innocent yet indignant games of pretending to consider such demands, while, in truth, they move forever onward in their same old ways of dealing with things--they become more repressive.

To give further evidence of the legitimacy of the general dissatisfaction and confusion the students express, let us look at the teachers who have begun to call upon something we have known throughout history--the general strike. Unfortunately, when they call for a general strike, they mean throughout the Board of Education not throughout the country, not even the city. The teachers manifest the same feeling that the students do. Behavior patterns, attitudes don't seem to mean anything anymore and consequently, they just don't know what to do. Fortunately for the teachers, the union has clarified and concretized all this confusion into one general demand--increased wages.

The Socialists and Communists who operate within the confines of an old dream, hail this strike as something groovy. Administrators and politicians again play their innocent, indignant games that conclude in more and more repression. What does all of this mean?

It means that every one of us--every man, woman, and child--every Black, White, Chinese, and Puerto Rican--the rich and the poor--living in these United States of America in 1973 is confronted with these same problems of confusion, lack of direction and understanding as the students and the teachers.

What is the solution? What are students and young people demanding? What are they saying? They want to wear longer hair, they want to smoke pot in the schools. They think it is irrelevant whether teachers want more pay, smaller class size, seniority benefits or whatever else. What is the relationship of all this to air pollution, governmental repression, the Vietnam War, the repression in South America, political campaigns and the like. What meaning does this have to the problems that we are confronted with today? Furthermore, what has this got to do with Cabral and the statement "Cabral Lives"?

The beginning of the answer goes back to the Russian Revolution and the scientific revolutionary concept that Marx established. It was scientific because Marx was the first social thinker to give a basis to why and how he felt the revolution would come. This is important. Marx did not just say, "Oh, probably the workers will do it and the revolution will come." He went further and projected how the means of production which shaped the workers lives to the extent that they become greatly organized through production in the formation of a union which would eventually move against the capitalists and take power because of their majority. Marx projected during this whole analysis that there was no need for a vanguard party, an elitist party. Marx'x position was that the workers would be able to do it on their own. If those who joined the union were knowledgeable and aware, it was Marx's contention that there would be no need for a vanguard party to give direction.

At this juncture, Nikolai Lenin entered the revolutionary arena. Lenin not only accepted the scientific revolutionary concept but also developed on it. Lenin used this concept as an analytical tool (dialectical materialism). Lenin saw the need for not only a vanguard, elitist party to help point the workers toward the problems or organization and propaganda that they would have to understand and control in the struggle, but also provide the direction, shape and focus to the struggle of the working class. He further predicted the kind of revolutionary activities the workers would have to engage in, the kind of form they would initiate and what kind of discipline they had to assume if they were to be a part of a revolutionary organization. This was not only a major break-through in revolutionary organization, thinking, practice, and theory, it was also the moving of all the ideas of revolution to another level. Lenin, as we know and as history has recorded it, led the Russian people to the revolution.

IS THIS TO SAY MARX WAS WRONG? IS THIS TO SAY WE SHOULD FORGET ABOUT ALL MARXIAN CONCEPTS?

Is this to say that this guy was not great? Or should we argue that this is not true--that he was never wrong, that he was great, wonderful, all powerful and all seeing? Rather than to take any of these positions, let us start out on a totally different basis. We have said many times in this newsletter that the history of the world is the history of humanity. We have further said that history is the story of humanity constantly moving to higher levels of activity and complexity. We see the present system as being the product of the whole history of human beings.

To better explain this, let's deal with this example. At the age of three years old, we have certain aspirations, goals, and behavior patterns. The older we get the more complex the things are we can engage in; there are more activities we can do and therefore, our productivity is greater for ourselves as well as others. Consequently, at age fifteen again our aspirations and ideas change and thus the greater the production for us and our fellow man. This process if continued, and with it comes higher development which is demonstrated by the more complex our activities become and the more we produce. The ages given in this example are not important. What is important is that as human beings change and develop they accumulate more experiences that cause their aspirations and ideas to change. They have more information; a greater wealth of facts at their disposal.

But in what way do these new and more varied experiences lead human beings? What Marx projected was that the major motivating force for world changes is a material one (dialectical materialism). Marx posited that in order to get certain needs answered, dialectical materialism was the concept that must be used to change the world. Again we disagree with this and have projected a new concept to be used to change the world. The concept is dialectical humanism. We say that the whole forces of change in the world were not external forces. Such an evaluation makes us a victim--one who is almost like a light that one plugs in and the light comes on without any thinking, exertion, or force by the lamp. Thus, we do not see humanity as being externally motivated. We see people as being more internally motivated. We see human beings as having the dynamics of motivation within them. We see that human beings, just by virtue of being human, cannot avoid the unique qualities that we all possess. We must strive for satisfaction and a certain equilibrium with nature which we cannot reach unless we move forward toward that satisfaction. In order to get this satisfaction, we reflect on the past and project into the future. This is good; this is human; this is not something that one has to learn. This is what one does. One can develop it to a much higher degree, but this is what one does by virtue of being born. We are constantly able to project a new kind of circumstance, a new kind of world.

As a result, at each level of humanity's history, there have been strong individuals to come forth and project a new vision of how human beings can live, how human beings can move toward the goal, hence making a definition between revolutionaries and revolutionists. Revolutionaries are people who see inconsistencies, the contradictions, the unsatisfactory relationships that exist; be the relationships personal, governmental, national, or environmental, revolutionaries postulate that one must move to another level of development--a kind of relationship with new goals, new activities. They are unwilling to accept the reformist's position of just restructuring. They say that we must totally develop a new system. What distinguishes a revolutionary from a revolutionist is that revolutionists may or may not say and recognize all the things that revolutionaries do, but revolutionists take responsibility for carrying out their decisions. In