have been overflow crowds. What's been really gratifying is having women come up to me afterwards and say, "I thought I was crazy and now it's so good to know someone else feels the same way I do." That was really heartening and it made me feel good, too, because as I was working on this book I sort of felt crazy, to see so many other women who have felt that same sense of pressure that came from some unknown source, to be able to identify it.
GI Resisters: Real Heroes in the “Perfect War”

by Jeff Paterson

By the time the U.S. started its massive bombing of Iraq a year ago on January 17, there was a powerful storm of resistance against this criminal war. Hundreds of thousands protested in major cities across the country—they marched, blocked bridges, took over government buildings, walked out of schools, clashed with police and took other bold actions. And there was significant resistance within the military, which the government tried hard to suppress and cover up. Over 2,000 GIs and reservists fled for conscientious objector status, others deserted, and some publicly defied their marching orders.

Today many of the military resisters are still in jail. Taliban Jones is about to face court-martial in February. The following article on the situation with the Gulf War resisters was submitted to the RW by Jeff Paterson. On August 16, 1990, as an active-duty marine corporal, Jeff became the first public opponent within the military to the impending war. At a press conference where he was AWOL, he said, “I was not a pawn for America’s power plays for oil and profit in the Middle East.” Near midnight on August 29, he made good on his promise by sitting down in the runway of the Kaneohe Marine Corps Air Station in Hawaii and refusing to board a C-130 transport plane headed for Saudi Arabia. After spending the next month in the Pearl Harbor brig and an additional two months under restriction during a highly publicized court-martial, Jeff was released from Camp Lejeune include: Dave Bobbi, Demeckie Peters, Eric Haynes, Darwin Ahele, Greg Dawson, Sam Lin, LaVern McKinney, Patrick Lorrain, Kevin Sparrick, Marcus Blackwell, Colin Rockman and George Ward. Rest assured that these resisters, the “real heroes” are not being released for the “good of the movement.” Only from persistent outside pressure has the military begun seeing the release of some of its prisoners as in its best interests—politically expedient moves which allow it to get back to doing its job—raping the world, its resources and people, for the good of the empire.

Resisters Still in Jail or Facing Trial

Even while many are being released, Taliban K. Jones, a black youth from Oakland, continues to await court-martial for desertion in North Carolina. The court martial is tentatively scheduled for early February. In a recent statement to the press, entitled “Can a Black Person Be a Conscientious Objector?” Taliban states, “When people apply for a CO discharge, they are confronted with a review process influenced by society in which violence is institutionalized and, in the case of black applicants, has a racist attitude. One discovers that the military has a narrow idea of what constitutes a CO....” He was assigned Captain Swan, a white man, as his investigating officer. He asked typical questions, customized for an African American, like, “Would you fight in the Civil War to free the slaves?” What kinds of conflicts would you fight in, if it occurred in Africa? Confronted with racism, sexism and cultural ignorance, the obstacles before an African American applicant for CO is a juggernaut with hungry sharks waiting at the bottom.” In refusing Taliban’s claim for discharge, Swan declared him as “of marginal intelligence.”

The sexism Taliban speaks of is a day-to-day reality for women within the military. Two women resisters currently imprisoned are Faith Glenn, a Black army specialist, and Yolanda Huet-Vaughns, a 40-year-old Mexican American. She is also the mother of three children, ages 6, 5 and 1. On August 9, 1991—Nagasaki Day—she was sentenced to 30 months at Fort Leavenworth. She had spent January of 1991 traveling the U.S., speaking out as a medical doctor and army captain against the war on the people of Iraq. In surrendering to the military at a rally on February 2, Yolanda stated, “My oath as a physician to preserve life and prevent disease, and my responsibility as a human being to the preservation of this planet, would be violated if I cooperated with Operation Desert Storm.” In an unprecedented move, the military has been able to revoke her medical credential. She has spent most of her time working at two clinics treating low-income people. Women’s liberation cannot be achieved within the context of the U.S.-military-industrial complex, despite what a few PC-minded girls may express.

Meanwhile, Erik Larson (who was in the same unit as Taliban) continues to serve a six-month sentence handed down on November 19 for missing movement and being AWOL. “I have no regrets about what I did,” stated Erik after his sentencing. “I still think it’s a GI’s right to say no.” While Erik’s sentence is far less than the earlier threat of the death penalty, Dave Raymond of Erik’s defense committee correctly stated, “It’s outrageous that he should have to spend even one day in jail.”

Desert Storm Nightmares

In Hawaii last August, I interviewed a Desert Storm trooper from the Kaneohe Marine Corps Air Station (which was where I was stationed a year ago) who had served “on the front.” In relating his experiences, he mentioned watching, “Blackhawk down” Iraqis with 90 cal machine gun fire (illegal by the Geneva Convention) which resulted in a “red mist with legs,” watching Kuwaiti soldiers randomly excrete around, laughing at the “inuits and grunts,” and watching troops of the French Foreign Legion massacre Iraqi companies attempting to surrender—“they don’t take prisoners.” During the “mop-up” phase of the war, he was ordered to fire his TOW rocket at an encampment of Iraqis awaiting their turn to surrender. He refused, and a sergeant put a pistol to his head. Again he refused. He is currently awaiting discharge for “suicidal and homicidal tendencies.” He had stabbed his wrist twice since his personal stand-off in the desert. This article from The Detainee, October 10, 1991, points out that he is not alone.

Lance Corporal Christopher Green had dreams of fighting for his country since he was a little kid. In Kuwait, he got his wish, serving in some of the ugliest combat of the brief Gulf War. But once the fighting stopped and Christopher came home, something inside the 20-year-old cracked. He went AWOL. His parents got him to a psychiatrist, who diagnosed the young man as depressed and potentially suicidal, and immediately placed him in the locked ward of a mental hospital.

“ar that Christopher was... when the Marines arrived with handcuffs and chains to bind and transport the combat veteran to the brig at Camp Pendleton, CA... Experts on military health say that Christopher’s sort of trauma can be expected in five to ten percent of combat vet-
erant, Christopher's parents say he has nonever experienced nightmarish nightmares, written morbid poetry and passages in his journal, and is obsessed with immortality. He cannot shake. He cannot forget the eyes of a young Iraqi soldier he thought was going to surrender to him during the carnage in Kuwait City. Before he could reach the Iraqi, a Kuwaiti soldier lobbed the Iraq's head off with a saber.

The Marines intent to court martial Christopher. Marine Corps spokespeople respond that everything has been procedural and by the book.

Laying the Basis of Resistance to the Next Imperialist War

We 150+ public GI refuseniks were doing our part to born that hated book. (Overall about 2,500 people attempted to get CO discharges, and the military says that 4,000 went AWOL during the Gulf War period.) And while we were not able to change the pillars of military authority as the Vietnam-era GI movement did, it was an impressive showing taking into account the U.S. was able to pull off the “perfect” war. It is much more than a ray of hope for the next imperialist war that might not go down so smoothly.

Today's challenges of laying the foundation of resistance are not simple, yet some lessons should not be repeated overlooked. Undoubtedly the established pacifist organizations fulfill a vital role (“objective” counseling, draft training, etc.). However, leading a defiant and unrepentant political struggle has never been an easy path. If they are unwilling to decide at critical junctures Just what side they arc on. Standing in solidarity with my Arab brothers and sisters has guided me through the last year without fail. It has allowed me to avoid many of the pitfalls of political pragmatism which dominate a large section of the American Left. This includes the tendency to engulf oneself in mutated nationalism—saying “peace is patriotic” or being confused by the argument about “supporting the troops.”

It is actions such as these that make the U.S. war pigs cringe. Women and men who have joined the military for reasons that “serve one’s country” to “getting the fuck out of town” deserve what they get because “they should have known better before they signed the contract.” Why aren’t they asking themselves what happens when the movement for real social change becomes a real threat to the U.S. government? Those who believe that this government will never turn its guns on the people “should know better.” The powers love to set the debate of either the “contractual obligations” of their troops. Of course, it’s easier to point to a contract forged in inequality than to defend complicity in the thousands buried alive in trenches, burned alive attempting to flee, and hundreds bombed in dark shelters with babies cradled.

While stationed (forcibly) four miles from the Kuwait border, Paul Cook's commanding officer told him he should take up a rifle because he had been “paid for three and a half years to do a job.” Paul answered, “I am not a mercenary, Sir.” He was convicted of “misbehavior in the Presence of the Enemy” and sentenced to 15 months.

The road to a revolutionary society based on real justice and peace must be paved with military resistance for it is unavowable. And if it is not this we are in struggle—for why bother?

Going Beyond “Conscientious Objection”

Even in a “Wolody war,” resistance took on many shapes and went far beyond the military’s definition of conscientious objection.

Shane Fisher and Robert Beard dropped by their commander’s office and left a three-page letter outlining their political objections to Operation Desert Storm. The letter was addressed to “King George Bush.” They continued out the gate for a few months of absence instead of shipping out. Shane was sentenced to 12 months upon his surrender. Robert was captured and “awarded” a two year sentence.

Jody Anderson was convicted of numerous counts of assault resulting in the death of Daniel Gillis as Daniel physically resisted being forced onto a transport for Fort Saudi Arabia. As Daniel stated, “An officer put my hands in plastic ties and ordered four Marines to force me onto the bus....Since all of the Marines attacking me were white, several African American Marines came to my defense. There followed a brawl....” Jody originally faced “life plus 20 years” for “creating волнabil and disturbance by disobeysing (a First Lieutenant) and attacking (a Staff Sergeant) with a wooden axe handle....” And his closest fiat and exhorting others to join him in defiance.” He was deployed that night and was not court martialed until his unit returned from the Middle East. He is serving a 24-month sentence.

It is actions such as these that make the U.S. war pigs cringe. Women and men who have joined the military for reasons that “serve one’s country” to “getting the fuck out of town” deserve what they get because “they should have known better before they signed the contract.” Why aren’t they asking themselves what happens when the movement for real social change becomes a real threat to the U.S. government? Those who believe that this government will never turn its guns on the people “should know better.” The powers love to set the debate of either the “contractual obligations” of their troops. Of course, it’s easier to point to a contract forged in inequality than to defend complicity in the thousands buried alive in trenches, burned alive attempting to flee, and hundreds bombed in dark shelters with babies cradled.

While stationed (forcibly) four miles from the Kuwait border, Paul Cook's commanding officer told him he should take up a rifle because he had been “paid for three and a half years to do a job.” Paul answered, “I am not a mercenary, Sir.” He was convicted of “misbehavior in the Presence of the Enemy” and sentenced to 15 months.

The road to a revolutionary society based on real justice and peace must be paved with military resistance for it is unavowable. And if it is not this we are in struggle—for why bother?

Want To write to the resisters at Camp Lejeune:

Resister Name: Marine Corps Bldg. Bldg. 1041
Camp Lejeune, NC 28542-5921

To: General Daniel Christman, Commanding General
HQ Marine Corps
Call: 504-948-1210
HQ, 2nd MEB, Subunit 1
NewOrleans, LA 70146

Shane Fisher: Bldg. 435, Rm 111
Camp Lejeune, NC 28542-5090

Jack up the generals!

Commanding General, C.C., V.M.F.A.
4th MAW, N.F, 14th MCR
4401y Griffith St.
New Orleans, LA 70146

Tell them to: “Drop all charges and release all resisters immediately.”

Demand “clemency” for Yolanda Huet-Vaughn from:

General Daniel Christman, Commanding General
US Army Engineer Center, Fort Leonard Wood, MO 65473

Others resisters are being held in different jails across the country. For more information on the resisters contact The ANTI-WARrior. Issue 3, January 1992 of The ANTI-WARrior is currently available for $1 from 48 Shattuck Sq., Box 129, Berkeley, CA 94704. Phone: 415-272-2427. The ANTI-WARrior is free to all prisoners.
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Unless we despise the old system and the old reactionary productive relationships, what do we think we are doing? If we do not have faith in socialism and communism, what do we think we are doing?

Mao Teiting from Talks at the Chengu Conference.

What is needed is really “Mao More Than Ever.” What is called for is really turning up our ideological counteroffensive, going on the offensive with Marxism-Leninism-Maoism in opposition to all these reactionary monsters and all this bourgeois muck.

Bob Avakian, Chairman of the Revolutionary Communist Party, from Radical Ruptures, or Yes, Mao More Than Ever.

With the official end of the Soviet Union, the U.S. imperialists have been waging a big campaign to affect how people think—an ideological offensive. The theme of their campaign is that capitalism, and U.S. capitalism in particular, is now victorious across the world. For example, a special issue of Newsweek magazine featured headlines like: “The Last Breath of Communism,” “Dictators on the Skids,” and “The Greatest Expansion of Freedom in Human History.” One purpose of this campaign is to make the poor and oppressed feel that any opposition is hopeless—that there is no way to fight back and win.

Responding to Chairman Avakian’s call for an ideological counteroffensive, revolutionary speakers, writers and spokespersons have jumped into this battle. Carl Dix, the national spokesperson for the RCP, has appeared on radio talk shows, Maoist writer C. Clark Kissinger has appeared at 10 programs and forums from Dartmouth University to UCLA, “op-ed” articles pointing out that revolutionary communism is alive and well have appeared in major papers, and revolutionary political economist Raymond Lotta has spoken at campuses and conferences. A new video of Kissinger’s talk at Revolution Books in New York is now available.

The experience has been exciting. Just as the capitalists gather around what they hope will be the grave of revolution, here come the Maoists with a powerful refutation of the bourgeoisie’s sick system and a vision of a world without oppression.

Carl Dix on the Airwaves

“The basic problem with communism is that it doesn’t offer people a reward,” suggested one talk show host in Florida. “Dog does a trick, you throw it a bone. Porpoise does a trick, you throw it a fish.”

“First off, people ain’t dogs or porpoises,” shot back Carl Dix. “And communism does take into account the need for reward for effort—but it takes it into account in order to transcend it.” He went on to describe the system of distribution in the socialist transition period where people are rewarded “each according to his labor” for the first time in history—not like under capitalism where fat cats make millions for doing nothing. Then he described a future communist society where the whole organization of society and people’s political consciousness enables them to share material wealth according to actual need, rather than as a personal reward.

“That makes people into lobotomized clones,” sneered the talk show host.

“No, it’s about being conscious,” Carl replied. “I was in the Black liberation movement of the ’60s. We did not do that to
 stick something in our pockets. People were struggling consciously, because other people who were oppressed liked them and wanted to go forward. You'd even hear people saying, "Well, I probably won't get anything out of this, but hopefully those who come behind will get something...." Yours in a theory of innate human selfishness. But selfishness is not innate—it's ingrained.

The impact of the Revolution in Peru

The collapse of the Soviet Union has had a big effect on political movements in the oppressed countries that had been influenced politically and supported materially by Soviet imperialism. Events in Nicaragua, El Salvador, Palestine, and South Africa have impacted heavily on the anti-imperialists forces in the U.S. In this context a major workshop entitled "Shining Path and Contemporary Relevance of Marxism" was held at the second annual Midwest Radical Activists and Scholars Conference, in early November. The speakers were Raymond Lotta, author of America in Velvet, Herberto Osorio, national spokesperson for the Committee to Support the Revolution in Peru; and Bill Martin, a member of the philosophy faculty at De Paul University.

The progress of a real revolution in Peru stands in marked contrast to the obvious capitulation of so many other "revolutionary movements" in Latin America. The developing situation raises sharply the basic truth of Mao Tsetung that "ideological and political line decide everything" and the importance of lines of demarcation between real communism and phony communism.

As if to drive home the importance of the Peruvian revolution for the U.S. left—especially for the reflected and so interesting that many in the audience were moved by its own audio and video recordings of it.

Our ideological counteroffensives and the battle for the minds of the masses.

One obvious innovation from the last few months is that the collapse of the Soviet Union, the disarray of various movements dependent on the Soviet Union, the bourgeoisie's ideological offensive to declare communism dead, and, in contrast, the forward march of the Peruvian revolution have opened up whole new opportunities. There is both a new openness to learning about real communism as well as people raising big and important questions.

The offensive by the capitalists has had its effect. For example, there are still many people who believe there has to be a radical change in the way things are being run. But at the same time they now question whether Marxism provides the answer. They have little faith in the capitalists' solution of the "free market," but they view communism as too "coercive," "centralized," and "authoritarian." People who know very little about the experience of China in Mao's time have an incorrect impression that communism cannot really address other important concerns about race, sex, and class.

One issue is what appears to many to be an "all-powerful" Amerrikka in the wake of the Persian Gulf war and the collapse of the Soviet Union. They wonder: If the Soviet Union did play a role in restraining U.S. power to abet the people of the world in the collapse of the Soviet Union, there is a better chance of genuine communism and a truly liberated planet has just begun.

Based on this analysis, he delves into the fundamental principles of genuine as opposed to phony communism and concludes that it is capitalism itself that is in grave crisis and has no future. From an historical viewpoint, the battle for genuine communism and a truly liberated planet has just begun.

This speech is characterized by historical sweep, deep political insights, revolutionary optimism, and also by Kissing's trademark wit and humor. It must be seen by all who desire and are fighting for the birth of a new world.
The Railroad of a Revolutionary

The following excerpts are taken from a paper prepared by two of the lawyers for Geronimo Pratt, Robert Bloom and Stuart Hardman:

In 1960, Geronimo Pratt was the head of the Black Panther Party (BPP) in Los Angeles. The FBI's infamous director, J. Edgar Hoover, publicly asserting that the BPP was the most dangerous organization in the country, embarked on a program expressly designed to destroy and discredit the BPP, as well as its members and its supporters. This program, known as COINTELPRO, was exposed by the United States Senate in 1975 after lengthy hearings in what was known as the Senate Church Committee Inquiry. The Report documented the unconstitutional, dishonest and often criminal activities of the FBI's campaign against the BPP and its sympathetic targets.

In 1969, Geronimo was named by the FBI as one of their specific targets. In August of 1969, the FBI and the LAPD, using an FBI and LAPD informant who had infiltrated the BPP, framed Geronimo for a robbery-murder that had been committed 9 months earlier on a ten dollar bill in San Francisco.

In 1968, the FBI had installed an illegal wiretap on the residence of BPP leader Bobby Seale in Oakland. This wiretap was active on the day the crime was committed, December 18, 1968. It is now known that FBI wiretap logs reveal that Geronimo spoke on this telephone while he was physically present at this residence in Oakland shortly before the crime took place. 400 miles away in Santa Monica. The wiretap log was seen by two highly respected private investigators who had provided sworn declarations describing the FBI document they saw. At the time of their observation, the investigators were examining wiretap documentation at FBI offices in San Francisco in connection with an unrelated BPP case.

Six former BPP members have now come forward to swear that Geronimo was an active participant in a meeting with them in Oakland at the very moment the crime was committed. None of these witnesses had previously been antagonistic to Geronimo because of a deeply hostile split in the BPP that was caused directly by the FBI's dirty tricks.

The split also caused the expulsion of Geronimo from the BPP a year prior to his trial and this expulsion led to the refusal of the witnesses to testify for Geronimo at his 1972 trial. Each of the witnesses specifically places Geronimo in Oakland at the exact time of the crime. Their recollections are based on documentary proof of a particular memorable event that took place in Oakland on the day the crime was committed.

There is newly discovered documentary evidence that relates to the informant, Julius Butler, who was the key witness at the trial. Butler, who had been an LA County deputy sheriff in the early 1960's, emphatically denied at the trial that he was ever an informant for anyone at any time. There is now irrefutable proof that Butler blantly lied about this and other critical matters at the trial.

Two former LA police officers told Geronimo's attorneys that Butler was an LAPD informant regarding the BPP and other matters beginning in 1966, three years before Butler claimed that Geronimo had confessed the crime to him.

The FBI documents conclusively prove that Butler was an active FBI informant specifically focused on Geronimo months prior to the time he fabricated the claim that Geronimo had confessed the crime to him.

Geronimo now has documentary proof that the DA, who handled the trial, Richard Paskal, knew that the prosecution and the jury regarding (at least) one very critical witness, a vital witness who had provided the key to the true motivation for the prosecution of Geronimo. Defense attorneys for Geronimo have exposed the lies of prosecution witnesses.

In 1974-1980, as a result of the U.S. Senate's Church Committee investigation, Freedom of Information lawsuits and other investigations, attorneys for Geronimo uncovered powerful evidence that had been suppressed by the prosecution. For example:

• There had been an illegal FBI wiretap of FBI headquarters in LA that was operating on the day of the crime. As explained above, Geronimo was in Oakland attending a week-long series of BPP meetings and he called BPP headquarters in LA at least once a day. FBI tapes and logs of conversations collected by the FBI during this period revealed that Geronimo was in Oakland at the time of the crime, but the FBI claimed that all these materials were missing from FBI files when the case was raised in 1979.

• The FBI had placed at least one informant directly in the offices of the trial attorney. That informant spied on the defense and related defense strategy to the FBI.

• There had been an illegal FBI wiretap of FBI headquarters in LA that was operating on the day of the crime. As explained above, Geronimo was in Oakland attending a week-long series of BPP meetings and he called BPP headquarters in LA at least once a day. FBI tapes and logs of conversations collected by the FBI during this period revealed that Geronimo was in Oakland at the time of the crime, but the FBI claimed that all these materials were missing from FBI files when the case was raised in 1979.

• The FBI had placed at least one informant directly in the offices of the trial attorney. That informant spied on the defense and related defense strategy to the FBI.

The Railroad of a Revolutionary

Geronimo Ji Jaga Pratt Must Go Free!

Continued from page 7

Letters can be sent to:
Geronimo Ji Jaga Pratt
DAS90 (1979)
Tahleah Chipmunk P.O. Box 39
Oakland, CA 94609
or
P.O. Box 379
Los Angeles, CA 90016
On December 10 Dhoruba bin Wahad (formerly Richard Moore) found out that the New York State Court of Appeals had issued a ruling that meant he might have to go back to prison. Dhoruba was released from prison in April 1990 after serving 29 years for a crime he did not commit. His murder conviction was reversed after a state appeals court uncovered evidence suggesting that he had been framed up. The government's case was so lame that the trial judge declared a mistrial. In the early 1980s Dhoruba was a leader of the Black Panther Party in New York City. He was one of the defendants in the Panther 21 case. The case involved outrageous charges brought by the government that the Panthers had conspired to blow up a Board of Education building in Harlem and bomb the Bronx Botanical Gardens, three police precincts, and several department stores. The government's case was so weak that the trial ended with the judge acquitting all the accused on the first day of the trial. Dhoruba was eventually exonerated and painied an innocent man that day. But Dhoruba was eventually exonerated and painied an innocent man that day.

On December 10 Dhoruba bin Wahad (formerly Richard Moore) found out that the New York State Court of Appeals had issued a ruling that meant he might have to go back to prison. Dhoruba was released from prison in April 1990 after serving 29 years for a crime he did not commit. His murder conviction was reversed after a state appeals court uncovered evidence suggesting that he had been framed up. The government's case was so lame that the trial judge declared a mistrial. In the early 1980s Dhoruba was a leader of the Black Panther Party in New York City. He was one of the defendants in the Panther 21 case. The case involved outrageous charges brought by the government that the Panthers had conspired to blow up a Board of Education building in Harlem and bomb the Bronx Botanical Gardens, three police precincts, and several department stores. The government's case was so weak that the trial ended with the judge acquitting all the accused on the first day of the trial. Dhoruba was eventually exonerated and painied an innocent man that day.

While Dhoruba was in jail, he and his attorneys obtained over 300,000 pages of documents from the New York Police Department and the FBI. They proved through these documents that the government had withheld key evidence from Dhoruba's defense. Based on this newly uncovered evidence a judge was forced to throw out Dhoruba's conviction.

The District Attorney immediately appealed the ruling that set Dhoruba free. On December 10 the Court of Appeals used the cases of Dhoruba and D.C. to change the law regarding reversals of convictions. (According to D.C.'s lawyer William Kunstler the court had been aware of a conspiracy of a supermarket and murder of six firemen who died in the fire. D.C. was released from jail after the police came to the fire marshal, a key witness in the trial, and told him that the fire was caused by arson.) According to Kunstler: "Before this case the only way to removeibly prove the innocence (according to the Rosario rule) if you showed that they withheld evidence. The Court of Appeals changed the rule now and said it's only automatic if you discover it before the appeal is over. The court has indicated that the government's case was so weak that the trial ended with the judge acquitting all the accused on the first day of the trial.

The incident is also being used in a cynical attempt to promote the police. This is right after the New York police murdered again—Hector Rivera was shot in cold blood in front of his family on New Year's Day in Bushwick, Brooklyn. There are glowing news accounts of how quick the police were to respond. The mother of the victim has been quoted praising the police for their help. Since Monday's attack, there have been reported instances of Black youth attacking an Indian woman and Latino youth in retaliation. The media ran stories from the woman and the father of the Latino youth calling for more police on the streets.

The mainstream media has gone out of its way to downplay the events of last night. The New York Times, under the headline "Two youths were shot and critically wounded by shots from a passing car. Though there were no eyewitnesses and even the cops involved in the shooting didn't identify the suspects, despite the fact that one of the suspects, a woman who had shared housing with some Panthers, she at first told police that she had no idea who the suspects were. She at first told police that she had no idea who the suspects were. She at first told police that she had no idea who the suspects were. She at first told police that she had no idea who the suspects were. She at first told police that she had no idea who the suspects were. She at first told police that she had no idea who the suspects were.
Dear RW:

In the two and a half years I have been deeply involved in women's issues, primarily abortion rights, I must admit that the majority of what I've learned has come from alternative news sources. ABC, CBS, NBC, and CNN just don't cut it, nor do they ever dig deep enough into a subject to get at the core. Thankfully, though, there are publications to turn to like the Revolutionary Worker. Not only does the RW provide detailed background information on issues, which takes considerable research, its continuous coverage of oppressive attacks such as lock-ins and clinic shutdowns is an ever present reminder of the daily struggles we all must fight. The mainstream media will report on these events as long as they have front page appeal, but they are soon forgotten in the race for ratings or as soon as another "event" merits all the attention. Of course, such a paper would not be possible without the dedicated work of the people in the RCP. While there may be those who, unfortunately, will avoid working with the RCP because of the word "communist," I enjoy working with these people because I see they are committed to what they do. They have been some of the most organized, and intelligent people I've known in the many activist circles I've worked in. They challenge me, encourage me, and together we have confronted those who seek to keep the people in their place and boldly told them WE WILL NOT BE A PART OF YOUR NEW WORLD ORDER!

Oppression is not a one time event like a Supreme Court decision as the media would have you believe. It is an ongoing battle being fought on a daily basis all over the world. The outreach and education provided by the RW and RCP is needed and needs support to continue. I encourage readers to support the RCP fund drive which in turn will work to keep the heat on the oppressors and will strive to gain the freedom rightfully ours.

In Struggle and Solidarity,

Miz Atlanta, GA

Capitalism is a dog-eat-dog, people-killing, spirit-crushing system. Something much better is possible. There is a REVOLUTIONARY way! Where the people work in common for the common good. We saw this in the high tide of the Cultural Revolution in Mao's China. And we can see it today in the mountains of Peru.

It's a fact: when the common people get connected with revolutionary politics, the New World Order can be brought down. The Revolutionary Communist Party is out to make it happen here.

We are striving to make some very big leaps in the revolutionary movement, to strengthen the people's side in the battles being waged now and get in position for THE TIME.

We need your financial support to make this happen. Many more party organizers and agitators need to be trained and sent out to wherever people are fighting back—organizing, mobilizing, strategizing and getting ready to lead people in revolutionizing. Networks of readers of the Revolutionary Worker/Obrero Revolucionario newspaper need to spread everywhere—in the ghettos and barrios, schools, factories, on campuses and among all those fighting the outrages and abuses of this system.