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Guns, Puppets, and Ballot Boxes

Ugly U.S. Plans for Dominating Iraq

One year into the conquest of Iraq, the U.S. government is eager (very, very eager) to announce that their armies are no longer occupiers there. But you are told it is because the claim there is an Iraqi government that wants the invaders there. They want such a government to legally approve what they want.

And they want to convince the world (they must have people in both the U.S. and Iraq) that their goals in Iraq are not to control Iraq or to dominate the huge amounts of Iraqi wealth, but indeed to impose a "transitional Iraqi government." Occupation will end. This government will be "sustainable" (in control of the country's affairs and destiny). And this new government will then hold "democratic elections" (currently scheduled for Jan. 31) to create a national assembly. And Iraq's people will then (supposedly) be free and in control (even though U.S. armies will be camped all over their country and region for many, many years).

And that is the official line from Washington, D.C. Now let's look at some truth.

Who Controls the Guns?

"In the war against the militias every door American troops crash through, every door they go into. And they demand many—will make matters worse, for a while. Nevertheless, the first task of the occupation remains the first task of government: to establish a monopoly on violence."

Conservative columnist George Will, Washington Post, April 7, 2004

Whenever the U.S. government says its current government will be "sovereign"—they get asked, "If this government you leave, will you go?" The U.S. government gave every possible response to this question—but the real answer was always obvious: No, this government in Iraq will not have the power to control U.S. troops or make them leave. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld said (who knows if the new transitional government would not have the power to ask the U.S. to leave. More recently, Secretary of State Colin Powell said that they would have the power to ask the U.S. to leave. Then Bush's personal tutor and top adviser Condoleezza Rice said that the question didn't matter, since the coming Iraqi government is "pro-U.S."

And Powell returned to the question by saying UN resolutions on Iraq should not say the interim government has the final say. "You can't use the word 'vote,'" Powell insisted. Why? Because, he explained, "They could be a situation where we have to act and there may be a disagreement."

As the Iraqi armed resistance spread, Bush announced last fall that he would "hand over" power to some unnamed democratic clique on June 30. And the UN offered to provide a "flag of international legitimacy" by picking the A-list of new Iraqi officials.

But when it came down to it, the UN envoy Brahimi's choices were blasted aside—and the U.S. picked Ali Allawi, a tried-and-tested CIA agent, for Iraq's new Prime Minister.

And as the U.S. invasion, Allawi lived his corrupt and repulsive life inside Iraq—in high-paid service to the U.S. Empire. His specialty was secretly trying to recruit high-level forces (within Saddam Hussein's army and party) for a petty U.S. army. Putting him in power shows that the U.S. now intends to bring back more and more former Baathist generals and government officials from Saddam Hussein's government—promoting Baathist Sums to balance the power and demands of Iraq's Shiite parties.

And, at the same time, Allawi's rival Ahmed Chalabi (another ambitious CIA agent) fell out of favor. On May 30, Chalabi's offices were raided. (For more see the article in this issue: Iraq: A Tale of Two Governments)

"These puppet wars produced an angry national confrontation inside the U.S. ruling class: On May 22, a delegation of high-level Republican rightwingers marched into the White House office, the heated debate we heard would NOT be over how best to serve the American people. I mean, the Bush Doctrine is still very much a living reality for people all over their country and region for many, many years."

What the World Is Watching

"The problem is that many Iraqis may interpret the government that is created now as essentially acting on our behalf and being a stooge for us.

Zbigniew Brzezinski National Security Advisor to President Carter after Bush's November 1977

"He was an American candidate. They brought him to us. We supported him."

Rufat, member of Iraq Governing Council and member of council's subcommittee of Iraqi national assembly. These are not America's puppet governments. This is a terrific list and really good government, and we're very pleased with the names that emerged."

Conservative Neo-Conservative National Security Advisor to Bush "The new "interim government" is expected to sign all kinds of new treaties—making the "privatization" and sale of Iraqi wealth final and legal. And setting up new contracts for the exploitation of their oil—which are expected to be made with companies of the invading countries."

Meanwhile, what are the steps taken by the U.S. toward "democracy" in Iraq? First, puppet forces are recruited, tested, financed, trained, and put in power—taped simply and solely on whether they seem likely to some U.S. interests. Other forces (who in various ways and for various reasons, oppose or threaten U.S. plans for Iraq) are suppressed, marginalized, and killed—using assassins, prison interrogators, death squads and torture.

While the U.S. Occupation authorities are pouring millions of dollars into their "own" puppet Iraqi army, they still padlocked a prominent Islamist newspaper.
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in Baghdad because they didn’t like its cov-
ernance.

Meanwhile anyone who expresses any views opposed to the occupation have no legal protection—they face the threat of jail-without-charges, torture, rape and even murder (as the inhumane Abu Ghraib showed). And (at the same time) U.S. agents in Iraq are not subject to Iraqi laws, and their shadowy “concerns” are not subject to ANY laws, not even U.S. mili-
itary law (and can apparently kill and tort-
ure for miles without any excuse).

So much for “freedom of press” and “rule of law.”

In short, the U.S. government is going all out to establish their own stable domination and exploitation of Iraq—by any means necessary. And they are using the conquest of Iraq to plant the seeds of the whole surrounding, highly strategic region.

And while they do all this, they will claim they are “bringing democracy”—because they will (almost certainly) hold some kind of elections in Iraq once “the country is ready for elections.” Reality means pacified. Areas with strong opposi-
tion will not have elections. And areas where the opposition has been killed or crushed will be considered “ready for democracy.”

And U.S. officials, like Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld, have already said that certain political forces are just not ac-
cceptable to the U.S.—and will simply be held powerless, even if they win elections.

All of these preparations and repres-
sions make it clear that any U.S. created democ-
acy will have nothing to do with giving real power to the masses of people in Iraq. And elections will have everything to do with continuing, enforcing and stabilizing continuing U.S. domination over the people in Iraq.

These elections will be completely con-
trolled by the U.S. invaders and their vari-
sous emerging allies and puppets.

The elections will not make any basic decisions in any case—since the key deci-
sions will be made through treaties and laws that legalize the U.S. occupation and the foreign capitalist control of Iraqi wealth.

These elections will have the primary pur-
pose of giving some slim legitimacy to a future pro-U.S. government in Iraq—legiti-
macy which this Allawi will never have! And they will serve as a way of channeling, confining, and controlling the political activ-
ity of the masses of people in Iraq.

And all of that, if you think about it, is also precisely how electoral democracy works inside the U.S. too—where (in times like this current election circus) people are forced to pick between tested representa-
tives of the system, and where the whole structure and direction of society and the basic policies of government are removed from the election debate and discussion.

Wielding the Real Power

Who will rule Iraq after this bogus “handover” of power?

Aside from the fact that U.S. troops will stay, and probably grow in number, and aside from the fact that this Iraq government will have no say in what they do, or whether they stay... and aside from the fact that it now has no troops of its own, and when it does it will probably not command them... Aside from all that, the U.S. is setting up the world’s largest “embassy” in Baghdad—

with a staff of 3,000 in a vast complex that is being built over five years.

Embassies are officially supposed to communicate with a country’s government, and study its political developments. But this vast new “embassy” complex will be built like previous U.S. embassies in the coun-
tries of Central America—where the U.S. “embassy” is not only the site of the U.S. govern-
ment, ordered around the local military, and picked by the local elite and plantation owner would become the next president.

And this new colonial U.S. embassy in Iraq will be run by Ambassador John Negroponte, who has no background in Iraq or Middle Eastern affairs, but served as an architect of Ronald Reagan’s brutal reign of terror and murder in Central America.

Negroponte is the blood-soaked U.S. cut-
throat who used the U.S. “embassy” in Honduras (from 1981-1985) as a head-
quarters to unleash death squads on the people of Nicaragua, El Salvador, and Honduras.

On the day he announced his new ambas-
dador to Iraq, President Bush said, “John Negroponte is a man of enormous experi-
ence and skill”... and “has done a really good job of speaking for the United States to the world about our intentions to spread freedom and peace.”

So what is being set up in Iraq is classic “neo-colonialism”—which has long been the hallmark of U.S. domination in the third world. The countries dominated by the U.S. are not mainly ruled directly by colonial government. On paper, countries like the Philippines, or Honduras, or the Congo, or Peru have been “independent” and have their own “sovereign” governments. But the real influence and power is wielded through all its various arms, including the U.S. military, intelligence services, its ambassadorial armies of “advisors,” high-
level bankers and corporate operatives, and all those local puppets who understand U.S. interests well.

Look close at Negroponte’s grim killer’s face. It gives a chilling glimpse of what the U.S. government has in store for the people as “Iraq moves towards democracy.”
The irony here is that the U.S. asked for Brahimi's help in the first place because, as The New York Times wrote, "Opinion polls show that Iraqis view the Council largely as a U.S. mouthpiece." Informed that the decision was "can't be decided by the hands of the Bush administration declared that they would be "sought" after June 30. The idea was "that by putting the decision in Brahimi's hands, the U.S. was signalling its willingness to loosen its grip on the country, even if only a very little, and compromise a bit with its European critics. Brahimi wanted to install Hossain Shahrizadis, a nuclear scientist thought to be acceptable to both the U.S. and Europe. Within days, the U.S. overruled him because it was worried that Shahrizadi was "not sympathetic enough to American politics," particularly the Bush administration's desire for U.S. forces to have unfettered power in the country after the handover." Brahimi's boss at the UN, for his views, he replied, "The Secretary-General respects the decision, as I said Mr. Brahimi does. "Respect" is a very carefully chosen word." In other words, the UN didn't like this gangster farce but went along with it anyway.

Why the U.S. finally picked Allawi and not Chalabi is also very revealing. Both men come from one of Iraq's main traditional ruling class families. Chalabi's father was among Iraq's richest men and his grandfather, a feudal lord, had his own personal guard whom he kept safe who failed to turn over enough of their wheat crops. That family lost much of its wealth and power in the 1958 revolutionary army coup that overthrew the monarchy. Chalabi went into exile, where he became an ally and friend of the king of Jordan. Eventually, he began working for the CIA. Allawi's path was a little different. In 1961, he joined the Baath party that was eventually to be headed by Saddam. The party began to come to power in a U.S.-backed 1963 counter-coup marked by the slaughter of communists and other leftists and nationalists on a list supplied by the CIA. After the Baathists consolidated their grip in 1968, he was sent to medical school in London, where he became head of the Baath Party student union. According to sources as diverse as Al-Jazeera and The New Republic, he also became a key figure in the Baath apparatus in Europe. A doctor who went to school with Allawi described him as a man "who carried a gun on his belt and frequently brandished it, terrorizing the medical students." Sometimes in the 1970s, he also became linked to M16, Britain's MI6, and the KGB, terrorizing the medical students. It is not clear if that came before or after his public break with Saddam. In 1978, the year before Saddam came to power with CIA and MB support, Allawi was described as a "gangster farce but went along with it any way."

"Respect" is a very carefully chosen word. In other words, the UN didn't like this gangster farce but went along with it anyway.
Talking About Bob Avakian on the Mexican Border

The following correspondence is from a Revolutionary Communist Youth Brigade member in Los Angeles.

On Friday morning, four of us left Los Angeles around 11 a.m. We were headed to San Diego, loaded with anticipation and hundreds of copies of the special May Day issue of the Revolutionary Worker newspaper. We were on a mission: to hook up Chairman Bob Avakian with people from across the border. Around 2 p.m. we met up with some YBsers from San Diego, and we all talked about how to bring the Chairman’s vision of a beautiful communist future to some of the people who most need (and want!) to hear about it.

We decided to sell at a grocery store near the border where there are several check-cashing places. Most of the people here were from Tijuana, and we knew that if we got out bundles of newspapers to them, they would be taking them back into Mexico. This would be a great opportunity for us to get the word about our Main Man across the border and connect him with the masses over there.

There were about three check-cashing places on one corner. It was a good set-up. At first, we found it a little difficult because we had to speak Spanish. At least I knew I did. But we did very well and we got a great response from the masses out there. They told us we should go sell at the bus stop of these big buses that drive people into the U.S. so they can go shopping or for when they go back home from work, and they gave us directions to the bus stop.

We decided to break into two teams: one team would stay at the check-cashing places, and the other team would sell at the bus stop where people bus back to Tijuana. We had one person sitting while the rest of us would go and sell the paper to the people waiting for the buses or standing in line to cash their checks.

Overall, we got a very positive response. There were people from different strata, both middle class and proletarians, who hate how the world is and want it changed. People were in a hurry, but once they saw someone buy the paper, they wanted it, too, and would come back and get it. One YBer said she mostly talked to people about how we were celebrating the paper’s 25th anniversary, and most of the masses asked how was that possible if it was the first time they ever saw it. Someone else summed up that most of the women at the bus stop really liked the article around the youth in Mexico, and never knew people in Mexico were fighting back against their oppression.

I spoke to several people who could not envision another world. One man told me that all he could do in this life was work and survive. What else was there? He felt hopeless, but got the paper because he wanted to know what Bob Avakian was saying about revolution and how we can change the world.

Another man I spoke to thanked me for being out there because he felt that young people should be trying to change the world. He also was angry at the situation he was in. He used to be an alcoholic, but now he lives in a mission and is forced to work very hard as a farmworker. He hates what the president is doing to the Iraqi people and “his people.” He bought a subscription on the spot off of looking over the Chairman’s article.

One of the YBs spoke to several people who were surprised she was even talking about revolution. They would say, “Revolution? In this country?!” (meaning, the U.S.). They all wanted the paper.

Almost everyone we spoke to got the paper and we got bundles out as well. We raised over $40 and got out all that we had. We then went to the grocery store on the border, and sold out bundles out as well. We raised over $40 and got out all that we had. We then went to the grocery store on the border, and sold out bundles out as well. We raised over $40 and got out all that we had.

But we did very well and we got a great response from the people here. They all wanted the paper. They told us we should go sell at the check-cashing places, and the other team would sell at the bus stop where people bus back to Tijuana. We had one person sitting while the rest of us would go and sell the paper to the people waiting for the buses or standing in line to cash their checks.

Later that night we shared our excitement and our stories. We learned that most of us had been trying to connect with people by talking about the Cancon article or the 25th anniversary of the newspaper or by using agitation comparing what the U.S. is doing to the Iraqi people to what to do immigrants crossing the border. We sold a lot of papers but we’d hidden Bob Avakian and his vision of a bright communist future from the people we’d meet!

Then one of the comrades made an important point. She said that when she was selling the paper, she’d feel with the Chairman’s article and it called to the advanced—people
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“Walking on the Path of the Vanguard”

Viewing Chairman Avakian’s speech in the heart of the barrio

“This was a great event: to hear the words of the leader who speaks to us with the truth, who takes things up with such a clear light, who teaches us with a science that advances our understanding.” So it was described by an organizer of the May Day showing of the video clip.

On May 1st, in a restaurant in the Pico-Union section of Los Angeles, a group of revolutionaries and supporters gathered to watch the video clip of the historic speech by Chairman Avakian, “Revolution: Why It’s Necessary, Why It’s Possible, What It’s All About.” The event was sponsored by Libros Revolucionarios, a group of supporters from Mexico and Central America, some of whom heard about it at the earlier Immigrant Workers March.

There were revolutionary comrades and members of La Resistencia. One woman makes a living as a street vendor, and stayed up all night before to study the speech excerpt that was in the Obrero Revolucionario. An African American man who attended was thrilled by the multi-ethnic gathering. After the clip was over, an immigrant woman from Mexico rose to her feet and said: “When was I ever going to meet up with an analysis that made me feel sane and whole? The things you think and feel weigh on your heart because you can’t understand. Why do we live in such desperation, without any real reason for the fact that no matter how hard you work, you don’t have enough money to survive? You just can’t understand why they’re fighting this senseless war, where they’re killing innocent people—what for?”

“...be more than that I can understand and express things. It’s this leader and this newspaper that gives me the courage to express things that I’m drowning in. It makes me feel we have something to fight for. What would be the sense of a revolution if we didn’t have something to fight for. It’s this leader and this newspaper that gives me the courage to express things that I’m drowning in. It makes me feel we have something to fight for. What would be the sense of a revolution if we didn’t have something to fight for. It’s this leader and this newspaper that gives me the courage to express things that I’m drowning in. It makes me feel we have something to fight for. What would be the sense of a revolution if we didn’t have something to fight for. It’s this leader and this newspaper that gives me the courage to express things that I’m drowning in. It makes me feel we have something to fight for. What would be the sense of a revolution if we didn’t have something to fight for. It’s this leader and this newspaper that gives me the courage to express things that I’m drowning in. It makes me feel we have something to fight for. What would be the sense of a revolution if we didn’t have something to fight for. It’s this leader and this newspaper that gives me the courage to express things that I’m drowning in. It makes me feel we have something to fight for. What would be the sense of a revolution if we didn’t have something to fight for. It’s this leader and this newspaper that gives me the courage to express things that I’m drowning in. It makes me feel we have something to fight for. What would be the sense of a revolution if we didn’t have something to fight for. It’s this leader and this newspaper that gives me the courage to express things that I’m drowning in. It makes me feel we have something to fight for. What would be the sense of a revolution if we didn’t have something to fight for. It’s this leader and this newspaper that gives me the courage to express things that I’m drowning in. It makes me feel we have something to fight for. What would be the sense of a revolution if we didn’t have something to fight for. It’s this leader and this newspaper that...
Kerry on Iraq

"While we may have differened on how we went to war, Americans of all political persuasions are united in our determination to succeed. The extremists attacking our forces should know they will not succeed in dividing America, or in sapping American resolve, or in forcing the premature withdrawal of U.S. troops."


Kerry voted for the 2003 Congressional resolution authorizing the war with Iraq. He joined the same lying justification for war as Bush—accusing Iraq of possessing chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons. "These weapons represent an unacceptable threat," Kerry said, "Iraq has some chemical and biological agents and is capable of quickly producing and weaponizing a variety of such agents, including anthrax, for delivery on a range of vehicles such as bombs, missiles, aerial sprayers, and covert operatives which could bring them to the United States homeland."

Even now, Kerry won't even say he was wrong about the U.S. going to war against Iraq. What he does say is that the way the Bush administration went to war was a mistake. Kerry argues that the U.S. should have put more emphasis on drawing in other countries and the United Nations to support the war. And Kerry is firmly against any pullout of U.S. forces from Iraq. "We will persevere in that mission," he insists—regardless of who is elected in November.

The widespread "anybody but Bush" sentiment reflects the deep hatred that many people have for the Bush agenda. At the same time, many people simply don't know what Kerry's position is on the war. Many simply assume that he is "anti-war," opposed to the Bush doctrines of preemptive war and domestic repression. But that is not the reality.

In the 1960s Bob Dylan sang, "Let us not talk falsely now, the hour is getting late." With such high stakes for the whole world, the people have a right to confront reality as it is and to cast off illusions. This article will examine John Kerry's positions on the war in Iraq, domestic repression, and the overall international agenda of the U.S. government.

Quer Iraq. Speaking on June 3 in Independence, Missouri, Kerry said, "We went into Iraq with too few troops."

And Kerry thinks the U.S. should pour in a lot more troops now to stabilize Iraq. In an op-ed piece on Iraq, Kerry wrote, "To maximize our chances for success, and to minimize the risk of failure, we must make full use of the assets we have. If our military commanders request more troops, we should deploy them."

Kerry hopes that additional troops in Iraq will come from U.S. allies, "We also need to renew our effort to attract international support in the form of boots on the ground to create a climate of security in Iraq," Kerry wrote.

But Kerry has also made clear that he will quickly enlarge the size of the U.S. military as a whole if he wins the election. Kerry argues that the size of the U.S. military as a whole if he wins the election. Kerry argues that the size of the U.S. military as a whole if he wins the election. Kerry argues that the size of the U.S. military as a whole if he wins the election. Kerry argues that the size of the U.S. military as a whole if he wins the election. Kerry argues that the size of the U.S. military as a whole if he wins the election.

"While we may have differened on how we went to war, Americans of all political persuasions are united in our determination to succeed. The extremists attacking our forces should know they will not succeed in dividing America, or in sapping American resolve, or in forcing the premature withdrawal of U.S. troops."
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Even now, Kerry won't even say he was wrong about the U.S. going to war against Iraq. What he does say is that the way the Bush administration went to war was a mistake. Kerry argues that the U.S. should have put more emphasis on drawing in other countries and the United Nations to support the war. And Kerry is firmly against any pullout of U.S. forces from Iraq. "We will persevere in that mission," he insists—regardless of who is elected in November.

The widespread "anybody but Bush" sentiment reflects the deep hatred that many people have for the Bush agenda. At the same time, many people simply don't know what Kerry's position is on the war. Many simply assume that he is "anti-war," opposed to the Bush doctrines of preemptive war and domestic repression. But that is not the reality.
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Quer Iraq. Speaking on June 3 in Independence, Missouri, Kerry said, "We went into Iraq with too few troops."

And Kerry thinks the U.S. should pour in a lot more troops now to stabilize Iraq. In an op-ed piece on Iraq, Kerry wrote, "To maximize our chances for success, and to minimize the risk of failure, we must make full use of the assets we have. If our military commanders request more troops, we should deploy them."

Kerry hopes that additional troops in Iraq will come from U.S. allies, "We also need to renew our effort to attract international support in the form of boots on the ground to create a climate of security in Iraq," Kerry wrote.

But Kerry has also made clear that he will quickly enlarge the size of the U.S. military as a whole if he wins the election. Kerry argues that the size of the U.S. military as a whole if he wins the election. Kerry argues that the size of the U.S. military as a whole if he wins the election. Kerry argues that the size of the U.S. military as a whole if he wins the election. Kerry argues that the size of the U.S. military as a whole if he wins the election.

"While we may have differened on how we went to war, Americans of all political persuasions are united in our determination to succeed. The extremists attacking our forces should know they will not succeed in dividing America, or in sapping American resolve, or in forcing the premature withdrawal of U.S. troops."


Kerry voted for the 2003 Congressional resolution authorizing the war with Iraq. He joined the same lying justification for war as Bush—accusing Iraq of possessing chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons. "These weapons represent an unacceptable threat," Kerry said, "Iraq has some chemical and biological agents and is capable of quickly producing and weaponizing a variety of such agents, including anthrax, for delivery on a range of vehicles such as bombs, missiles, aerial sprayers, and covert operatives which could bring them to the United States homeland."

Even now, Kerry won't even say he was wrong about the U.S. going to war against Iraq. What he does say is that the way the Bush administration went to war was a mistake. Kerry argues that the U.S. should have put more emphasis on drawing in other countries and the United Nations to support the war. And Kerry is firmly against any pullout of U.S. forces from Iraq. "We will persevere in that mission," he insists—regardless of who is elected in November.

The widespread "anybody but Bush" sentiment reflects the deep hatred that many people have for the Bush agenda. At the same time, many people simply don't know what Kerry's position is on the war. Many simply assume that he is "anti-war," opposed to the Bush doctrines of preemptive war and domestic repression. But that is not the reality.

In the 1960s Bob Dylan sang, "Let us not talk falsely now, the hour is getting late." With such high stakes for the whole world, the people have a right to confront reality as it is and to cast off illusions. This article will examine John Kerry's positions on the war in Iraq, domestic repression, and the overall international agenda of the U.S. government.

Quer Iraq. Speaking on June 3 in Independence, Missouri, Kerry said, "We went into Iraq with too few troops."

And Kerry thinks the U.S. should pour in a lot more troops now to stabilize Iraq. In an op-ed piece on Iraq, Kerry wrote, "To maximize our chances for success, and to minimize the risk of failure, we must make full use of the assets we have. If our military commanders request more troops, we should deploy them."

Kerry hopes that additional troops in Iraq will come from U.S. allies, "We also need to renew our effort to attract international support in the form of boots on the ground to create a climate of security in Iraq," Kerry wrote.

But Kerry has also made clear that he will quickly enlarge the size of the U.S. military as a whole if he wins the election. Kerry argues that the size of the U.S. military as a whole if he wins the election. Kerry argues that the size of the U.S. military as a whole if he wins the election. Kerry argues that the size of the U.S. military as a whole if he wins the election. Kerry argues that the size of the U.S. military as a whole if he wins the election.

"While we may have differened on how we went to war, Americans of all political persuasions are united in our determination to succeed. The extremists attacking our forces should know they will not succeed in dividing America, or in sapping American resolve, or in forcing the premature withdrawal of U.S. troops."


Kerry voted for the 2003 Congressional resolution authorizing the war with Iraq. He joined the same lying justification for war as Bush—accusing Iraq of possessing chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons. "These weapons represent an unacceptable threat," Kerry said, "Iraq has some chemical and biological agents and is capable of quickly producing and weaponizing a variety of such agents, including anthrax, for delivery on a range of vehicles such as bombs, missiles, aerial sprayers, and covert operatives which could bring them to the United States homeland."

Even now, Kerry won't even say he was wrong about the U.S. going to war against Iraq. What he does say is that the way the Bush administration went to war was a mistake. Kerry argues that the U.S. should have put more emphasis on drawing in other countries and the United Nations to support the war. And Kerry is firmly against any pullout of U.S. forces from Iraq. "We will persevere in that mission," he insists—regardless of who is elected in November.

The widespread "anybody but Bush" sentiment reflects the deep hatred that many people have for the Bush agenda. At the same time, many people simply don't know what Kerry's position is on the war. Many simply assume that he is "anti-war," opposed to the Bush doctrines of preemptive war and domestic repression. But that is not the reality.

In the 1960s Bob Dylan sang, "Let us not talk falsely now, the hour is getting late." With such high stakes for the whole world, the people have a right to confront reality as it is and to cast off illusions. This article will examine John Kerry's positions on the war in Iraq, domestic repression, and the overall international agenda of the U.S. government.

Quer Iraq. Speaking on June 3 in Independence, Missouri, Kerry said, "We went into Iraq with too few troops."

And Kerry thinks the U.S. should pour in a lot more troops now to stabilize Iraq. In an op-ed piece on Iraq, Kerry wrote, "To maximize our chances for success, and to minimize the risk of failure, we must make full use of the assets we have. If our military commanders request more troops, we should deploy them."

Kerry hopes that additional troops in Iraq will come from U.S. allies, "We also need to renew our effort to attract international support in the form of boots on the ground to create a climate of security in Iraq," Kerry wrote.

But Kerry has also made clear that he will quickly enlarge the size of the U.S. military as a whole if he wins the election. Kerry argues that the size of the U.S. military as a whole if he wins the election. Kerry argues that the size of the U.S. military as a whole if he wins the election. Kerry argues that the size of the U.S. military as a whole if he wins the election.
From “Democracy: More Than Ever We Can and Must Do Better Than That”

The RW/OR presents an important series based on a major 1991 article by Bob Avakian, “Democracy: More Than Ever We Can and Must Do Better Than That.” RCP Chairman Avakian’s polemical essay takes head on key arguments and questions that have been raised in opposition to the overall historical experience of socialist states in the world. He defies the crucial essence of that historic experience from attack, and, in doing so, brings new insights into learning from the achievements of the proletariat in power, as well as the mistakes, to carry forward with communist revolution in today’s world.

The entire article by Bob Avakian is now available on line at rwor.org, and the CRC article it is criticizing will also soon be available there.

The Paris Commune

The Bolsheviks as Its Continuing Revolutionary Counterpart

This series begins with several segments of Bob Avakian’s article which discuss the Paris Commune of 1871. Marx hailed the Commune as the first historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Here Bob Avakian takes on the argument of the CRC, which upholds only the Commune as a legitimate exercise of the dictatorship of the proletariat and pits the Commune’s experience—which was very important, but brief and initial—against the entire historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat in socialist society beginning with the October 1917 Soviet Revolution.

The Bolsheviks as Its Continuing Revolutionary Counterpart

1The Paris Commune of 1871 was the first successful seizure of power by the working class. For 72 days, between March 26 and May 28, the revolutionary workers held the city of Paris.

2The French bourgeoisie had been defeated in war by neighboring Prussia, and the two governments conspired to disarm and suppress the population of Paris. In defiance, the people formed an armed militia—the National Guard—and launched a struggle for power. On March 28, a city-wide council of workers and soldiers declared the Paris Commune.

3While fighting courageously at the barricades and ramparts that defended the city, the revolutionary Communards took farsighted steps toward the social transformation toward classless communist society. They declared the abolition of the military draft and the standing army and police. They enacted the separation of church and state, nationalized church property, abolished night shift, abolished interest on debt, and canceled rents owed by the people. The hated galliotaise was publicly burned and state execution was abolished. The workers reopened factories closed by the capitalists and ran them cooperatively. Schooling was made free and open to all. The Vendome Column, a monument to France’s wars of aggression, was pulled down. It was announced that no one leading or working for the Commune would make wages above the workers. Immigrant residents of Paris were declared full citizens of the Commune and held many posts in the revolutionary government—and it was declared that “the flag of the Commune is the flag of the world Republic.”

4The same time, the working class had not yet formed a Marxist vanguard party to lead this revolution. The Marxist internationalist currents were still only a small minority among the many different utopian socialist and radical democratic trends.

5The reactionary French government launched an invasion from the nearby town of Versailles. The heroic fighters of the Commune, including many women and youth, defended the revolution with arms, street by street. Finally they were overrun by enemy troops. Tens of thousands were murdered in a bloodbath of mass executions.

6The founder of modern communism, Karl Marx, who supported and closely studied this great struggle, wrote afterwards “Workingmen’s Paris with its Commune, will forever be celebrated as the glorious harbinger of a new society.”

7Throughout the critique of the CRC document, where I speak of how it reunits ‘the entire historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat,’ I am referring specifically to the experience beginning with the October 1917 Soviet Revolution. While the CRC document claims to recognize certain achievements of this historical experience, it is clear in examining this document that—even on its own terms and without considering the logical implications of its position, it regards this entire experience as fundamentally flawed and insists that a whole different orientation should be adopted. And it should also be said that, in omitting the limited experience of the Paris Commune against the experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat since then, rather than recognizing and emphasizing the essential unity between them, this CRC document in reality rejects the fundamental spirit and lessons of the Paris Commune itself.”—Bob Avakian

The declaration of the Paris Commune, March 1871
Here it seems important to speak to another practice of the Paris Commune that Marx identified as a matter of decisive importance: the “replaceability” or “renewability” of leaders. Once again the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat has shown that it has not been possible to apply this principle in the strict sense in which Marx spoke of it, drawing from the Paris Commune, where officials were elected by the masses and subject to recall by them at any time.

It must be said straightforwardly that it does not get to the essence of things if the masses have the formal right to replace leaders, when the social conditions (contradictions) are such that some people are less “replaceable” than others. To give an extreme example, if the masses in socialist China had had the right to vote Mao out of office, and if they had exercised that right foolishly and voted him out, they would not have been another Mao to take his place. In reality, they would find themselves in a situation where someone would have to play a role which, from a formal standpoint, would be the same as that of Mao; that is, someone would have to occupy leading positions like that, and the division of labour in society—particularly between mental and manual labour—would mean that only a small section of people would then be capable of playing such a role. Voting Mao out of office would only mean that someone less qualified—or, even worse, someone representing the bourgeoisie instead of the proletariat—would be playing that leadership role. You can't get around this, and adhering to the strictures of formal democracy would be no help at all.3

This, of course, does not mean that the division between masses and leaders should be made into an absolute, rather than being restricted and finally overcome; nor still less does it mean that the leaders and not the masses should be seen as the real masters of socialist society. In revolutionary China great emphasis was given to the role of the masses in criticizing and in an overall sense supervising the leaders. And this found expression on a whole new level through the Cultural Revolution, which, Mao stressed, represented something radically new—a form, a method, to arouse the broad masses to expose our dark aspect openly, in an all-round way and from below.6 (Mao, cited in Report to the Ninth National Congress of the Communist Party of China, Peking: Foreign Languages Press [FLP], p. 27)

Yet, as important and pathbreaking as this was, the fact remains that throughout the socialist transition there will not only be the need for leaders—and an objective contradiction between leaders and led—but there will be the possibility for this to be transformed into relations of exploitation and oppression.

Given the contradictions that characterize the transition from capitalism to communism, worldwide, if the party did not play the leading role that it has within the proletarian state, that role would be played by other organized groups—bourgeois cliques—and soon enough the state would no longer be proletarian, but bourgeois. It must be said bluntly that, from the point of view of the proletariat, the problem with the ruling parties in the revisionist countries is not that they have had a “monopoly” of political power but that they have exercised that political power to restore and maintain capitalism. The problem is that they are not revolutionary, not really communist—and therefore they do not rely on and mobilize the masses to exercise the dictatorship of the proletariat, and to continue the revolution under this dictatorship.

As spoken to above, through the Cultural Revolution in China new means and methods were discovered for attacking the differences and inequalities left over from the old society—means and methods for restricting bourgeois right to the greatest degree possible at any given time in accordance with the material and ideological conditions. Yet it will remain a fundamental contradiction throughout the socialist transition period that there are these underlying differences and inequalities and their expression in bourgeois right, which constitute the material basis for classes, class struggle and the danger of capitalist restoration. This is a problem that cannot even be fundamentally addressed, let alone solved, by a formalistic approach. It has to be addressed through waging class struggle under the leadership of revolutionary communists—making this the key link—and in no other way. And this is exactly how it was approached under Mao's leadership.

Specifically with regard to income distribution, through the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution a basic orientation and, flowing from it, concrete policies were adopted to gradually narrow wage differentials—in accordance with the development of common affluence and mainly by raising the bottom levels up. As an important part of this, there was an orientation of keeping the difference in pay between government officials and ordinary workers as little as possible—the fundamental spirit of the Paris Commune on this was proclaimed and upheld in practice—although such pay differences still existed and were viewed as something that had to be further reduced. But, once again, as important as it was to apply such principles, in correspondence with the actual conditions at any given time, this could not change the essential fact that, for a long historical period, there will persist differences and inequalities in socialist society which contain within them the potential to develop into class antagonism if a proletarian line is not in command in dealing with them.
TO BE AVAILABLE JUNE 2004
THREE Q PRODUCTIONS is proud to announce the
upcoming video/DVD release of an historic talk by RCP Chairman Bob Avakian:

REVOLUTION
WHY IT’S NECESSARY • WHY IT’S POSSIBLE • WHAT IT’S ALL ABOUT

Some comments from people who attended the talk:

"It was like hearing Mao speak on the Long March."
[A young Black proletarian woman]

"If my people had a leader like this, we would have been free a long time ago."
[A young worker from the Mixtec national minority of Mexico]

"Quite frankly, many people have never heard anyone say the things Chairman Avakian said, or have ever heard anyone talk about this world, this social system, this society, and another possible society and way of living in the way he did before. This talk addressed questions that literally millions of people all over the world are agonizing over at this moment."
[A communist artist]

"He was showing the kind of system we live in and what it does to all humanity... he was inviting people to rise up their sights, their views and look at things at this moment of history we're in and the need to transform and change things."
[A young construction worker from Latin America]

"He speaks from the heart and at the same time with such a sweeping understanding, with total resolution, and not just with hatred for the bourgeoisie but confidence in the masses of people."
[A young immigrant woman from South Asia]

"A journey to be savored."
[A veteran communist]

In 2003 Chairman Bob Avakian delivered an historic talk in the United States. This 5-VHS or 4-DVD set, with Spanish translation, combines materials from two amazing events.

This talk, followed by questions and answers, is a wide-ranging revolutionary journey, covering many topics. It breaks down the very nature of the society we live in and how humanity has come to a time where a radically different society is possible. It takes us deep into the heart of the horrors we see around us — from the oppression of whole peoples and parts of the world to what underlies brutal wars of domination; why we live in a world where profound poverty, starvation and exploitation co-exists with unprecedented wealth. From the American nightmare to a sweeping vision of a whole new world, he breaks it all down, and shows how and why a radically different world can be brought forward.

If you’ve ever questioned why Black people and others are oppressed in America, why some people work with their minds while others slave in back-breaking labor all their lives; if you’ve wondered about the role of religion in society, or whether the problem is human nature; if you’ve wondered why the spread of America’s so-called freedom and democracy comes wrapped in war and deadly destruction; if you’ve wondered if a better world is possible — you won’t want to miss this talk.

This video/DVD is full of heart and soul, humor and seriousness. It will challenge you and set your heart and mind to flight.

BOB AVAKIAN is a creative and wide-ranging thinker who, at the same time, maintains a profound sense of the actual struggles, trends and sentiments among the masses, the movements of opposition, and society broadly. And, he is the leader of the RCP, USA, a Party which is seriously setting its sight on the seizure of power right within the U.S. itself, and the revolutionary transformation of society as part of the world proletarian revolution, and he is at the same time a very important leader of the international revolutionary movement and the international communist movement. He is one of those truly rare individuals who emerge only occasionally as an especially concentrated expression of the very best of what the revolutionary people and their struggles can forge and bring to the forefront at certain junctures in history. "REVOLUTION: Why It’s Necessary, Why It’s Possible, What It’s All About" will allow you to spend a day with this unique leader. He will take you on a journey that can change your life.

PLACE YOUR ORDER NOW and/or CONTRIBUTE TO THE VIDEO PRODUCTION

□ $100 Contribution — One VHS or DVD will be shipped free to contributor when available—choose below:
  English/Spanish DVD  English VHS  Spanish VHS
□ I want to contribute to the video production. Enclosed: □ $500  □ $200  □ $100  □ $________
□ I want to order copies of the video — $34.95 + $4 shipping each (enter how many of each)  
  English/Spanish DVD  English VHS  Spanish VHS

TOTAL ENCLOSED: $__________ (make checks or money orders to THREE Q PRODUCTIONS. Please do not send cash.)

Videos and DVDs will be shipped when available. Anticipated release in June 2004.

Send to: THREE Q PRODUCTIONS, 2038 W. Chicago Ave, Suite 126, Chicago, IL 60622
Note: contributions are not tax deductible
Continued from page 6

were challenged by his words and wanted to know more. She said that what we should do is lead with the Chairman's article. As we made plans for Saturday, we were determined to do just that.

On Saturday, four more YBers drove in to join us. We shared some of our stories with them and what we'd learned from the day before. Today we drove to Calexico which is about two hours away from San Diego, a border town in the middle of the desert. I was told it could get up to 110 degrees out there, but today we were told we were lucky—it was only about 102 degrees! The 102 degree heat was pretty intense, but as we all said if the farmworkers could do it and these are the conditions they slave and break their backs under, then we can take the paper out to them in those conditions as well.

Upon arrival, some people asked who was Bob Avakian? How did they find this paper? Many people asked who was this抽象an? I then told her that if people knew what was going on, they would be outraged and want to leave. So the YBer jumped off the bus and took out this revolutionary communist newspaper that had an article from our chairman, Bob Avakian. He asked to see the paper and we spoke about revolution a little. He said he worked with a lot of people who picked fruit in Fresno, that he was down there checking things out. He said that he wanted to read the Chairman's article to see what his thoughts were about changing things. He took a paper and a bundle. He said he was going to give one to all his students so they could read it on the ride back home.

"Now, this is pretty funny. It was the end of the day and we were about to leave when suddenly a bus drove by right in front of us. We decided to drive after it. When it stopped, we all jumped out of the car and got into our positions...but only two people got off the bus. One YBer started to go onto the bus, saying he wanted to people this paper. Everyone on the bus said "nooooo." They wanted to leave. So the YBer jumped off the bus, we all got back in the car and chased the bus. When it stopped again, we all got out of the car, and this time we just ran onto the bus and started taking out the paper. The farmworkers apologized after they learned why we were there. They said they'd wanted to get home and take a shower because they were really tired and dirty from working in the fields all day, but after we spoke about the paper most of them wanted it and put a donation in our car. It was pretty cool! All together, we hit about 11 buses that day.

I noticed a change in everyone's practice when it came to taking out the paper, even in itself. Everywhere I turned, there was a YBer opening to the centerfold with Bob Avakian's article, boldly taking up the paper, and discussing revolution, our Chairman and communist to farmworkers who, before we met, couldn't even imagine a different future. We made a difference by taking out the paper in San Diego and especially to the farmworkers and the people of Mexico. Getting the paper into Mexico will let people there know that there is a real communist party with a great leader who is fighting for a different world, a communist world.

I would say that this was a great experience for the YB. We learned a lot from the farmworkers, how their lives are full of struggle and hardship, how this system has failed them and nothing short of revolution can take them out of their misery. It was a reality check for us. I would say, like a slap in the face. By the end of the weekend, we'd gotten over 700 Obrero Revolutionarios. We came back to L.A. with a little more pride, knowing that the majority of papers we'd sold were crossing the border and that hundreds of our sisters and brothers in Mexico would now be able to meet Chairman "Abakanan."

Chairman’s name. They would say, “Quién es este Abakanan y quién es el líder de éste?” Not only trying to pronounce his name, but also asking who this leader was. One farmworker asked why he hadn't heard of this person before? He's been around for a long time! Most people loved the idea of revolution.

There was a man who didn't know how to read. But after someone spoke to him about the Chairman and what he said about revolution, his eyes got bigger and bigger. He was really digging what he was hearing. He told us that he himself couldn't read but he knew a family member who could read it to him, and so he got the paper.

Some people wanted the paper but didn't have money, so there were two instances where one comrade got melons for the paper. People didn't have money, so they gave her fruit. It was pretty cool.

All the YBers said that almost everyone they spoke to was surprised we were communists. They couldn't believe it. They couldn't believe there was a communist party in the U.S.

This was our first experience going onto buses and taking out the paper to farmworkers, and it was very emotional. One YBer said she almost felt like crying because people on the bus really dug what we had to say and not one person disagreed that a whole different world is needed. When people told us their stories, it was very inspiring and heart-wrenching at the same time. I know I got a little choked up.

One time, as I was running towards a bus, I ran into a teacher who came from Phoenix, Arizona. When we would see a bus coming, we would look at where it parked and we would run to catch it. It was pretty fun but especially running in 102 degree heat!

We got onto a couple of the buses and sold the paper to literally every person on the bus. We had one agitator, two people passing out the paper, and one person passing the hat around for donations. While one bus was driving off, we would pass out the papers we'd sold were crossing the border and that hundreds of our sisters and brothers in Mexico would now be able to meet Chairman "Abakanan."

We finally found a station where the bus would stop and drop off the workers. The farmworkers there told us they were busied to places like Coachella, Yuma, Westland, and other places. They picked onions, melons, watermelons, and cotton. When we talked to them, we once again got a sense of their hatred for the world they live in, but once again, that they could not imagine another world. Many said that all they could do is work and try to live the best they can.

A farmworker we met told us she had come to the U.S. to sell their labor; how they have to work hard all their life and that hundreds of our sisters and brothers in Mexico would now be able to meet Chairman "Abakanan."

A tomato field in southern California.

Talking About Bob Avakian on the Mexican Border
It was 4:30 in the morning in February 2003 when 19-year-old Samir Omar Al-Hussayen was arrested by FBI agents as he worked on his computer in his Idaho State University dorm room. Al-Hussayen was among 26 others arrested that day throughout the United States for alleged support of terrorism.

Al-Hussayen was charged with providing material support to terrorists, which carries a maximum sentence of 30 years and a maximum fine of $250,000.

The FBI had been investigating Al-Hussayen for months, and the charges were based on his work as a webmaster for websites that the government accused of containing material that supported Al-Qaeda and other terrorist organizations.

The FBI agents who arrested Al-Hussayen had been monitoring his website activities for over a year, and they were aware of his affiliation with radical Islamic groups.

The case against Al-Hussayen was one of the largest of its kind at the time, and it was seen as a significant blow to the supporters of terrorism.

The prosecution argued that Al-Hussayen was a member of a terrorist organization and that he had provided material support to terrorists. The defense, on the other hand, argued that Al-Hussayen was merely a computer technician and that the websites he maintained were not intended to support terrorism.

The trial lasted for several months, and it was one of the most closely watched cases in recent American history. The government's case was based largely on evidence gathered from Al-Hussayen's computer, which contained over 1,000 web pages and email communications.

The defense argued that the evidence was either circumstantial or fabricated, and they sought to introduce evidence of government misconduct during the investigation.

On March 1, 2004, Al-Hussayen was found guilty of providing material support to terrorism and was sentenced to 14 years in prison.

The case against Al-Hussayen was one of the many that helped to establish the power of the government's anti-terrorism measures, and it set a precedent for the prosecution of individuals who were suspected of supporting terrorism online.

The case also raised questions about the government's use of surveillance and the extent to which it could be used to monitor the activities of American citizens.

The verdict in the Al-Hussayen case was seen as a significant victory for the government, and it was hailed as a warning to other Americans who might consider supporting terrorism.

The case also had broader implications for the future of the Internet and the right of Americans to express their views online.

The government's victory in the Al-Hussayen case was seen as a step forward in its efforts to combat terrorism, but it also raised concerns about the potential for government overreach and the infringement of civil liberties.
The Indian Elections and the Prospects for Revolution

We received the following article from A World to Win News Service about the elections which took place in early May in India.

May 31, 2004. A World to Win News Service. (By a South Asian correspondent.) India, one-sixth of the world's population, had been busy with parliamentary elections for several months. Also some of the assembly (state) elections scheduled at the same time had drawn people's attention further towards the electoral process. But the outcome was quite unexpected. Not only the losers but the winners too were disillusioned. It is obvious that no matter who ascends to office under this system, no real changes will take place in people's force. But the result of these elections has revealed many things that are very important for the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist forces in India as they sketch out the future course of their revolutionary practice.

First of all, it was clear that people in India hate and are opposed to the Bhartiya Janata Party's (BJP) communal (Hindu chauvinist) fascism. Led by defeated Prime Minister Atal Behar Vajpayee, the BJP had been most associated with attempts to stir up hysteria and mob attacks against Muslims and other minorities in India. Their attempt to dupe people with hollow phrases like "Feel Good Factor" and "India Shining" basically failed. These slogans proved to mean nothing to the masses who live miserable lives of poverty, deprivation and oppression under the crushing weight of feudalism and bureaucratic capitalism, represented by the BJP and its allies. It should be noted that the votes other parties collected were not because of any pro-people policies on their part. In fact, they benefited because people felt they were disillusioned with the system itself. It is noteworthy that Hyderabad, the capital of Andhra Pradesh, Chandra Babu Naidu's party, the Telugu Desam Party, had been quite isolated in this election and boycotted it completely (state) elections scheduled at the same time. The TDP's defeat in Andhra Pradesh, led by the CPI(ML)(PW), Maoist Communist Centre (India), Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist) (Naxalbari) and other communist forces, as well as militant nationalist forces in Kashmir and the North East region of India. In Kashmir, the total turnout was only 15%. In a number of states, the Indian government used the elections to launch attacks on revolutionary forces. In Andhra Pradesh, five air force helicopters were dispatched to try to terrify the masses and attack fighters led by the communist revolutionaries. The third factor was the organized boycott in some of the constituencies, even if it was on the basis of a low level of consciousness, where people boycotted this election on mass with the complaint that no candidate had fulfilled his/her promises made in previous election campaigns.

Whatever the factors behind this election, as a result one reactionary government alliance has been replaced by another one. The new governing Progressive Secular Alliance is led by the Congress Party, the traditional pillar of the Indian ruling class since independence in 1947. In this situation it would be wrong to expect positive changes in favor of the people's interests. But there are grounds to believe that U.S. hegemony over India is likely to be shaken by the rise of the alliance under Congress leadership. Historically Congress had close political, economic and military ties with the U.S.'s chief rival, the ex-USSR, as well as warming up to the European Union. Yet we cannot forget that under Rajiv Gandhi, the Congress Party presided over the "reengagement" of India in line with the new international realities after the fall of the Soviet Union and the rise of the U.S. to undisputed world hegemony. The opening of the openly pro-U.S. BJP by the voters and the increasing conflict within Indian ruling circles is likely to create more favorable conditions for anti-U.S. struggle in India and internationally. The present situation of a hung parliament in India will make the coalition government comparatively weak. The two largest revisionist parties in the Alliance, the Communist Party of India and the Communist Party of India (Marxist), both made significant electoral gains. They are supporting the new Congress-led government while at the same time refusing to participate in it for fear that would lead to even more exposure of their anti-people character.

Most importantly, people's frustration towards this system, the conscious and unconscious boycott of the elections mainly on the part of the urban petty-bourgeoisie and the rising tide of discontent of the masses against this system have created a very positive situation for the revolutionaries in India. This situation further shows the possibilities of uniting various sections of the Indian masses in a powerful people's war. In this sense, the elections present a challenge to Indian revolutionaries to further develop a correct ideological and political line that can bring together the vast masses, thirsty for revolutionary change, within the fold of a revolutionary united front. The ongoing struggle of the Maoist parties to build up a single Maoist vanguard in India firmly based on a correct ideological and political line will definitely address these issues and develop a correct line for leading the broad Indian masses under proletarian leadership.

The Indian ruling class has tried to isolate and attack the communist revolutionaries by calling them "terrorists" despite the support these forces have among millions of people. The U.S. State Department recently added the MCC, a participating party in the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement, and the CPI(M-L)(PW) to one of its lists of "terrorist" organizations. This points to the real fears of the reactionaries that the genuine communist revolutionaries in India are attracting and leading wide sections of the people. It also shows the danger that U.S. imperialism will step up its assistance to the counter-revolutionary terror of the Indian ruling classes.

From A World to Win News Service
Correspondence on Abu Ghraib

"We Saw This Before"

The following is a correspondence from a reader:

All of us by now are aware of the Abu Ghraib Prison officer abuse "scandal." While the mainstream media and its political leaders could not hide, still we have been told again and again that this is an aberration or an exception—that these were the actions only of a few lower rank "bad apples." While further evidence that has come to light has shown these statements by the mainstream press and our so-called "leaders" to be outright lies and deceptions, there are still people in the U.S. and around the world who do not understand that this abuse flows from the nature of this system—or that this is generally a "free enterprise" nation that tries to respect human rights.

I have seen the rhetoric that's blasted in this society—the culture of white supremacy, the idea that people in the U.S. are better than people in "third world" countries, and the kind of power trips that leads to. This kind of abuse flows from the class divisions and white supremacy that this system is based on. Millions of Black, Latino, and other poor and oppressed people living in the ghettos and barrios inside the U.S. and the over two million people inside prisons know through firsthand experience that this system has no respect for human rights.

When I first saw the pictures of U.S. soldiers torturing prisoners at Abu Ghraib I was outraged. I started tearing up. I had something in my hand and threw it to the floor in a fit of anger. I've seen this before. This is how they treat people who are not their friends, neighbors, and the police apparatus of the state. This is what they do. I thought back on injustices I had seen and experienced when I was in prison and was deeply disturbed by the connection. The actions of Abu Ghraib are an obvious excuse for keeping me in security prison.

My house (group) was then taken out of the mess hall. I was handcuffed and forced into a vestibule away from the other prisoners. The steel doors were shut but I'm sure my screams could be heard. They told me to get up against the wall with my hands up. I did. One C.O. took my left arm, pulled it up, over and down in a sort of counter-clockwise motion. It literally felt like my arm had come off. Another correction officer punched me in the head. I immediately went down to the floor to try and protect my face. Half a dozen C.O.'s proceeded to kick my ribs and head, hit me with their batons (and yes, there were senior C.O.'s present). Finally a C.O. took his boot and drove it into my elbow joint. For the first time I screamed out in pain. These pigs pulled me up to my feet and brought me to the "Special Housing Unit (SHU)." I had no feeling in my arm and wondered if it was pulled off.

I was brought into the intake and secluded off from other prisoners. There were again about half a dozen C.O.'s in this room with me. When they took the handcuffs off, my arm was numb but I saw that it was still there! I was snarled in the face. Finally I said out loud in a sort of sarcastic manner (but not joking), "OK, I am kind of scared now." The C.O. continued to hit me.

I was brought to an isolation cell where I was held for over 30 days. Wait—I was allowed out once—to be hit with a disciplinary ticket for "assault on a correction officer"—an obvious excuse for keeping me in isolation for not eating! I was brought tampered food and not allowed to shower. I had no contact with the outside world. When I got out I was transferred to a medium security prison briefly and then to a maximum security prison. I saw other prisoners put into strip cells but naked and left in those conditions until they were forced to cooperate with doctors and guards. I witnessed bloody prisoners being taken from SHU to the hospital after being beaten by these pigs. The October 22nd Coalition to Stop Police Brutality cites thousands of examples of individuals and families that were not as lucky as me—where victims lost their lives.

As RCP Chairman Bob Avakian wrote in "Hill Street Bullshit, Richard Pryor Routines and the Real Deal" (in his book Reflections, Sketches & Provocations): "Pigs are pigs. Of course, that's an image—a symbol—in the most literal sense they are human beings, but they are human beings with a murderer's mentality, sanctioned, disciplined, unleashed by the ruling class of society to keep the oppressed in line, through terror whenever necessary and as the 'bottom line'."

So when I see these photos of what went down in Abu Ghraib and I hear out "so-called" leaders describe these incidents as "isolated," do I buy that shit? I know differently—and it burns. I know that the defenders of this system must act in this manner in order force billions of people around the world to live under the miserable conditions that they enforce. But I also know that this treatment produces hatred for the very system it upholds. And that there is potential for a different kind of political line of Marxism-Leninism— Maoism—to become part of a revolutionary struggle to transform these miserable conditions to a radically different world without any oppression or exploitation.

"In Reaching for the Heights and Flying Without a Safety Net, Chairman Avakian says: "Revolution opens up these possibilities, it creates the basis on which, through continuing struggle, these things can happen, and must happen, if we’re going to keep going forward. And just think about that. Think about the fact that every day we’re going out working among people of various strata, from the basic masses of people in the middle strata who suffer under this system in different ways, who even to the degree they don’t suffer so much personally are outraged by the fact that things exist that they can see are unjust and unnecessary and they are frustrated because these things keep going, and there doesn’t seem to be anything that can be done about them—which fundamentally, there isn’t under this system. But all those things can be changed, transformed. A whole bunch of things which are impossible under this system, but are essential for the masses of people, become possible with revolution and the establishment of a new, revolutionary state power.

"So this is something we have to keep clearly in mind—both sides of this contradiction—that without state power all is illusion, but with state power a lot of things that are illusionary become possible. And that’s a very important contradiction, or unity of opposites, that we have to grasp firmly and bring out to masses of people. It’s not like we’re some religious nuts or something—we don’t go out ‘glowing’, talking about supernatural nonsense—this is based on material reality and the actual necessity of masses of people, and it conforms to the way the world is finding, even though the tendencies in the world and society are sharply contradictory." (Part 2: "We Want State Power—and We Should Want It")
Continued from page 7

Richard Morningstar, a former advisor to President Clinton on energy resources in the Caribbean Sea region, Morningstar was instrumental in pushing for the Bush-Tikriti Ceyhan oil pipeline which will run through the Caspian Sea region. The pipeline would bring oil west to the world market—and keep it in the U.S. control. This is an important U.S. strategic goal, supported by both Democrats and Republicans, and it is being championed by Bush.

He served as a paid consultant for defense contractor Northrop Grumman, immediately before joining the Clinton administration.

The Cause of Israel is the Cause of America

Recently Bush announced a major change in U.S. policy in the Middle East. He expressed support for the Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon's declaration that his government intends to formally withdraw from the Gaza Strip and parts of the West Bank. This decision is a welcome development, and it is clear that Kerry was the instigator of this shift in policy. Bush has previously called for an unconditional cease-fire and the withdrawal of all Israeli forces from the West Bank and Gaza Strip. He had stated that an international conference was necessary to reach a peace settlement between Israel and the Palestinians.

In an editorial, Kerry wrote that the U.S. government's official position had been to oppose them. So Kerry's challenge is how to keep these forces in line while continuing to support the war. This contradiction is bound to come to a head.

Part of the way that Kerry deals with this is to offer extremely vague proposals and promises. For example in a major speech on national security, on May 27, Kerry only mentioned Iraq at the end of a long talk and offered no concrete proposals about how he would deal with the situation.

On May 23, former Vice President Al Gore announced that he would not seek the nomination. In his speech, Gore addressed the issue of Iraq, criticizing the Bush administration for not doing enough to bring about a peace settlement.

Currently, there is a political division of labor between Gore and Kerry. Democratic pundits have pointed out that Gore helps Kerry by keeping away from the conflict, while Kerry is more likely to take a stance on Iraq.

In the 2004 election, Kerry was the candidate for the Democratic Party. His campaign was strongly supported by the media and was criticized for lacking a clear stance on Iraq. However, Kerry's campaign was able to maintain a strong presence in the media and was able to attract significant voter support.

In the end, Kerry was able to secure victory in the 2004 election, and his campaign provided a model for future Democratic candidates.

John Kerry and the Mission of War

It's very clear that they're creating an open, unlimited war and they're creating a situation of a country that is more or less permanently at war—that's a permanent feature of the U.S. now. And then what has to go along with that is a lot of police-state repression and a whole repressive and intimidating atmosphere, because you can't carry out the one without carrying out the other. -HRC Chairman Bob Avakian

Kerry's response to this outburst was cautiously supportive. He publicly expressed support for Israeli settlements and the defense industry. He had worked as a paid consultant for defense contractor Northrop Grumman, immediately before joining the Clinton administration.

John Kerry and the Mission of War

It's very clear that they're creating an open, unlimited war and they're creating a situation of a country that is more or less permanently at war—that's a permanent feature of the U.S. now. And then what has to go along with that is a lot of police-state repression and a whole repressive and intimidating atmosphere, because you can't carry out the one without carrying out the other. -HRC Chairman Bob Avakian

I was talking about earlier: they are oppressed, alienated and angry back home. The system wants to channel people into the streets this base of people that they hoped to, to vote for them. -Bob Avakian, from "The Tyranny of Power, The Tyranny of Gold, the Whole Thing Upside Down"

A key contradiction that Kerry faces is that most people in, or influenced by, the Democratic Party oppose the war in Iraq—and are not about the way Democratic leaders have shamelessly and repeatedly fallen behind the White House on this issue.

A big part of Kerry's political role for the bourgeoisie is to keep that people confused within the framework of electoral politics. Kerry, and the ruling class forces generally, have always maintained a clear political and economic interest in the war in Iraq. They have worked to keep the war going while at the same time trying to keep the war from becoming too controversial.

This system wants to channel people into opposition, but it does not want that opposition to grow into something more serious. It is trying to prevent the war from becoming a central issue in the election.

There is a political division of labor between Gore and Kerry. Democratic pundits have pointed out that Gore helps Kerry by keeping away from the conflict, while Kerry is more likely to take a stance on Iraq.

In the 2004 election, Kerry was the candidate for the Democratic Party. His campaign was strongly supported by the media and was criticized for lacking a clear stance on Iraq. However, Kerry's campaign was able to maintain a strong presence in the media and was able to attract significant voter support.

In the end, Kerry was able to secure victory in the 2004 election, and his campaign provided a model for future Democratic candidates.
Looking for TRUTH in a world of unjust war, censorship, patriotic hype and lies

Experience the Unique Perspective of the Revolutionary Worker
The RW offers a bold strategic vision and revolutionary theory. It spreads truth to prepare for revolution.
It connects the people to the revolutionary communist leader Bob Avakian and his cutting-edge analysis.
It gives voice to the oppressed people and rebel dreamers.
It is a crucial part of a great dialogue on how to change the world, and at the same time part of the struggle for a radically different planet.
Read the RW every week. Subscribe.

Build Networks of RW Distributors
Everyone who wants real change needs to connect with the RW.
In a time of growing resistance, imagine the RW reaching hundreds of thousands of people.
Get bundles of RWs. Organize distribution in the projects, campuses, workplaces, and among all who dream of a better world.

Promote rwor.org everywhere
Spread the word. Put the RW Online web address on banners, t-shirts, leaflets, stickers, and websites. E-mail and post articles from rwor.org.

Raise Money for the RW
The RW needs tens of thousands of dollars to expand its work and reach, to send reporters to go deep among the people — here and around the world, to get the RW into bookstores and newstands across the country.

Check out the Revolutionary Communist Party’s Draft Programme at rwor.org