THE PEOPLE OF THE WORLD STILL DEMAND:

U.S. Out of El Salvador!
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.
The People of the World Still Demand: U.S. Out of El Salvador!

By Jack Gardener

This is the second in a series of articles by RW correspondent Jack Gardener on the new “peace” agreement in El Salvador. The first article, “El Salvador: The Land Has Not Been Liberated,” in #643, concentrated on the agrarian question—what the agreement means to the peasants in the countryside. This article goes into the role of the U.S. in El Salvador. A note to our readers: The first article should have been credited to Jack Gardener, but the byline was omitted by mistake.

The agreement between the Salvadorean government and the leaders of the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Movement (FMLN) in El Salvador’s twelve-year-long civil war has had a dramatic impact on everyone concerned with the struggle for liberation in Latin America. For a large number of young activists and students (and many older folks as well), the fight against U.S. intervention in Central America and support for armed struggle against the brutal U.S.-backed Salvadorean government throughout those years has been the one thing that has most defined their political stance. Now the FMLN leadership has apparently agreed to end its armed struggle, dismantle its military apparatus and become a political party—some might call this a “negotiated revolution.”

By lack Gardener

The FMLN leadership seems to think that the U.S. can be a force for “peace” in El Salvador. But people will never forget the bloody role the U.S. intervention has played in that country.

• Death squads—U.S. advisers set up the spy apparatus of the Salvadorean “security forces,” computerized the records of potential and actual political activists, and linked it to similar operations throughout Central America. Starting with the so-called Alliance for Progress under U.S. President John F. Kennedy in the early 1960s, these advisers trained henchmen like Roberto D'Aubuisson in the U.S. doctrine of “counterinsurgency.” The advisers helped organize the first official death squad (ORDEN) in the 1940s and brought together and expanded the forces that became the death squads of the 1980s and 90s. These were not random, independent operations but regular activities of the “security forces.” U.S. advisers supplied sipy information on individuals later assassinated, kept key security force officials known to be death-squad leaders on the CIA payroll and trained them in torture methods, explosives, combat weapons use, etc. All this is widely known in El Salvador.

• Massacres of civilians (especially peasants)—The most vicious and blood-drenched massacres of entire peasant populations during the Salvadorean civil war were carried out by battalions trained and linked it to similar operations throughout Central America. Starting with the so-called Alliance for Progress under U.S. President John F. Kennedy in the early 1960s, these advisers trained henchmen like Roberto D'Aubuisson in the U.S. doctrine of “counterinsurgency.” The advis

Given the bloody history of U.S. intervention in a region the gringo oppressors so arrogantly call their “own backyard,” it might seem that the answers to these questions would be obvious. The U.S. should get the hell out of El Salvador, and stay out! But the FMLN leadership has apparently decided it is in its interest to “forget” these lessons. We now have the spectacle of the leaders of the former armed opposition requesting U.S. “intervention.” There have been reports in a number of publications that the FMLN...
Continued from page 3 that the U.S.-trained Atlacatl Battalion committed the infamous 1982 massacre in Mozote in central Morazán that murdered nearly 800 people (mostly civilians), over half of them under fourteen years of age. In another notorious incident, the Ramón Belloso Battalion returned from four months and $8 million worth of training at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, and immediately launched an offensive into eastern Chalatenango, murdering hundreds of civilians and forcing 5,000 refugees to flee their homes. In both cases, reports indicate that FMLN regulars had already left the area when the U.S.-trained battalionbegan murdering hundreds of people suspected of being supporters of the guerrillas. The 1989 murder of six Jesuit priests and their housekeeper was also carried out by the U.S.-trained Atlacatl Battalion. In fact, one U.S. adviser admitted that he knew ahead of time of the unit's plans to murder the Jesuits but didn't try to stop it. The adviser later changed his story after being "briefed" for several days by his superior.

Direct military operations—U.S. military advisors ran the war against the Salvadoran maestres. U.S. advisers directed numerous military operations, including calling in air strikes that killed hundreds of civilians. U.S. advisors were filmed by TV news crews carrying combat weapons in combat zones. Journalists in El Salvador picked up radio transmissions on several occasions where U.S. advisors were overheard giving direct orders to Salvadoran commanders and telling the Salvadoran air force where to drop their U.S.-supplied bombs.

U.S. military aid—The U.S. spent $4.5 billion in "aid" to the Salvadoran government during the civil war. One billion dollars of this was direct military aid, including 500-tlb. bombs, helicopter gunships, fighter-bomber aircraft, heavy artillery, etc. The rest of the "aid" went for programs to support the regime, feed up its funds for military use and otherwise crush all opposition to the U.S. and its Salvadoran junior partners.

Does anyone, including FMLN leaders, believe that the El Salvador regime would have been able to carry out its mass murder, or even have survived, without U.S. military support? The FMLN leaders say they will be killed by night-wing forces if they don't get protection from the U.S. military. But aren't they the very forces that the FMLN fears are the same forces that have been selected, assisted, trained and led by the U.S.? Has the U.S. military suddenly changed its nature, becoming a protector of the people? With the peace agreement, the FMLN leaders seek to become legitimate politicians of a legitimate political party in El Salvador. Perhaps they feel that there may be some protection for themselves under the U.S. military umbrella (although U.S. practice in El Salvador and elsewhere argues against even this)—there are numerous U.S. "friends" who have been rubbed out when they no longer proved useful. But what about the masses of people—in the countryside and the shantytowns and the schools and universities—especially those who find it difficult to go along with the phony land reform and other aspects of the agreement? What kind of "protection" will they get from the U.S. military's continued presence in El Salvador?

U.S. "Aid" Means U.S. Domination

The FMLN request for U.S. military assistance is connected to the fact that their so-called "negotiated revolution" does not break at all with domination of El Salvador by imperialism, especially the U.S. In fact, the FMLN seeks more economic penetration by the U.S.

The agreement envisages El Salvador's "reconstruction" as a product of foreign (that is, imperialist) investment and "aid." Not only is the Salvadoran government expected to seek out such investment, but so are the organizations run by the FMLN. The agreement gives these organizations the ability to go after foreign investment from both government and non-government sources.

During the civil war FMLN supporters helped the U.S. Congress to cut off all support to the Salvadoran government. Now they are demanding that the Congress "investigate"—but they want to make sure that this "investigation" is fueled by the United Nations. The FMLN leaders say they will give FMLN leaders an opportunity to advertise their "success." Given the current domination by the U.S. military umbrella, they hope the UN will give FMLN leaders an opportunity to advertise their "success." The UN is the same organization that "investigated" the Salvadoran civil war for the U.N. which killed hundreds of thousands of Salvadoran people and has contributed to the U.S. attacks against Iraq. The FMLN supporters now want this reactionary body to help the Salvadoran people.

The FMLN supporters also promote this as a "model" for others around the world. The January 1992 issue of CISPES's publication ALERTE! says, "The solidarity movement still has a long way to go if, in the future, the U.S.-aided regimes do not pass on to their regimes what they no longer need for the U.S. military. All of this will mean more misery for the masses. The biggest lesson of the agreements is aimed at breaking the hold of foreign domination rather than to promote real development." The big question for the Salvadoran people is not how U.S. "aid" comes to El Salvador, but whether the U.S.-aided regimes go through negotiated channels and not strengthens ARONA. This would set a new precedent for U.S. economic aid in the Third World, which has traditionally gone to support counter-revolutionary activity and the domination rather than to promote real development. The agreement envisages El Salvador's "reconstruction" as a product of foreign (that is, imperialist) investment and "aid." Not only is the Salvadoran government expected to seek out such investment, but so are the organizations run by the FMLN. The agreement gives these organizations the ability to go after foreign investment from both government and non-government sources.

The agreement envisages El Salvador's "reconstruction" as a product of foreign (that is, imperialist) investment and "aid." Not only is the Salvadoran government expected to seek out such investment, but so are the organizations run by the FMLN. The agreement gives these organizations the ability to go after foreign investment from both government and non-government sources.

The FMLN supporters also promote this as a "model" for others around the world. The January 1992 issue of CISPES's publication ALERTE! says, "The solidarity movement still has a long way to go if, in the future, the U.S.-aided regimes do not pass on to their regimes what they no longer need for the U.S. military. All of this will mean more misery for the masses. The biggest lesson of the agreements is aimed at breaking the hold of foreign domination rather than to promote real development." The big question for the Salvadoran people is not how U.S. "aid" comes to El Salvador, but whether the U.S.-aided regimes go through negotiated channels and not strengthens ARONA. This would set a new precedent for U.S. economic aid in the Third World, which has traditionally gone to support counter-revolutionary activity and the domination rather than to promote real development. The agreement envisages El Salvador's "reconstruction" as a product of foreign (that is, imperialist) investment and "aid." Not only is the Salvadoran government expected to seek out such investment, but so are the organizations run by the FMLN. The agreement gives these organizations the ability to go after foreign investment from both government and non-government sources.

The FMLN leaders claim that they are being "realistic." What kind of "realism" is it that tells the masses that laying down their weapons and relying on their numbers will somehow be a step toward liberation?
Interview with Chairman Gonzalo

Part 3: Applying Maoism to the Conditions in Peru

This is the third in a series of excerpts from a new English translation of the historic interview with Chairman Gonzalo, leader of the Communist Party of Peru. Previous excerpts can be found in RW #643 and #645. The interview originally appeared in July 1988 in the Peruvian newspaper El Diario. The interview, conducted by El Diario editors Luis Arce Borja and James Talavera, was a big blow against the reactionary Peruvian government. Two editions of the interview—100,000 copies—quickly sold out. The government retaliated by confiscating the third edition, destroying El Diario’s press and arresting Talavera and other staff.

Since 1988 there have been some important changes in the situation in Peru. The revolution has further advanced and is winning greater victories. The APRA regime of Alan García Pérez was replaced by a government headed by Alberto Fujimori. The U.S. has stepped up its military intervention against the people’s war. But the interview with Chairman Gonzalo continues to be a very relevant and important document for a greater understanding of the revolution in Peru. The new English edition is available to pamphlet form from the Committee to Support the Revolution in Peru.

EL DIARIO: What are some of the particularities of the people’s war in Peru, and how does it differ from other struggles in the world, in Latin America, and from the Movimiento Revolucionario Tupac Amaru (MRTA)?

CHAIRMAN GONZALO: That’s a good question. I thank you for asking it, because it gives us a chance to look at the Party’s so-called “dogmatism” a bit more. There are even those who say that we incorrectly try to apply Chairman Mao to an era where he is no longer applicable. In short, they babble on so much that we feel perfectly justified asking whether they have any idea what they are talking about. This includes the much-decorated senator who is a specialist in violence.

People’s war is universally applicable, in accordance with the character of the revolution and adapted to the specific conditions of each country. Otherwise, it cannot be carried out. In our case, the particularities are very clear. It is a struggle that is waged in the countryside and in the city, as was established as far back as 1958 in the plan for the people’s war. Here we have a difference, a particularity: it is waged in the countryside and the city. This, we believe, has to do with our own specific conditions, Latin America, for instance, has cities which are proportionately larger than those on other continents. It is a reality of Latin America that can’t be ignored. Just look at the capital of Peru, for example, which has a high percentage of the country’s population. So, for us, the city could not be left aside, and the war had to be developed there as well. But the struggle in the countryside is principal, the struggle in the city is a necessary complement. This is one particularity, there’s another.

In the beginning of the people’s war we confronted the police. That was the reality because only in December 1982 did the armed forces enter the war. This is not to say that they had not been used in a support role before then. They had, in addition to their studying the process of our development. It is a particularity because we created a power vacuum in the countryside and we had to establish the New Power without having defeated large armed forces—because they hadn’t come into the war. And when they did, when they came in, it was because we had established People’s Power. That was the concrete political situation in the country. If we had applied the letter and not the spirit of Mao, we would not have established the New Power and we would have been sitting, waiting for the armed forces to come in. We would have gotten bogged down. Another particularity was the structure of the army, which I’ve already talked about.

All these are particularities. We have already spoken to the countryside and city, to how to carry out the war, to the army, to how the New Power arose; and the militarization of the Party itself is another particularity. These are specific things that correspond to our reality, to the application of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, of Chairman Mao’s theory on people’s war, to the conditions in our country. Does this make us different from other struggles? No.

Why do we differ from others? Because we carry out people’s war, this makes us different from other struggles in Latin America. In Cuba, people’s war was not carried out, but they also had their own particularities which they had intentionally forgotten. Before, they said Cuba was an exceptional case—Guevara said this—the fact that U.S. imperialism didn’t take part. Later they forgot this. Aside from this, there was no Communist Party there to give leadership. These are questions of Cubanism and its five characteristics: an insuficient class differentiation which demanded that saviors save the oppressed; socialist revolution or a caricature of revolution; united front but without the national bourgeoisie; no need for Base Areas; and as noted, no need for a Party. What we are seeing in Latin America today is just the development of these same positions, only more and more at the service of social-imperialism and its confrontation with Yankee imperialism for world hegemony. We can see this clearly in Central America. The MRTA, the little that we know of it, falls into the same category.

Finally, another issue that makes us different—and forgive me if I’m insisting—concerns independence, self-reliance, and making our own decisions. Because others do not have these characteristics they are used as pawns, while we are not. And one far-reaching difference: we take Marxism-Leninism-Maoism as our guide, others do not. In sum, the greatest difference, the fundamental difference, is in the point of departure; ours is the ideology of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, principally Maoism, applied to the specific conditions of our country, and I insist here again, that this is with clear particularities which show the falsehood of the so-called dogmatism they accuse us of—which they do at the behest of their masters.

EL DIARIO: Chairman, would you say then that the MRTA is playing a counterrevolutionary role in this country?

CHAIRMAN GONZALO: The MRTA has positions that should make one think. For example, the truce they granted to APRA until, as they said, APRA attacked the people. But we all know that the same day that García Pérez assumed the presidency, he represented the masses in the very capital of the republic. In October 1983 there was genocide at Lurigancho prison.1 Were the people being attacked or not? And how long did they wait to put an end to their torture? These are things one must ask oneself.
Outlawing Abortion Was—and Is—a Nazi Program

THE NAZIS on the Family and the Role of Women:

“The mission of woman is to be beautiful and to bring children into the world. This is not at all as rude and unmorden as it sounds. The female bird prettises herself for her mate and matches the eggs for him. In exchange, the mate takes care of gathering the food, and stands guard and wards off the enemy.”

“We grant the rest of the world the ideal type of woman that it wishes for itself, but the rest of the world should kindly grant us the woman which is most suitable to us...a woman who is capable of intellectually standing at her husband's side in his interests, in his struggle for existence, who makes the world more beautiful and richer in content for him. This is the ideal woman of the German man of today. She is a woman who, above all, is also able to be a mother.”

Joseph Goebbels, head of propaganda for the Nazis.

“It today a female jurist accomplishes ever so much and next door there lives a mother with five, six, seven children, who are all healthy and well-brought up, then I would like to say: From the standpoint of the eternal value of our people the woman who has given birth to children and raised them and who thereby has given back our people life for the future has accomplished more and does more!”

Adolf Hitler, from a 1936 speech to the National Socialist Women's Congress.

“The so-called granting of equal rights to women, which Marxism demands, in reality does not grant equal rights but constitutes a deprivation of rights, since it draws the woman into an area in which she will necessarily be inferior.”

Adolf Hitler, from a 1935 speech to the National Socialist Women's Congress.

“Thus the family is the most important cell of the state. Whoever disturbs the family acts against the well-being of the state. National Socialism has restored the family to its rightful place. We do not want any petit-bourgeois ideal in the family, with its plush-sofa psychology and walking manicures, with its contempt for and degradation of the woman and the eutermanization of the children.”

Hans Andorlahn, from a 1937 book about his experiences as a Nazi stormtrooper.

“In free love, in which the mutual impulse to union is contained exclusively in erotic feelings, the confluence of the germ-plasm endowments of both parents is left exclusively to chance, whereas monogamy, through the elaboration of high-grade hereditary stocks for human breeding and to exterminate hereditary stocks of inferior grade...”

Hermann Paull, from a 1934 Nazi book on “German Race Hygiene.”

In Germany, on May 26, 1933, two pieces of penal legislation prohibited the availability of abortion facilities and services. A strict handling of the anti-abortion law resulted in a 65 percent increase in yearly convictions between 1933 and 1938, when their number reached almost 7,003. In 1936 Heinrich Himmler, head of all police forces and the SS (militarized Nazi units), established the Reich's Central Agency for the Struggle Against Homosexuality and Abortion, and in 1943, after three years of preparation by the Ministries of the Interior and of Justice, the law entitled Protection of Marriage, Family and Motherhood called for the death penalty in “extreme cases.”

THE CHRISTIAN FASCISTS AND OPERATION RESCUE

on the Family and the Role of Women:

“Never before has the cause you espouse been more important to the future of our country. The critical values of the family and the sanctity of human life that you advocate are being increasingly accepted by our citizens as essential to reestablishing the moral strength of our nation.”


“We are totally opposed to abortion under any circumstances. We are also opposed to abortifacient drugs and chemicals like the Pill and the IUD, and we are also opposed to all forms of birth control with the exception of natural family planning.”

Judie Brown, President, American Life League.

“We plan to restore moral sanity to this country and bring everyone back to the Judeo-Christian ethic. That is going to involve the entertainment world, medicine, the college, politics, the judicial system, the prison system, the whole nine yards.”

Randall Terry, founder of Operation Rescue.

“A woman can be a spiritual leader, but biblically, she should be under a man’s authority. There’s nothing we can do about the Truth. God made men responsible for women. It could be a boss or a husband. If a woman is married, it is always her husband.”

Joanna Bertenshaw, an Operation Rescue “foot soldier.”

“We see the anti-family movement as an attempt to prevent soul from reaching eternal salvation, and as such we feel not just a political commitment to change the situation, but a moral and, if you will, a religious commitment to battle these forces.... Among the anti-family forces are hardcore socialists who see it as a means by which they can attain greater state control.... Then there are people who want a different kind of family, who are not necessarily Marxists. Symbolized by the women’s liberation movement, they believe that the future for their political power lies in the restructuring of the traditional family, and particularly in the downsizing of the male or father role in the traditional family.”

Paul Weithen, right-wing conservative theologian.

“It is they who are doing violence to our beloved nation by their systematic undermining of the basic unit of our society, the family. They do violence by their so-called sex education which is encouraging sexual promiscuity in our children and leading to more and more abortions. The do violence to us by driving wedges, barriers, and suspicion between teenagers and parents. They do violence to marriage by helping to remove the right of a husband to protect the life of the child he has fathered in his wife’s womb.”

Dr. J.C. Wilke, speaker at an Operation Rescue rally before a New York clinic assault.

Frankfurt, West Germany, 1988—Woman prays less against abortion.
If the Christian Fascists Had Their Say, And the Bible Was the Law Today, Would You Want to Live This Way?

There are “Christian Soldiers” on the loose. They assault women in front of health clinics. They claim to be the saviors of unborn babies. But they are really Christian Fascists—morality police with a whole program of oppression for women and children. Not only are they against a woman’s right to terminate her pregnancy—they are against birth control and against sex for women who are not married. They claim that there is justification for their views in the Bible. But people who hate oppression would rise up against many things in the Bible. There are many laws and instructions and practices that even religious people consider oppressive and would never want to be enforced.

Check out some of the rules and laws written in the Bible. If these things were put into practice, the world would be a cruel and horrible place. These quotations are ammunition to be used against those who pick up the Bible to keep women down. The Christian Fascist crusaders against abortion should be forced to say whether this is the kind of world they want and the kind of morality they want to impose on the people.

DO YOU REALLY WANT TO FOLLOW THIS?

THE BIBLE UPHOLDS SLAVERY:

Slaves Must Obey Their Masters— Even the Most Cruel Masters
Servants, be subject to your masters with all fear, not only to the good and gentle, but also to the forward. (1 Peter 2:18)
Wives Are Slaves To Their Husbands
Wives submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord. (Ephesians 5:22)
The People Must Obey the Powers-That-Be
Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates. (Romans 13:1)
Foreigners Should Be Bought
And Sold as Slaves
Moreover of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy; and of their families that are with you, which they begin in your land: and they shall be your possessions. (Leviticus 25:45)

IN THE BIBLE WOMEN ARE PROPERTY OF HUSBANDS AND FATHERS:

A Man Can Sell His Daughter but She Can’t Even Go Out Like a Man Slave and If Her Master Doesn’t Like Her, He Can Sell Her Back—But Not to Foreigners
If a man sell his daughter to be a maidervant, she shall not go out as the menservant do. If she please not her master, who hath betrothed her to himself, then shall he let her be redeemed: to sell her unto a strange nation he shall have no power. (Exodus 21:7-8)

Brides Whose Fathers Cannot Prove They Are Virgins Are Stoned to Death
If any man take a wife, and go in unto her, and hate her. And give occasions of speech against her, and bring up an evil name upon her, and say, I looked this woman, and when I came to her, I found her not a woman: if this thing be true, and the tokens of virginity be not found for the damsel: then they shall bring out the damsel to the door of her father’s house, and the men of the city shall stone her unto a strange nation he shall have no power. (Deuteronomy 22:13-21)

IN THE BIBLE WOMEN ARE PUNISHED FOR RAPE:

If a Woman Engaged To Be Married Is Raped In the City She and the Rapist Are Stoned to Death
If a damsel that is a virgin be betrothed unto an husband, and a man find her in the city, and lie with her; Then ye shall bring out both unto the gate of that city, and ye shall stone them with stones that they die; the damsel, because she cried not, being in the city; and the man, because he hath humbled his neighbor’s wife. (Deuteronomy 22:13-24)
If a Man Is Caught Raping a Girl Who Is Not Engaged, the Rapist Must Pay the Girl’s Father, and the Girl Must Marry the Rapist!
If a man find a damsel that is a virgin, which is not betrothed, and lay hold on her and lie with her, and they be found; Then the man that lay with her shall give unto the damsel’s father fifty shekels of silver; and she shall he his wife: because he hath humbled her, he may not put her away all his days. (Deuteronomy 22:23-29)

THE BIBLE TEACHES THAT WOMEN ARE UNCLEAN AND INFERIOR

If You Give Birth to a Boy You Are Unclean For a Week, If It’s a Girl 2 Weeks!
If a woman have conceived seed, and born a man child: then she shall be unclean seven days… And she shall then continue in the blood of her purifying three and thirty days; she shall touch no hallowed thing, not come into the sanctuary… But if she bear a maids child, then she shall be unclean two weeks… and she shall continue in the blood of her purifying threescore and six days. (Leviticus 12:2-5)

Women Can’t Talk in Church
And Can Only Learn from Men
Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak, but they are commanded to be under obedience. (1 Corinthians 14:34-35)

Women Are No Good But They Can Be Saved If They Have Babies and Behave Themselves
For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression. Nevertheless she shall be saved in childbearing, if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety. (1 Timothy 2:13-15)

THE BIBLE HAS MANY DEATH PENALTIES

Death Penalty for Witches
Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live. (Exodus 22:18)

Death Penalty for Homosexuals
If a man also lie with mankind, as he lieth with a woman, both of them shall surely be put to death. (Leviticus 20:13)

Death Penalty for Children Who Cuss, Hit, Disobey, or Rebel Against Their Parents
And he that smiteth his father, or his mother, shall be surely put to death. (Exodus 21:15)

For God commanded, saying, Honour thy father and mother: and, He that curseth father or mother, let him die the death. (Matthew 15:4)

THE BIBLE SUPPORTS WARS OF CONQUEST:

Instructions for Taking Women as Prisoners of War
But the women, and the little ones, and the cattle, and all that is in the city, even all the spoil thereof, shalt thou take unto thyself; and thou shalt eat the spoil of thine enemies, which the Lord thy God hath given thee. (Deuteronomy 20:14)

WE WON’T GO BACK!

Women Are Not Incubators!
Fetuses Are Not Children!
Abortion Is Not Murder!
From the New Book by Bob Avakian: Phony Communism Is Dead...Long Live Real Communism!

Communism Is Not a "Utopian Tyranny," But a Realizable and Liberating Goal

In this excerpt from his new book, "Phony Communism Is Dead...Long Live Real Communism," Bob Avakian answers a common charge made against communism. This is the idea that communism is both unworkable and nightmarish because it tried to forcibly create a utopia. You had this notion that you could create utopia, a telling exposure of its outlook on the part of the bourgeoisie, a revealing exposure of its outlook.

This is a common refrain. It is also very similar to comments in an article in the New York Times where it is said: (The Soviet Union) "was the source of tyranny, the epicenter of the utopian ideology in whose name freedoms were crushed and economies were crippled on two continents... The principal illusion, as Pasteur, Alastair had said, was that it was possible to fabricate new human material, to perfect man through the artificial manipulation of social organization. The contrasting strength of democracy and (the) free market, it could be argued, lay in recognizing that for all his failings, man functioned best when left to his own devices." (Wit ness to Revolution, NYT, August 25, 1991)

First, this is nothing but an undogmatized celebration of selfishness. In commenting on what certain common features can be identified in human society up to the present time is owing, yes, to the fact that there are certain basic qualities common to human beings in general, certain things about their biological makeup, including very importantly the development of their brains. But this common human identity is relative and not absolute, and in fact one of the most significant distinguishing features of human beings in general is their great "plasticity," their ability to adapt and change according to differing circumstances, and in turn to react upon and change those external circumstances—more and more consciously. Throughout their thousands of years of history, human beings and human society have undergone very great transformation, even though, as emphasized before, this has taken place within certain very definite limits—which themselves are due to the still limited development of social productive forces and the corresponding production and social relations, and not to some unchanging, so-called "human nature." Even what has been considered "human nature" (and what has been considered "rational" and "irrational") has been different in different epochs and in the outlook of different classes (for example, what seems "natural" or "rational" to a slaveowner is very different; and, as a matter of fact, what seems rational or irrational to a capitalist differs in significant respects from how this is seen by a slaveowner—both are exploiters, but they represent different systems of exploitative relations, upheld by correspondingly different values, "morals," etc.).

That certain common features can be identified in human society up to the present time is owing, yes, to the fact that there are certain basic qualities common to human beings in general, but specifically with regard to such things as the desire or willingness to profit at the expense of others; the idea that some people or nations are superior to others, and that men must dominate women; the notion that people's fate is controlled by supernatural forces and powers; all this is the result not of "human nature" but of the fact that up until now the basis has not yet existed for common abundance (note: common abundance) and the elimination of the struggle for individual

In this excerpt from his new book, "Phony Communism Is Dead...Long Live Real Communism," Bob Avakian answers a common charge made against communism. This is the idea that communism is both unworkable and nightmarish because it tried to forcibly create a utopia. You had this notion that you could create utopia, a telling exposure of its outlook on the part of the bourgeoisie, a revealing exposure of its outlook.

This is a common refrain. It is also very similar to comments in an article in the New York Times where it is said: (The Soviet Union) "was the source of tyranny, the epicenter of the utopian ideology in whose name freedoms were crushed and economies were crippled on two continents... The principal illusion, as Pasteur, Alastair had said, was that it was possible to fabricate new human material, to perfect man through the artificial manipulation of social organization. The contrasting strength of democracy and (the) free market, it could be argued, lay in recognizing that for all his failings, man functioned best when left to his own devices." (Witness to Revolution, NYT, August 25, 1991)

First, this is nothing but an undogmatized celebration of selfishness. In commenting on what certain common features can be identified in human society up to the present time is owing, yes, to the fact that there are certain basic qualities common to human beings in general, certain things about their biological makeup, including very importantly the development of their brains. But this common human identity is relative and not absolute, and in fact one of the most significant distinguishing features of human beings in general is their great "plasticity," their ability to adapt and change according to differing circumstances, and in turn to react upon and change those external circumstances—more and more consciously. Throughout their thousands of years of history, human beings and human society have undergone very great transformation, even though, as emphasized before, this has taken place within certain very definite limits—which themselves are due to the still limited development of social productive forces and the corresponding production and social relations, and not to some unchanging, so-called "human nature." Even what has been considered "human nature" (and what has been considered "rational" and "irrational") has been different in different epochs and in the outlook of different classes (for example, what seems "natural" or "rational" to a slaveowner is very different; and, as a matter of fact, what seems rational or irrational to a capitalist differs in significant respects from how this is seen by a slaveowner—both are exploiters, but they represent different systems of exploitative relations, upheld by correspondingly different values, "morals," etc.).

That certain common features can be identified in human society up to the present time is owing, yes, to the fact that there are certain basic qualities common to human beings in general, but specifically with regard to such things as the desire or willingness to profit at the expense of others; the idea that some people or nations are superior to others, and that men must dominate women; the notion that people's fate is controlled by supernatural forces and powers; all this is the result not of "human nature" but of the fact that up until now the basis has not yet existed for common abundance (note: common abundance) and the elimination of the struggle for individual
existence and social antagonism. Before now, the basis has not existed for a society, a world, of freely associating human beings conscious of their relation to the rest of nature and to each other in society. But the point is precisely that the possibility, as well as the practical necessity, for such a world now exists for the first time in human history. With revolutionary sweep, Engels made this clear:

"If...division into classes has a certain historical justification, it has this only for a given period, only under given social conditions. It was based upon the insufficiency of production. It will be swept away by the complete development of modern productive forces. And, in fact, the abolition of classes in society presupposes a degree of historical evolution at which the existence, not simply of this or that particular ruling class, but of any ruling class at all, and, therefore, the existence of class distinction itself has become an obsolete anachronism. It presupposes, therefore, the development of production and of the products, and, with this, of political domination, of the society itself—and therefore there is the continual danger of capitalist restoration as the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Now, it is not the case that the abolition of classes in society presupposes a degree of political domination, of the monopoly of culture, and of intellectual leadership by a particular class of society, but becomes not only superfluous but economically, politically, intellectually, a hindrance to development.

"This point is now reached...The possibility of securing for every member of society a world now exists for the first time in human history."

Not a "Utopia"—But a Real Great Leap Ahead

Finally, in response to Brezhnev, Marx—Leninism-Maoism promises some "perfect" society without contradiction—as Marx put it, without contradiction and struggle life would come to an end. What I do mean is that Marx—Leninism-Maoism includes, and must include, an aspect of looking beyond the limitations set by the current stage of human society and envisioning a radically different world in which human beings have been emancipated from the shackles of class-divided society.

The point is this—to take up the terms used by Brezhnev—there is in this vision of communism a certain identity, a synthesis, of the ideal and the rational. That is, the ideal of a world without exploitation and oppression, without class distinctions or even national distinctions, is, at this stage of human history, a rational—"realizable"—goal. But, in the deeper, fundamental philosophical sense, this is not a matter of idealism, but of materialism—dialectical materialism— it is an expression of the fact that the development of human society, occurring not only through gradual changes but more decisively through revolutionary leaps and radical ruptures, has prepared the ground for the achievement of such a communist society, and more than that urgently demands its realization. As Lenin once said with regard to the revolutionary struggle, it is not only alright, it is necessary to demand...so long as your dreams are in accord with the course of development of reality and if you then work tirelessly to bring your dreams into realization on that basis.

...and oppression, without class distinctions...
The Dearborn Hunger March

“Anyone who wants work and who looks for work can find work.”

“There is nothing in the business situation to be disturbed about.”

“Prosperity is just around the corner.”

Doesn’t that sound like the stuff we hear today from the White House and the boob tube? It sure does, but the quotes are from the early 1930s, before the television set was even invented. The cold words were spoken by capitalist Henry Ford, Commerce Secretary Robert Lamont, and President Herbert Hoover. It was hard times then, and it’s hard times now.

Sixty years ago this week, on March 7, 1932. Henry Ford’s armed thugs and cops attacked a righteous march of thousands against hunger, homelessness and joblessness in Dearborn, Michigan. The matter of five radical workers for daring to lead resistance was like a gauntlet thrown down by the ruling class to the workers.

There are many things we can learn from this battle, even though some conditions were different then during the “Great Depression.” In the winter of 1932, there were 16 million unemployed people in the U.S.—today the official tally is 9 million and rising. Hunger and joblessness stalked the land. Impoverished masses were herded into the cores of cities, living a life not much different from that in the modern ghetto. Ruined farmers wandered across a western Dust Bowl of exhausted farmland. There are many things we can learn from this battle, even though some conditions were different then during “the Great Depression.”

In these conditions, the calls by communists for the people to resist were like matches in a dry prairie. The fine promises of the bosses during the time of the Auto show that the auto industry would bring prosperity have proven so much different from that in the modern ghetto. Razed farmers wandered across a western Dust Bowl of exhausted farmland. There are many things we can learn from this battle, even though some conditions were different then during “the Great Depression.”

Some of the banners read: “We Want Bread, Not Crumbs!” “Open the Rooms of the Ys for Homeless Youth!” “Fight Against Dumping of Milk While Babies Starve!” “Come on Workers, Don’t Be Afraid!” The marchers sang as they surged down the road toward Dearborn.

Fifty-two percent of the entire property wealth of Dearborn was congealed in the River Rouge factory. It was the biggest industrial plant in the world and a crown jewel of Ford’s and America’s capitalist empire. 122,000 workers slaved on this 12,000-acre “plantation” before the stock market crashed in 1929.

By 1932 the payroll was down to 80,000 workers. Through massive layoffs and wage cuts, ruthless speedup and the hated terror of a 5,000-man “Service Department,” Ford had managed to keep the plant a profit-making enterprise. But it was more than just greed for profits that compelled officials to come down hard against the workers that day. This was a battle that they knew could reverberate through the whole antidemocratic edifice of capitalism. Auto firms were central to U.S. industry, with one-sixth of all jobs in the country depending directly on auto production. Auto was also a war industry that had been built up during World War I and was primed for the next imperialist conflict. At a conference held by the U.S. War Department in 1931, Detroit auto executives promised to be ready at a moment’s notice to gut up for war, including by keeping jigs and dies on hand that would be needed for military production.

There was a special effort to keep the industry from being unionized. Trade unions were almost unheard of in major industries at that time. In those days workers in basic industry were not a relatively privileged section of the workers. The Auto Workers Union was originally created and led by the Communist Party, and none of the auto company tycoons gave it any slack. (It would be 1941 before Ford was forced to concede to a union, and that was to foster harmony behind the imperialist war effort.)

Henry Ford and his men were determined to stop any “trouble”—especially led by “reds”—at the Rouge plant that day. Ford hunkered down nearby at Fair Lane, his castle-like mansion. He had designated his son Edsel, the corporate president, to be inside the plant supervising its “defense,” along with corporate general manager Charles Sorrentino and ex-Governor Fred W. Green, Service Department head Harry Bennett had been directed to clamp a tight lid on the plant workers, all of whom would
1932: Blood in the Streets

be held inside at shift change to prevent them joining the march. 

Deborah, a 23-year-old Ford employee, told the Free Press that as she walked outside, a man ran up and smashed the window of her car. He then led her into a nearby house, where she was beaten to death. City police and Ford security officials were called to the scene, but no action was taken.

The next day, on March 10, about 8,000 people gathered at the entrance to the Ford Motor Company plant in Dearborn, Michigan. They demanded justice for the three workers who had died and called for an end to the violence that had characterized the company's operations in recent weeks. The crowd was met with a force of police and national guardsmen, who used tear gas, clubs, and machine guns to disperse the demonstrators. In the ensuing chaos, four workers were killed and dozens were injured.

News of the killings spread quickly, and protests and strikes broke out across the country. The government, under pressure from labor leaders and social reformers, ordered the National Guard to the scene to restore order.

The Dearborn骚乱 lasted for three days, during which thousands of workers faced off against police and National Guard troops. The government's response was brutal, as it sought to maintain control of the city and protect the interests of business.

The violence ended on March 12, when a compromise was reached between the workers' union and the Ford Motor Company. The union agreed to suspend the strike, and the company promised to investigate the deaths of the three workers and to introduce measures to prevent similar incidents in the future.

The Dearborn骚乱 remains a significant event in labor history, as it highlighted the tensions between labor and management and the role of the government in maintaining order. It also underscored the importance of peaceful protest and the need for a more just and equitable society.
The Dearborn Hunger March 1932

Sixty years ago, Detroit was already "the Motor City," the hub of the automotive industry. Henry Ford, the founder of the Ford Motor Company, had a vision of creating a "model" city where everyone would have a job and live in peace. However, this vision was not realized for all the workers. The 1932 Dearborn Hunger March was a significant event in the history of the labor movement and a testament to the struggles faced by workers.

In 1932, the auto industry was in crisis, and unemployment was high. The Ford Motor Company, under the leadership of Henry Ford, was struggling to maintain its dominance in the industry. The company had implemented a policy of paying workers a daily wage of $5, which was considered a living wage at the time. However, the economic downturn in the early 1930s made it difficult for the company to sustain this policy. Workers feared losing their jobs and had to survive on meager wages.

The Dearborn Hunger March was a protest by workers against the low wages and poor working conditions they faced. The workers, who were predominantly Black, were paid as little as 30-45 cents an hour. Many workers were unemployed and had to rely on temporary jobs and to put off evictions. The local Board of Commerce complained that the company was paying slave wages as a form of punishment.

The Dearborn Hunger March was a pivotal moment in the history of the labor movement. It highlighted the struggles faced by workers and the need for a revolutionary struggle against capitalism. The event was covered extensively by the media, including the Revolutionary Worker, a journal of the revolutionary movement. The Dearborn and Detroit political system was under siege as the workers took to the streets in protest.

The negotiations between the workers and the Ford Motor Company were unsuccessful, and the workers continued to protest. The Dearborn Hunger March was a setback for the company, and it eventually had to increase wages and improve working conditions. The workers' struggle for better pay and working conditions continued, and it paved the way for future labor movements.

In conclusion, the Dearborn Hunger March of 1932 was a significant event in the history of the labor movement. It highlighted the struggles faced by workers and the need for a revolutionary struggle against capitalism. The event was a turning point in the history of the labor movement, and it paved the way for future labor movements.
The RW Interview: Nawal El-Saadawi Tears Off the Veil

Effect of all this on Arab women is very negative.

ON July 11 the Arab Women's Solidarity Association was abolished by the Egyptian government. Could you talk about that?

NES: This is exactly one of the results of the Gulf war and one of the results of the Israeli lobby within the UN and other international organizations. They gave us a number of false promises. "You are a women's organization, why do you talk about the Gulf? Why do you speak about politics? Why do you want political freedom?"

On the other hand, the international association (not the national which had no money because Egypt and Arab countries gave us no money) got some money from UNESCO and other international sources. So they went to the bank of our international association and from the money they used to give to the Women of Islam and wanted to take the money and give it to the Women of Islam. Our activities were stopped.

If we come to Egypt, I think Egyptian women are avant garde. We have a very high percentage of women among professionals. I became a medical doctor and a writer. There was no discrimination against women in the university. This is because of the change Nasser made, in education. They offered women free medical education, because I came from a poor family. [Many Arab women were leaders of Egypt during the 1950s and '60s]. Where I was in medical college in the '50s there was not a single veiled woman. But in the '70s when my daughter was a student, 30 percent of the women were veiled. We also get equal pay for equal work in the public sector—because in the private sector there is discrimination. The family court is terrible in Egypt because of polygamy and the fact that the man can divorce his wife; she cannot divorce him. There is no equality in the right of divorce. We were fighting this, but the effect of fundamentalism aborts our fight.

And this is happening in other Arab countries. There is an increase of veiled women because of fundamentalism. The media is very reactionary. For example, progressive women like me or sometimes men cannot speak on the television or radio. If you use fundamentalist, female or male talking on television. The government says it is against fundamentalism, but the media is propagating it. It's a contradiction. It puzzles us. Now the fundamentalists say they have won. You have this double game played by states and governments in our region. It's very dangerous. They fight against fundamentalism but they need them as a reserve power to use against the left and progressive groups.

We are facing some problems. Education, the economic crisis, the debt. The debt increased because of the open door policy of Sadat. Instead of producing what we need and what we eat, we import our food. We have become dependent, economically speaking, of the United States. Because of this imperialism, new colonial order. The regimes in the Gulf countries had their interest in this. The so-called open door policy of Sadat destroyed Egypt in debt and development.

Agricultural and industrial development was very much diminished, and we started to go over to an import and export. We produce what we do not eat and we eat what we do not produce. Egypt can be self-sufficient, but we are not. We import oranges. We import wheat instead of cultivating it.

What were the sentiments of the people, the opposition, to the Gulf war?

The left party was split. The right-wing party was totally with the Americans, the fundamentalists were also split. It divided the non-reformist parties. I think the left party is my feeling, as a woman coming from a village, my feeling is the majority were against the war. And now after the defeat, some of the people who were for the war, some of the left who were against the war, all of us who were for the war, now they regret it.

THE RW INTERVIEW: a special feature of the RW to acquaint our readers with the views of邓小平's accomplishments, music and literature, science, sports and politics. The views expressed in this section are, of course, their own and they do not necessarily reflect the views of the RW. They are published without alteration or editing by the RW. They are published without alteration or editing by the RW.

A Global Feminist Conference sponsored by the Organization for Women took place in Washington, D.C., Jan. 9-12. Nawal El Saadawi, the founder and executive director of the International Arab Women's Solidarity Association, was one of those attending. The Association was that down from the Egyptian government last summer for its stand against U.S. intervention. During a break at the conference Mary Lou Greenberg interviewed her for the RW. Along with being an international activist, El Saadawi is a medical doctor and the author of 27 books, including a classic study of women in the Arab world, The Hidden Face of Eve. She was imprisoned by former Egyptian president Anwar el Sadat for her activities on behalf of women and the oppressed.

RW: What is the situation of women in Arab countries since the Persian Gulf War? Has that affected the lives of women?

NES: The problems of women in the Arab world varies very much from Saudi Arabia to Egypt to Algeria, Saudi Arabia is the worst regime. Women are veiled, they can't move around freely. Women don't work, some single veiled women. Under Sadat in the '70s when my daughter was a student, 30 percent of the women were veiled. Under Sadat in March 1975, the law was passed to take the veil off, they closed it because we are a women's organization. So we gave them the decree which closed the association.

RW: On July 11 the Arab Women's Solidarity Association was abolished by the administrative decree of the Egyptian government. Could you talk about that?

NES: This is exactly one of the results of the Gulf war and one of the results of the Israeli lobby within the UN and other international organizations. They gave us a number of false promises. "You are a women's organization, why do you talk about the Gulf? Why do you speak about politics? Why do you want political freedom?"

On the other hand, the international association (not the national which had no money because Egypt and Arab countries gave us no money) got some money from UNESCO and other international sources. So they went to the bank of our international association and from the money they used to give to the Women of Islam and wanted to take the money and give it to the Women of Islam. Our activities were stopped.

If we come to Egypt, I think Egyptian women are avant garde. We have a very high percentage of women among professionals. I became a medical doctor and a writer. There was no discrimination against women in the university. This is because of the change Nasser made, in education. They offered women free medical education, because I came from a poor family. [Many Arab women were leaders of Egypt during the 1950s and '60s]. Where I was in medical college in the '50s there was not a single veiled woman. But in the '70s when my daughter was a student, 30 percent of the women were veiled. We also get equal pay for equal work in the public sector—because in the private sector there is discrimination. The family court is terrible in Egypt because of polygamy and the fact that the man can divorce his wife; she cannot divorce him. There is no equality in the right of divorce. We were fighting this, but the effect of fundamentalism aborts our fight.

And this is happening in other Arab countries. There is an increase of veiled women because of fundamentalism. The media is very reactionary. For example, progressive women like me or sometimes men cannot speak on the television or radio. If you use fundamentalist, female or male talking on television. The government says it is against fundamentalism, but the media is propagating it. It's a contradiction; it puzzles us. Now the fundamentalists say they have won. You have this double game played by states and governments in our region. It's very dangerous. They fight against fundamentalism but they need them as a reserve power to use against the left and progressive groups.

We are facing some problems. Education, the economic crisis, the debt. The debt increased because of the open door policy of Sadat. Instead of producing what we need and what we eat, we import our food. We have become dependent, economically speaking, of the United States. Because of this imperialism, new colonial order. The regimes in the Gulf countries had their interest in this. The so-called open door policy of Sadat destroyed Egypt in debt and development.

Agricultural and industrial development was very much diminished, and we started to go over to an import and export. We produce what we do not eat and we eat what we do not produce. Egypt can be self-sufficient, but we are not. We import oranges. We import wheat instead of cultivating it.

What were the sentiments of the people, the opposition, to the Gulf war?

The left party was split. The right-wing party was totally with the Americans, the fundamentalists were also split. It divided the non-reformist parties. I think the left party is my feeling, as a woman coming from a village, my feeling is the majority were against the war. And now after the defeat, some of the people who were for the war, some of the left who were against the war, all of us who were for the war, now they regret it.

RW: You've seen the statement that was done by Mubarak about the end of the war. The Women's Day last year protesting the war. (The statement, published in Al-Ahram on March 8, was written by Greenberg and endorsed by various groups and individuals.) There was a lot of sentiment among women to somehow in expressing opposition and linking it to the Women's Day.
Hanging Judge Thomas Upholds Prison Beatings

The U.S. is the only power that has actual control over Japan. At the end of World War 2, when Japan was already in ruins and on the verge of conceding defeat, the United States dropped atomic bombs on the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The two bombings in August 1945 killed over 150,000 people immediately and caused many sufferers to suffer radiation sickness. It was concluded that the only way to win the war—they were meant as a cold-blooded demonstration to the world that the U.S. was perfectly willing to use this weapon of mass destruction to defend its domination of the world.

Some people think that the Democrats are somehow less reactionary than the Republicans. They are right to note. Hollings is a Democrat and Hollings has been doing some of the loudest “Japan-bashing” lately. (And, it should be pointed out, it was Majority Leader Thomas that ordered the nuclear bombs dropped on Japan.) But the Republicans are hardly likely to be any better. Last December George Bush declared that the U.S. would not offer any apologies for the nuclear bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

With the top officials and politicians in the U.S., public denouncing the bombing of Japan, is it any wonder that there has been a big rise in racist incidents occurring on the streets of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The two bombings in August 1945 killed over 150,000 people immediately and caused many sufferers to suffer radiation sickness. It was concluded that the only way to win the war—they were meant as a cold-blooded demonstration to the world that the U.S. was perfectly willing to use this weapon of mass destruction to defend its domination of the world.

During the Clarence Thomas hearings, did you know that it was the sister of the US Senator Edward Kennedy who had supported the Justice? Do you know people who thought Thomas would be sympathetic? Only women knew the answer to this. The answer is: yes. In 1983 Keith Hudson was brutally beaten by three guards in Camp J of the Louisiana State Penitentiary. He had been wounded in a head wound, left his face bloody and swollen. He was brought to hospital and never saw the man who did it. They were the men who were parts of the prison system. They were brutal in other places on his body, which he was never able to identify. He said, "I don't have too much faith!"

Hudson was a former soldier and was a part of the Army. He was also a member of the National Guard. The judge dismissed the case because it was a military court. The police were not involved in the case. They said that the beatings of Keith Hudson had been malicious and sadistic. The Court's majority said such beatings violated the U.S. Constitution's ban on "cruel and unusual punishment." But Clarence Thomas disagreed. He said, "There's no sense of obligation, no sensitivity, no nothing. We might have had a better deal with David Duke on the Court."

Four months ago, Clarence Thomas was put on the Supreme Court because he had a proven record as an extreme reactionary, and because he was Black. The ruling powers believed his nationality could confuse some of the people into supporting him. The oppressed brothers and sisters who fail for this game need to see the 1992 election as the end of the game. They need to see the U.S. as a reactionary force, and the reason they are in power is because they are serving the owners of this country. The rulers of the U.S. are the powerful who run this country. The rulers of the U.S. are the rich and powerful who run this country.

The U.S. Constitution's ban on "cruel and unusual punishment" was written into the Constitution because it was thought that the U.S. Constitution was a better guarantee of freedom than the U.S. government. The U.S. Constitution's ban on "cruel and unusual punishment" has been violated by the U.S. government.
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It was a cold and blustery Saturday, February 29, on an island in the middle of New York City harbor. Over 100 people had traveled by ferry to this gathering in the shadow of the Statue of Liberty. Filmmaker Jonathan Demme had called this demonstration in support of Katherine Dunham, a renowned African-American dancer who, at 82 years old, has been fasting for over a month, since February 1, in protest against the forced deportation of Haitian refugees (see last week’s RW, No. 646). 

Demme opened with these comments: "Bush has been accused of piracy by international organizations for intercepting boats of Haitians in international waters and taking them to what amounts to mass incarceration camps in Cuba. There, after a dubious interviewing process, the vast majority are returned to Haiti where they are suffering repression and beatings...."

Comedian and political activist Dick Gregory also spoke, moving the crowd with his honest and uncompromising stand and unique humor. He came in from East St. Louis, where he has been visiting Dunham daily throughout her fast. Gregory has been arrested for taking part in support actions. He has also joined her fast.

Gregory told the crowd: "I'm really amazed when I come to rallies and I hear Americans who should be wise and smart keep acting like you all are shocked. I'm really amazed when I hear Americans talk about the good old days. America's never wanted right. What good old days?... I'm very happy that I choose the fight that I chose, and I'm very happy for every vote that I get. I was 60 years old, and being no young to have been there during that Nazi time, I kinda always whispered in my ear, 'Had you been in Nazi Germany, would you have voted for Hitler? No!'

But that's easy. It's like you Christians are gonna have an easy job next Wednesday—going to church, putting some ash on your head and go 'Happy Easter.'... Then on Easter Sunday stand up in church singing about how you were 'there when they crucified the Lord.' What a cheap song to sing. You wasn't there two thousand years ago, and chances are most Christians shouldn't have been there either. Jesus Christ came back to America today andbugged the wrong people, they'd give Jesus the electric chair. Then all of us would be walking around with big chairs around our necks. Tell me about it. ... What you do here is more than just for Haitians. What you do here sends a message out around the world that we do care...."

Other speakers at the rally included Rev. Robert Castle, an Episcopal minister from a church in Harlem, noted for his actions against the Gulf War, who began fasting six days earlier in solidarity with Dunham; actress Mercedes Ruehl; Dr. Joseph Lowery of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference; U.S. Congressman Charles Rangel; and a number of Haitian activists, including Smith George, a Haitian artist from Rockland for Haiti.

The rally was covered minimally in the New York Times, as well as the Daily News. The Yol TV/MTV crew was there, and rapper Freedy Pouxx. The rap show had earlier covered the issue on Christmas Day when they broadcast the show from the Guantanamo Bay camps. 

The show's host, Fab Five Freddie, spoke to the crowd: "RW: Why are you here? Fab Five Freddie: ‘Cause the situation is f*cked up. It's cold-blooded, what’s going on. People are not getting justice. That’s why I’m here.... We want to be the information to the people so they can see the clear outright injustices being done by our government. Let the people know that they have a right to challenge the government, they have a right to protest. You know, a lot of people don’t have that privilege today, cause a lot of us are not going. But it’s still our right and we can do it, and we need to do it. That’s how this whole country was built, by people, revolutionaries, who want a change.

Many different voices were voiced at the rally, including that of poet laureate. For others for U.S. intervention to put Aristide back in power. As has been discussed in the RW, the Mainist view that it is any intervention by the U.S. is an act of imperialism that is not in the best interest of the people of Haiti. The gross brutality of the forced deportations is only the most recent example of how the U.S. government "helps" Haitians and other oppressed peoples.

But there was also a spirit of fearless defiance at this action. Rev. Robert Castle said, "It’s time to ‘Be wise as serpents and foolish as doves."

"Castle, who hopes for the reinstatement of Aristide, told the RW: "My congregation is in complete support of the struggle of the Haitian people. In fact, a few years ago we sent a letter to our presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church calling on him to excommunication Bush [for his policies on Haiti]. I can’t determine what people in Haiti have to do for themselves. But I do believe that people are oppressed need to feel free within their own decision-making to make that decision by whatever means are necessary for them to bring liberation and freedom to their people. The poverty and the guilt that exists between the rich and the poor—which is increasing even here in this country—is staggering. And whereas there have been some positive signs in terms of socialist economies in the world right now, I don’t think they’re dead by any means. And I think the people will move again to a greater sense of a fair economy, whether that socialist or communist, whatever. But we certainly cannot live with the greed of capitalism in the world now where we are so interdependent upon each other. And capitalism, as we know it, has got to go."

Katherine Dunham’s action has clearly struck a chord. Demme talked for a moment with the RW. He was anxious about his health, but said of her courageous action: "If she wasn’t doing that, I wouldn’t be here right now today doing this.

He added: "I know a lot of Haitians, so I’m very concerned about this. But coming from one of the most privileged immigrant groups, the English, it makes me especially appalled at what’s going on."

As we go to press, Katherine Dunham remains on her fast, and the RW has just heard from Demme’s office that fifteen people in Ohio have also joined in the fast.

New York Demo: Dunham in Protest Against Haitian Deportations

San Francisco: 1,500 Protest Bush

San Francisco Union Square, February 29—Over 1500 people protested George Bush’s mid-day visit to San Francisco. At St. Francis Hotel rich Republicans paid $1,000 a plate to suck up Bush’s lies and help raise funds for his campaign. Outside angry protesters raised their voices. Nine AIDS activists were able to get into the hotel and chain themselves together in protest. Balloons filled with red water splattered against the uniformed officers and signs protested the deportation of Haitian refugees, the government’s AIDS policy, recent cuts in social programs, racism, destruction of the environment and the U.S.’s continuing attack on the Iraqi people. Yea in the crowd, including some who had served in the Gulf war, denounced their former commander-in-chief and called for support for GI resisters. Others simply denounced this “racist, fucked-up system.”

An ACT UP demonstrator told a reporter, “There are 1,001 reasons to hate George Bush.”

Twice in the afternoon, hundreds of demonstrators broke off from the crowd around the hotel to march through the downtown streets. Signs marking Bush Street which goes through downtown, disappeared from poles. Metal police barricades lay knocked over on the ground as the marchers passed, and the red-faced cops scrambled to drag them back in place. Some bank windows were shattered. A total of 15 protesters were reported arrested. (sec last week’s RW, No. 646).

Correction

In last week’s issue the article “Church Proposes Saint Uncle Tom” reported that the hierarchy of the Catholic Church is proposing Pierre Toussaint, who was a punitively loyal black slave, for holy sainthood. The article was supposed to be accompanied by a photo of the reactionary Cardinal O’Connor. But unfortunately, a picture of another New York priest appeared instead. The photo on the right shows the actual features of New York’s top holy pig, Cardinal O’Connor.
“There is nothing more uplifting than communism—nothing which gives greater scope to human imagination and creativity, to the vision of a vastly different world, and to the initiative of the masses in creating such a world. That the rulers of the Soviet Union could not inspire people with this ideal is a condemnation of them. But more than that, it is a reflection of the fact that they had abandoned and betrayed the principles of communism and become but another group of enforcers of the old order.”

Bob Avakian, *Phony Communism Is Dead...Long Live Real Communism*

**NOW AVAILABLE!**

Bob Avakian has written a bold and challenging work that cuts right to the debate of our times. Over and over we are told that history has judged communism to be a “grand failure,” and that there is no use fighting for a different world. But is capitalism the best of all possible worlds? Avakian contrasts the brutal realities of the free market to the claims of its defenders. Has revolutionary communism proven to be a disastrous nightmare? Avakian refutes the charges that socialist economies are unworkable and that communism suppressed individuality and freedom.

Bob Avakian has produced a defiant manifesto. But this book is more than that. It probes deeply into the real history and lessons of the revolution, especially the Maoist Cultural Revolution. Can revolutions survive in a hostile world? How can they avoid going sour? Can the basic people actually run society? And is it really possible to move society beyond private gain and money relations?

If you want to know what real communism is about, and if you wonder whether society really has to be run as a dog-eat-dog enterprise, then you will find this book as timely as it is provocative.

**TAKE HEART AND TAKE PART...** help raise $5,000 to get this momentous book by Bob Avakian out and into the hands of those who are searching for a realist road to true liberation.

Send your contributions to RCP Publications, P.O. Box 3486, Merchandise Mart, Chicago IL 60654.

Or give your donation to an RW/OR distributor in your area.

Spanish Publication Date to Be Announced

**ORDER ADVANCE COPIES NOW**

Price: $5 plus $1.50 for postage

Please send ____________ copies of
Phony Communism Is Dead...Long Live Real Communism
English Edition at $5 per copy plus postage.

I am including ____________ as a contribution to support publication, translation, and distribution of the book.

Name

Address

City/State/Zip

Maker checks and money orders payable to:
RCP Publications, P.O. Box 3486, Merchandise Mart, Chicago IL 60654

ATTENTION RW/OR READERS AND DISTRIBUTORS:

We urge you to place advanced orders and to collect donations for the book.