After 40 years in prison

MOVE 9 women freed!

By Betsey Piette

MOVE 9 members Janet Holloway Africa, 68, and Janine Phillips Africa, 63, were freed on parole May 25, after over 40 years of incarceration. That included a decade of consistently being denied parole petitions by the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections.

While two other MOVE 9 members, Debbie Sims Africa and Michael Africa Sr., were released in 2018, parole for the two women was arbitrarily denied despite their impeccable disciplinary records and history of mentorship and community service while in prison at SCI Cambridge Springs.

In 2018, attorneys from the Abolitionist Law Center and People’s Law Office filed federal petitions for habeas corpus challenging the parole denials on the grounds of the lack of any evidence that the women presented a risk to public safety.

With May 28 set for a court date on that litigation, the Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole granted Janet and Janine parole May 14, one day after the anniversary of the notorious May 13, 1985, bombing of the MOVE home.

In a press release issued May 25, attorney Brad Thomson of the People’s Law Office said, “The release of Janet and Janine is a victory not only for them and their loved ones, but also for the MOVE Organization and the movement to free all political prisoners. Janet and Janine were excellent candidates for parole. They have been described by DOC staff as model prisoners and neither of them has had a single disciplinary incident in over twenty years. While in prison, they have participated in community fundraisers and social programs, including training service dogs. They are remarkable women who deserve to be free.”

MOVE: a history of police violence, frame-ups

A Philadelphia-based Black Liberation organization, MOVE was founded by John Africa in 1972. The group maintained the mantle against police brutality and environmental destruction after all-out state campaigns decimated the ranks of the Black Panther Party and other liberation groups.

MOVE soon became a frequent target of Philadelphia’s notoriously brutal police force. In 1976, police came to the MOVE house and scuffled with group members. During the incident Janine, who was holding her three-week-old baby, Life, was knocked over. Life was trampled by police who shattered his skull. He died later that day.

The police came to the MOVE house and preventing food or aid to be sent to the family. Throughout the ordeal, neighbors stepped up to support the family.

Janine (left) and Janet Africa. PHOTO: ONAMOVE.COM

thousands of rounds of munitions, water cannons and tear gas to destroy the compound and drive the family out. During the raid, Police Officer James P. Ramp was killed by a shot to the back of the head. While MOVE members maintain they did not fire any shots, nine were convicted of third-degree murder and conspiracy, even though no evidence linked any of them to the shooting. In fact, by immediately razing the entire property, police destroyed any potential evidence that would have helped the MOVE 9 prove their innocence. Police made no efforts to preserve the crime scene or measure for ballistic angles.

Five men and four women MOVE members were given 30-to-100-year sentences. They came to be known as the MOVE 9. Nearly seven years later, police attacked another MOVE home on Osage Avenue in West Philadelphia on May 13, 1985. They dropped a bomb that destroyed 62 houses on the block and killed 11 MOVE members, including five children. Both Janet and Janine Africa, imprisoned at the time, had young children in the compound who were murdered by the infamous police assault.

Ramona Africa, the only living survivor of the May 13 massacre, was imprisoned for seven years. However, no
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The politics behind Tubman $20 bill delay

By Monica Moorehead

General Harriet Tubman was one of the greatest abolitionists of the 19th century. Born into U.S. slavery, once she escaped from a Maryland plantation, Tubman joined the Underground Railroad and helped to free hundreds of enslaved Black people in the South from bondage. She even became a spy for the Union Army during the Civil War to help bring about the military defeat of the Confederate Army.

Compare the inspiring legacy of this heroic Black woman with that of Andrew Jackson, the seventh U.S. president. Before Jackson was elected president, he owned less than 10 enslaved people on his Heritage cotton plantation in Tennessee. When he died in 1845, that number had grown to at least 50.

Jackson was not only a slave owner, but also a butcher of Indigenous peoples. He led his troops in a bloody massacre of hundreds of Muscogee (aka Creek) Indians at the Battle of Horseshoe Bend in Alabama in 1814. Along with untold numbers of other atrocities, that battle contributed to the illegal theft of approximately 20 million acres of Indigenous lands as part of capitalist expansion in the West. For this “major victory,” Jackson was appointed major general. He also led assaults on the Seminole Nation in Florida.

As president, Jackson pushed the Indian Removal Act through Congress in 1830, which forced military removal of Native Nations east of the Mississippi River — Choctaw, Muscogee (Creek), Cherokee, Chickasaw and later the Shawnee, Fox, Potawatomi, Ottawa, Omaha, Miami and other Indigenous nations — west to Indian Territory (which later became the states of Oklahoma, Arkansas, Kansas and Nebraska). Thousands of Native people died along the Trail of Tears.

Why bring up the totally divergent lives of Tubman and Jackson? The image of Harriet Tubman was scheduled to replace Jackson’s on the most popular U.S. money denomination, the $20 bill, in 2020 to mark the centennial of women legally gaining the right to vote with the passage of the 19th Amendment. For the record, this right was mainly relegated to white women, not Black women living in the Jim Crow South or other women of color. It would take another 45 years for the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to be passed for women of color everywhere to win this basic democratic right, which is still under attack from the neo-fascist right wing.

Before he left office, President Barack Obama had slated the image change from Jackson to Tubman for 2020. However, at a congressional hearing this May 22, Treasury Secretary Steven Mnuchin reversed this directive, stating that the image of Jackson will remain on the bill until after the current president, a white supremacist and misogynist, leaves office. It could take upwards of nine more years before this change officially takes place, due to White House opposition for which there was no coherent explanation.

Mnuchin’s word is just his responsibility now to focus on what is the image of counterfeiting and the security features.” He said he would not reintroduce the Tubman proposal again, even if he agrees to a second term.

Trump degrades Tubman’s legacy

It is no secret that Trump, a great admirer of Jackson, has opposed this change in the $20 bill since before he took office, calling it “pure political correctness.” During his 2016 presidential campaign, he called for Tubman’s image to be relegated to the very rare $2 bill. Trump stated at the time: “Andrew Jackson had a great history, and I think it’s very rough when you take somebody off the bill.” (nytimes.com)

Trump has frequently hosted announcements in front of Jackson’s portrait, even a 2017 event honoring the Navajo (Dine) code talkers, World War II veterans.

The same day that Mnuchin made his decision, a white New York designer, Dano Wall, tweeted in response, “We’ll see about that.” Wall took the initiative to produce a 3-D stamp image of Tubman to superimpose over Jackson’s. He initially made 500 stamps, which sold out immediately. He plans to reproduce another 5,000 for others to use.

Wall stated, “Putting Harriet Tubman on the front of our bills, and, by putting her on the most popular note currently in circulation, indicates exactly what kind of a life we choose to celebrate; what values we, as a country, most hope to emulate. Harriet Tubman’s unparalleled grit, intelligence and bravery over the course of her long life certainly make her worthy of such an honor.” (Washington Post, May 23)

To recognize Tubman, no matter the form of the act, would be to acknowledge that there was resistance to slavery. It’s the last thing this administration wants anyone, especially young people, to be inspired by.

Even the so-called liberal President Bill Clinton could not bring himself to publicly apologize for slavery in the late 1980s. Then, a bill in Congress sparked debate over why Black people should have reparations from the corporations and government who became rich from the unpaid labor from enslaved ancestors — unpaid labor amounting to trillions of dollars.
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Fightback builds against abortion bans

By Kathy Durkin

A multinational, multigenerational crowd of hundreds of people rallied at Houston’s City Hall on May 21. Organizers were African-American and Latina leaders from NARAL Pro-Choice America, National Latina Health Initiative and reproductive rights groups. A popular sign read, “Abortion is Health Care!”

Gloria Rubac, a member of the National Latina Health Initiative’s Planned Parenthood Action Fund, introduced the speakers. Rubac emphasized the importance of abortion rights as a civil right.

“Connect with the groups here … who have been leading this fight—organizations of color. These bills are about more than just the war on women—they are about the war on Black and Latinx youth,” she said.

The speakers included SisterSong, a San Francisco-based reproductive justice organization, and AncesVia, a Baltimore-based organization that advocates for reproductive rights.

The speakers called for an end to restrictive abortion laws passed by right-wing legislatures. They emphasized the importance of reproductive rights as a civil right and called for the protection of abortion access.

The speakers also highlighted the importance of community organizing and mobilization in the fight for reproductive rights.

By Tony Murphy

June 5: Pack the court for subway elevators!

The fight for accessibility in New York’s public transportation system is approaching a critical milestone on June 5. That’s when New York State Supreme Court Judge Hagler will make a fateful decision on the lawsuit to mandate elevators in the subway.

The ACLU and Planned Parenthood filed a lawsuit on May 24, 2023, to require Hasidic subway stations to install elevators. The lawsuit claims that the MTA has failed to provide adequate access to the subway for people with disabilities.

The MTA responded by arguing that the cost of installing elevators is too high. However, the lawsuit argues that the MTA has a legal obligation to provide accessible transportation for all riders.

The lawsuit cites previous court rulings that have held the MTA accountable for providing accessible transportation. It also references the Americans with Disabilities Act, which requires public transportation systems to provide reasonable accommodations for people with disabilities.

If Judge Hagler rules in favor of the plaintiffs, the MTA will be forced to install elevators at Hasidic subway stations. This will ensure that people with disabilities have equal access to public transportation.

If Judge Hagler rules against the plaintiffs, the MTA will continue to ignore the needs of people with disabilities. This will perpetuate a system of discrimination and exclude people with disabilities from full participation in society.

The decision in this case will set a precedent for the future of accessibility in the subway system. It will determine whether the MTA is committed to providing equal access to public transportation for all riders.

The fight for accessibility is not just about providing a basic right—access to transportation. It is about ensuring that people with disabilities can participate fully in society.

The importance of this decision cannot be overstated. It is a matter of justice and human rights.
Airline mechanics win struggle for safety in new contact

After a very contentious, nearly 7-year struggle for a new contract involving two lawsuits over safety issues, 2,500 Southwest Airlines mechanics voted overwhelmingly May 21 for a new 3-year contact. Represented by the Aircraft Mechanics Maintenance Association (AMFA), the workers won $5.60 million in back pay as a bonus to cover the years after the last contract ended in August 2012, a 20 percent increase in wages as of April 1, and 3 percent annual raises in August. The AMFA noted in a statement that its biggest concession was allowing Southwest to continue outsourcing some work to foreign contractors.

The contract is a far cry from Southwest’s suit against the union in March for a so-called “illegal work slowdown” that forced the cancellation of 500 flights a day for weeks, according to the Federal Aviation Administration. Both sides agreed to the author’s rules. Regardless of media attention, these incidents of workplace violence regularly place both workers and customers at risk.”

Both Iowa demonstrations were supported by the Service Employees Union (SEIU). There was also a strong turnout of Iowa CCI members, as well as unions, on the pickets.

While McDonald’s was the main target, the message also being sent by the workers was directed at all food service companies, including fast food chains. McDonald’s has taken so many for its drivers through the restaurant’s drive-through, chanting, “Hold the pickles, hold the fries; make your wages supersize!”

The speaking portion of the rally was led by SEIU Local 109 President Cathy Glasson. Workers shared their stories, grievances and demands.

Cedar Rapids McDonald’s employee Kelly Osburn provides for her 5-year-old granddaughter. She joined the strike because she works “very hard for a very small wage” and supports the call for a union, higher wages, sick leave and paid vacation.

In a video message directed at McDonald’s, Osburn said, “We’re the ones running your company, not you guys sitting in the fat paycheques. We are making the hamburgers, and we make $8.25 an hour. It’s just not fair.”

Des Moines

At noon the same day, more than 100 McDonald’s workers and supporters rallied outside the restaurant at 3000 Merle Hay Road, again, with people coming and going, the turnout numbered in the hundreds.

Several strikers carried signs with slogans like “Raise the minimum wage,” “Iowa needs unions” and “We can’t survive on $7.25,” a reference to the current state minimum wage. Among the rallying cries, strikers chanted, “We work! We eat! We want $15 on our checks!”

Iowa CCI organizer Sebastian said in Des Moines that, like in Cedar Rapids and other cities, workers stood “shoulder to shoulder” with community organizations “to take a stand against corporate power and sexual harassment, and for $15 and a union.”

The strikers were joined by New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio, who recently called for a $15 minimum wage (and a union), andplan to run for president.

His appearance made local headlines, but almost obscured the fact that this was an event of and by the workers.

A movement of and for workers

In other parts of the country, a handful of Democratic presidential candidates voiced support for the strikers, including Bernie Sanders, Julián Castro, Jay Inslee and Cory Booker. While much of the media spotlight was on the presidential hopefuls who joined the rallies, the workers are taking the biggest risk by standing up for their rights. They are not political props. They are fighting for their lives.

The fact that presidential candidates have taken notice is a testament to the years of organizing by workers in these sectors. Since 2012, workers across the country have fought for $15 hourly wages and the right to form a union. The Fight for $15 came to Iowa three years later.

The May 23 strike represented not just the ongoing struggle of fast food employees, but all workers confronting the high-tech nightmare of late-stage capitalism.

This movement was started by workers, and workers are still leading the charge.
Protesters demand justice as Cleveland jail deaths continue

By Martha Grevatt
Cleveland

On May 10, Nicholas Colbert became the latest person to die in the Cuyahoga County Jail, the ninth in less than a year. The 38-year-old Army veteran was arrested for drug possession less than 48 hours prior to his death, which jail authorities described as a suicide. Colbert’s mother had called police, as she had sadly thought the struggling heroin addict would be safer in jail than in the streets.

The Coalition to Stop the Inhumanity in the Cuyahoga County Jail (SICCJ) protested outside the jail May 23. The rally and march were one of many demonstrations held since the group formed in late April. VW asked the board to delay an election and review company arguments against conducting one. With three of the five NLRB members voting, two voted in VW’s favor and one against. Then May 22, with four of its five members appointed by President Trump, the NLRB ruled 4-1 that an election could not be held.

How could this be justified? Normally, the NLRB requires that 30 percent of a potential bargaining unit sign union authorization cards to hold an election. In this case, the union had a solid majority. VW’s arguments were based on a 2015 vote by a smaller unit of workers in the plant, about 160 skilled maintenance workers, to have the UAW bargain on their behalf. The NLRB ordered VW to recognize the union as their representative.

For those who think the right of workplace injuries, a key issue in the union drive, did not decrease after the vote. The UAW, with the authorization cards to hold an election. In this case, the union had a solid majority. VW’s arguments were based on a 2015 vote by a smaller unit of workers in the plant, about 160 skilled maintenance workers, to have the UAW bargain on their behalf. The NLRB ordered VW to recognize the union as their representative.

For those who think the right of workers recently murdered by stigma, workers who have control of their bodies or have financial autonomy, can be summarized as sex workers who have been murdered by capitalism. The list also includes April Ellis, Ashley Brandeberry, Brittny Taylor, Isabella Serra, Gabrielle Owen, Andrea, and Zelia Ortiz were all shot in the head by Jean David Ortiz, a U.S. Border Patrol agent in Laredo, Texas, in September. Ashanti Carmon, a Black trans woman, was shot in her head, but lived. In Ed Buck’s home in July 2017 in Los Angeles. During a New York City police prostitution raid on Nov. 27, 2017, Yang Song, a woman from Shenyang, China, fell to her death from the third story of the massage parlor she worked in.

Last year, Domna Castleberry was shot eight times by undercover officer Andrew Mitchell on Aug. 23 in Ohio. Melissa Ramirez, Guiselda Alicia Cantu, Claudine Lauria and Humberto “Janelle” Ortiz were all shot in the head by Jean David Ortiz, a U.S. Border Patrol agent in Laredo, Texas, in September. Ashanti Carmon, a Black trans woman, was shot in her head, but lived. In Ed Buck’s home in July 2017 in Los Angeles. During a New York City police prostitution raid on Nov. 27, 2017, Yang Song, a woman from Shenyang, China, fell to her death from the third story of the massage parlor she worked in.

June 2: Support sex workers!

By Francis T. Parker

VW and Trump’s NLRB: partners in union busing

By Martha Grevatt

Volkswagen, the world’s largest auto company, owns 61 plants around the world. Asociación Mujeres Mercereases de la Argentina en Acción por Nuestros Derechos, the first trade union for sex workers in Latin America, was organized in 1994. In 2007 sex workers in Bolivia sewed their lips together as part of a hunger strike demanding that brothels be reopened.

On June 2, 1975, more than 100 sex workers occupied Saint Nizier church in Lyon, France, demanding the end of fines, police harassment and the release of 10 sex workers who had been recently imprisoned for doing their job. The parish priest refused to call the police on them, and the neighborhood brought them supplies. Eight days into the occupation, police forcibly removed the women from the church. June 2 is now commemorated as International Whores Day. Last year there were protests and demonstrations with thousands pouring into the streets across the globe to say sex workers are human and sex workers are workers.

Sex workers did not stop there. With three of the five NLRB members voting, two voted in VW’s favor and one against. Then May 22, with four of its five members appointed by President Trump, the NLRB ruled 4-1 that an election could not be held.

How could this be justified? Normally, the NLRB requires that 30 percent of a potential bargaining unit sign union authorization cards to hold an election. In this case, the union had a solid majority. VW’s arguments were based on a 2015 vote by a smaller unit of workers in the plant, about 160 skilled maintenance workers, to have the UAW bargain on their behalf. The NLRB ordered VW to recognize the union as their representative.

For those who think the right of workplace injuries, a key issue in the union drive, did not decrease after the vote. The UAW, with the majority of VW workers signing cards authorizing representation, petitioned the NLRB April 9 to hold another election in late April. VW asked the board to delay an election and review company arguments against conducting one. With three of the five NLRB members voting, two voted in VW’s favor and one against. Then May 22, with four of its five members appointed by President Trump, the NLRB ruled 4-1 that an election could not be held.

What makes this case ludicrous and hypocritical is that VW has spent the past four years denying these maintaining workers the right to union representation – based on the fact that they are only a small minority of the whole workforce. Moreover, the UAW certified to the NLRB that it had been forced to withdraw as a representative of the maintenance trades. That the board majority could uphold VW’s argument demonstrates its blatant anti-union bias.

Lauren McFerran, the last remaining independent member of the NLRB, described “the Board’s new motto” as “heads, the employer wins; tails, the union wins.”

Fighthack could defeat VW’s strategy

Now the UAW has to wait for a vote of the maintenance unit to decertify itself, then wait for the NLRB to conduct a plantwide election.

What VW and their anti-union political partners in Tennessee and Washington are banking on is being able to use the time lag to turn workers against the union. Just like their counterparts at Nissan in Mississippi, workers: full service, cam-girls, strippers, sugar babies, porn stars, etc.

How can you support sex workers?
• Do not out sex workers! Sex workers get to decide who knows, when they know and how they find out.
• Show support in person and online for the decriminalization of sex work.
• Denounce SESTA and FOSTA and all laws that criminalize sex work and wrongfully confute sex work and sex trafficking.
• Counter social norms that depict sex workers as lazy, dirty, diseased and not actually workers. Sex work is work, and it must be understood as part of the labor struggle.
• Support organizations run by and for sex workers. Pay sex workers for their services and labor.
• Always remember, fuck the police.

VW and Trump’s NLRB: partners in union busing

By Martha Grevatt

Volkswagen, the world’s largest auto company, owns 61 plants around the globe. Only one, in Chattanooga, Tenn., does not have a union. VW, with the assistance and encouragement of the capital state, intends to keep its only U.S. assembly plant union-free.

When the United Auto Workers first sought to represent the plant workers, the union narrowly lost a 2014 election supervised by the National Labor Relations Board. At the time VW itself feigned neutrality. False claims by right-wing politicians that a pro-union vote would mean less work in the plant, coupled with a barrage of well-funded anti-union TV and radio.

The UAW, joined by 17 area unions, as well as local civil rights organizations, held a rally May 21 to declare union busing by VW and the NLRB. Some of the union delegations and representatives included the Chattanooga Area Labor Council, United Steelworkers and the Amalgamated Transit Union. Downtown Chattanooga was packed with union supporters chanting, “No hypocrisy, let them vote. It’s about democracy, let them vote.”
Gunboat diplomacy and unequal treaties

China resists—then and now

By Sara Flounders

Most people in the U.S. are unaware of the fact that more than a century ago around the world, in countries as far apart as the U.S., Brazil, France, Germany and Japan were stationed in Chinese cities. The U.S. Navy had fleeing foreign ships and coastal rivers. These concessions were forced on China by brutal gunboat diplomacy and encouraged by envious multinationals that marked the era—imperialist countries huge indemnities.

Now, once again, the U.S. is making demands on China. President Xi Jinping has convoked them to those unequal treaties imposed by the imperialist powers over 130 years ago. The latest U.S. trade demands on China have awakened a fervent nationalist response in every current of Chinese society.

In China, the words "unequal treaties" resonate deeply, while most working people in the U.S. have never even heard the term. We are told that U.S. "gunboat diplomacy" was a tactic of more than 130 years ago.

But just this May 19, U.S. warships escorted their so-called "Freedom of Navigation" exercises by sailing through the busy waters of the South China Sea. On May 23, the U.S. Navy sent two guided missile destroyers through the narrow Straits of Taiwan. These are now regular monthly offensives. They are comparable to Chinese destroyers sailing into the Gulf of Mexico, off the coast of New Orleans and Houston.

The May 22 China Daily warned in an editorial: "With tensions between the two countries always high, there is no guarantee that the presence of U.S. warships on China's doorstep will not spark direct confrontation between the two militaries.

Break with past wars and chaos

The standing of the Chinese Communist Party is based in no small part on its ability over the past 70 years to break with the humiliations, chaos and constant warfare that marked gunboat diplomacy, the decades of occupation by numerous foreign troops, and the harsh and unequal treaties they imposed.

These treaties were in fact terms of surrender dictated by the major imperialist powers of Britain, the U.S., France, Germany and Russia, as if there is no guarantee to change its laws, pay huge indemnities and grant as "concessions" control of its cities, major ports and largest waterways.

The resulting uprisings, rebellions and civil wars were crushed, and much of the country was impoverished and destroyed.

The new communist government's intention to ensure stable development and broad prosperity while resisting foreign intervention was a promise Mao Zedong made in October 1949 while proclaiming the founding of the People's Republic of China.

Mao declared: "The Chinese people, composed of hundreds of millions, have now stood up! The Chinese have always been a great, courageous and industrious nation; it is only in modern times that they have been weakened by wars and foreign domination. Now, at the moment of liberation of the nation that was subjected to oppression and exploitation by foreign imperialism and domestic reactionaries, we Chinese people will not only finish the revolution of our country but we will also stand up and take hold of the new Chinese government..."

130 years of U.S. troops in China

The Pentagon and U.S. trade negotiators know the criminal history of 130 years of U.S. military occupation of major Chinese cities very well. However, that is seldom mentioned by the corporate media or in U.S. history books.

U.S. Marines were garrisoned in Beijing (then called Peking), Guangzhou (then called Canton) and Shanghai from 1868 to 1949. They were displaced from 1942 to 1945 by Japanese occupation during World War II. The Chinese Red Army finally expelled them in 1949.

U.S. Marines were on armed warships all along Chinese coastal waters, while special fleets of river gunboats of the U.S. Navy and Marines patrolled Chinese rivers up to 1,000 miles inland. They were there to enforce U.S. trade interests and suppress uprisings.

ChinaMarine.org is a website that gives a pictorial history glorifying the occupation.

The next day Xi called on China to embark on a new "Long March" and remain resilient — a clear signal that the country is gearing up for a prolonged struggle with the U.S.

President Xi’s talk was given in Jiangxi, known as the starting point of the 6,000-mile Long March by the Chinese Red Army in 1934-36. This organized retreat, under heavy bombardment, led to the ultimate victory of the Red Army and the defeat of U.S.-backed Nationalist forces by 1949, with the emergence of Mao Zedong as China’s leader.

On May 1, a Morgan Stanley economist, Michael Wilson, warned that the U.S. economy could fall into recession if the country's trade war keeps escalating. Even before the desperation of Trump's trade war, this was a steady prediction. It now seems inevitable.

The 18 years of U.S. wars in Afghanistan and Iraq are by every measure an absolute disaster for U.S. dreams of conquest and recolonization. China, with a population many times that of the United States, is comparably full-combined, with advanced technology, internal cohesion and many trading partners, is in a position to resist all U.S. demands on China.

It is not the world of 1840. U.S. imperialism is on the decline. It can’t recaputre its past position with threats and dreams of colonial anquest.
Why the imperialists hate Huawei
By Deirdre Griswold
The Chinese company Huawei has been targeted by the Donald Trump administration. At Washington’s request, Canada arrested Meng Wanzhou, the chief financial officer of the company, last December. The decision to charge? That the company did business with Iran, contrary to U.S. sanctions on that country. Meng, the daughter of Huawei founder Ren Zhengfei, is still under house arrest in Canada and is awaiting possible extradition to the U.S.

Why has Washington focused such animosity on Huawei? It is real terror of Iran, which is also a target of U.S. aggression at the present time? Or is there more to it?

Huawei was founded just 32 years ago, but today, Huawei’s products and solutions are deployed in over 170 countries, serving more than one third of the global population. Huawei is the third-biggest global manufacturer of routers, switches and other telecommunications equipment by market share after Alcatel-Lucent and Cisco, and the brand recently joined in the ultra-competitive smartphone market, where some companies are using a Chinese Technology Business to a Global Brand, “Huawei workers in North America.”

This article was published in paginaz.com.ar on May 21. Translation by Michael Ott.

May 20, 2018, is the date used as the focus of the narrative justifying the current political crisis in Venezuela. On that day, Nicolas Maduro won the election for president. A large grouping of rightist had announced months before the election that they would refuse to recognize his win and that is what they did. Two days later, on May 22, the National Assembly declared its contempt for the Supreme Court’s ruling: “The farce carried out on May 20 does not exist.”

Almost eight months later, in January, the political translation of the National Assembly’s refusal to recognize Maduro’s win took shape: Juan Guaidó proclaimed himself interim president.

Maduro’s re-election, however, was nothing like the false story manufactured by the right wing. On election day, four candidates participated. Maduro won with 6,150,612 votes, followed by Henri Falcón with 1,957,036 and Javier Bertucci with 898,751 votes, with participation of 46.02 percent of the electoral registry. [The fourth candidate, Reinaldo Quijada, received some 36,000 votes - WW].

International观察家 from sever¬al continents were present, and [for¬mer Spanish Prime Minister Jose Luis] Rodríguez Zapatero, a key player in the mediation process, said the same conditions existed as in December 2015, when the opposition won the National Assembly.

"Before the election takes place they said that there are no conditions for free and fair elections...it is very serious from a democratic point of view to declare elections invalid before they are held when four political leaders are contesting them," said Rodriguez Zapatero before the elections. The right wing accused him of being a Chavista accomplice for having continued to support what he said in the Dominican Republic when the opposition withdrew from the dialogue table in January 2018: that there was a decision to seek Maduro’s removal through non-electoral means.

The argument for trying to form a par¬allel government centered on that date. By refusing to recognize the May 20 election, they also didn’t recognize the beginning of Maduro’s new term on Jan. 10, 2019. Articles of the Constitution were adapted to justify Guaidó’s appearance [in January], blessed by Donald Trump’s tweet which anointed him interim presi¬dent of Venezuela.

Guaidó’s right wing’s narrative takes that date as a point of reference, the analy¬sis of Chavismo places the beginning of the current strategy of assault on state power on the rightists’ decision to withdraw from the dialogues taking place in the Dominican Republic in January 2018. It was then that the United States, with a section of the Venezuelan right wing as its pawns – mainly the Popular Will and Justice First parties – once again made the decision to attempt an overthrow by force, as they did in 2017, 2014 and the initial cycle of Chavismo in the 2003-04 government. What followed was a suc¬cession of steps leading to an attempt at regime change, one that they calculated would be a quick overthrow.

One year after the election, and just short of the fourth month since Guaidó’s self-proclamation, this is the situation:

On the international level the two sides are even, stalemated, while Chavismo is much stronger on the national level. The opposition is in a sustained retreat from being able to mobilize and sustain high levels of public participa¬tion in the street. The attacks from the United States continuously escalate, with mul¬tiple repercussions, and because there still exist internal problems, such as Venezuela’s dependency on funds earned from exporting oil, the decline in income levels, internal productivity, etc. As for the political dimension, the electoral scenario would involve moving toward elections to the National Assembly, where Maduro affirmed this at the public meet¬ing celebrating the one-year anniversary of his electoral victory.

There are no clear responses on either the economic front or the political front at the moment. Regarding economies, it is because the attacks from the United States continuously escalate, with mul¬tiple repercussions, and because there still exist internal problems, such as Venezuela’s dependency on funds earned from exporting oil, the decline in income levels, internal productivity, etc. As for the political dimension, the electoral scenario would involve moving toward elections to the National Assembly, where Maduro affirmed this at the public meet¬ing celebrating the one-year anniversary of his electoral victory.

The policy of economic aggression, as part of the strategy of weak down Chavismo, has grown from 2014 to the present, on the basis of the United States imposing one law and seven executive decrees, which form the framework for Washington’s unilateral attempt to stran¬gle the Venezuelan economy.

These actions translated into the con¬figuration of Venezuela’s financial assets, the prohibition of the renegotiation of Venezuela’s foreign debt, as well as the de¬feat of the state-owned PVSA oil com¬pany, the intensified attack on Venezuelan sovereignty, sanctions on oil trade and the Central Bank of Venezuela, and freezing $5.74 billion in assets held by interna¬tional banks, among other things.

How will this meeting translate into action? It is within the U.S. state appa¬ratus where the central decisions are made to carry out the strategy with Guaidó as its figurehead.

VENEZUELA
Maduro plans early legislative elections
By Marco Teruggi Caracas
This article was published in paginaz.com.ar on May 21. Translation by Michael Ott.
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There are no clear responses on either the economic front or the political front at the moment. Regarding economies, it is because the attacks from the United States continuously escalate, with mul¬tiple repercussions, and because there still exist internal problems, such as Venezuela’s dependency on funds earned from exporting oil, the decline in income levels, internal productivity, etc. As for the political dimension, the electoral scenario would involve moving toward elections to the National Assembly, where Maduro affirmed this at the public meet¬ing celebrating the one-year anniversary of his electoral victory.

The policy of economic aggression, as part of the strategy of weak down Chavismo, has grown from 2014 to the present, on the basis of the United States imposing one law and seven executive decrees, which form the framework for Washington’s unilateral attempt to stran¬gle the Venezuelan economy.
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Atlanta remembers legacy of Irish socialist James Connolly

By Christian Noakes
Atlanta

A public meeting and film screening was held in Atlanta on May 19 at which attendees discussed the struggle for national liberation and socialism in Ireland. The event resembled the informal and collaborative character of what the Guatemalan Marxist Walter Rodney called a “grounding session.” Participants were encouraged to delve into the history of British imperialism and Irish resistance, starting with the driving off of the indigenous population of Ulster and their land — known as the Plantation of Ulster — being redistributed to English and Scottish colonists. This process continued into the 19th century, as the colonial and neo-colonial states of the occupied northeastern six counties (Northern Ireland) and the self-declared Free State (Republic of Ireland).

The event paid special attention to the essential role of the Marxist James Connolly in forging the guiding vision of a workers’ republic.

Connolly was born in 1868 in the Cowgate district of Edinburgh, Scotland. His parents were John Connolly and Mary McGinn, Irish immigrants who fled mass starvation at the hands of the British and their colonial landlords. James Connolly grew up in a slum known as Little Ireland. Due to severe poverty, he was exposed to the Dublin Lockout and the 1916 Easter Rising.

The Dublin Lockout was an industrial dispute between the workers and employers of that city. At the time, Dublin’s urban and rural working class experienced extremely poor working and living conditions. Its inner city was one of the most destitute in all of Europe.

This widespread destitution drove many workers to the Irish Transport and General Workers’ Union (ITGWU). But employers led to increasingly militant strikes. To quell the rising tide, employers locked out workers thereby increasing the situation’s severity.

As tensions rose, strikers faced violent repression at the hands of police and Home Guards. Hundreds were injured. At least three workers were killed. Police murdered John Byrne and James Nolan; a striker killed Alice Brooks. Connolly, the union’s founder Jim Larkin and Jack White organized the Irish Citizen Army to defend the workers.

By G. Dunkel

Early projections report that more than 200 million people, out of the 450 million eligible, voted in the European parliaments elections. This turnout is a significant increase from the last election five years ago and indicates a growing concern about the future of the European Union.

While right-wing parties were predicted to make substantial gains, they only did slightly better than in 2014. The centrist parties that dominated the EU parliament for the past 40 years did have substantial losses, while the Greens and Liberal parties did substantially better.

The population of the EU is 540 million people, compared to 324 million in the United States. Elections to the EU Parliament took place from May 23 to May 26 in 28 member countries. Preliminary results were announced late on May 26.

The EU Parliament has little real authority. It can’t propose laws or EU leaders; it can just accept or reject them. The U.S. media barely reported on these elections in the past. This time, the correspondents reported detailed_directions.

That’s because the far- and fascist-right proclaimed their intent to win this vote in order to bring down the EU from the inside. Steve Bannon, one of Trump’s main ideologues, is promulgating among Europe from plush hotel to plush hotel planning a coup d’etat for the IHU and meeting with European anti-immigrant ultra-rightists.

Elections held for European Parliament

By G. Dunkel

At the same time there is a general mood of disillusionment among workers in many European countries over economic conditions, which also led to the greater turnout.

EU member countries are heterogeneous economies and wealthy imperialist countries, like France, Germany, Britain, and the smaller Nordic countries. Others like Romania and Cyprus aren’t.

For the European big bourgeoisie, the EU is a capitalist coalition that serves as an economic and political machine that can be wielded against former colonies, can improve its competitiveness with U.S. imperialism, and can provide a framework for the big German and French banks to operate more freely and dominate the economies of the other countries. It is also a capitalist tool to keep workers’ demands under multinational control.

Brexit scenarios

The EU faces an existential threat in Britain’s demand to leave, which was made almost three years ago. This process, called Brexit, has turned British politics from a governing working-class party to get the referendum authorizing Brexit approved was based on racist, xenophobic, and nationalist rhetoric, including the austerity that the British ruling class imposed.

Most Brexit scenarios predict major economic damage to the British economy, the second largest in the EU behind Germany. British, Scottish, Welsh and Irish workers — the working classes of the nations included in the so-called United Kingdom/Great Britain — will inevitably bear the biggest burden of any economic collapse.

Prime Minister Theresa May’s failed renegotiation of the British Parliament’s refusal to approve any deal that she worked out with the EU — makes a precipitous Brexit much more likely come Oct. 31, the deadline for Brexit to be completed.

The right-wing parties in Europe, which the U.S. media generally calls “populist,” have strong differences with each other as well as points of agreement. They are united for the most part in opposing immigration, strengthening their countries’ borders, and hypocritically criticizing “the elite.” After the mess that Brexit has created in Britain, these parties are rather circumspect about calling for an exit from the EU.

Like the Brexiteers in Great Britain, most of the far-right parties in Europe want to increase the power of their national governments against “Brussels,” a generic word for the European Union’s bureaucracy located in the EU’s capital city.

A major point of disagreement in the European right-wing is over whether to focus exclusively on economically or confrontational relations with Russia.

Results in Britain, France, Germany

The election results in Britain, France and Germany were particularly interesting.

In Great Britain, the Brexit Party — a single-issue party set up six weeks ago — came in first with 86 seats out of 650. Basically the total vote for leaving was close to the total vote for staying. The Conservatives, the party now running the British government, got less than 1 percent of the vote, coming in fifth, with their lowest percentage vote in almost 200 years.

In France, the semi-fascist Rassemblement National (National Rally) came in first with 23 percent, beat ing the République en marche (Forward the Republic), President Macron’s party, by just 1 percent. This is an embarrassing defeat for Macron, but not the smashing victory Marine Le Pen, head of the RN, the Greens and Libertarian party, had been predicting. The two parties that had been running France for decades barely made a showing.

In Germany, the Greens made strong gains to finish second with more than 20 percent of the vote, behind Angela Merkel’s center-right party. The far-right Alternative for Germany also made strong gains to finish fourth, just behind the Social Democrats, who with 15 percent had a brutal decline of more than 11 percentage points compared to five years ago.

Our guiding principle in looking at such a large, complicated event as the EU parliamentary elections is that workers’ struggles should have no borders. The EU is a capitalist institution being attacked by capitalists in their interests. Workers have their own interests at stake.
White House protest: ‘End sanctions on Zimbabwe!’

By Monica Moorehead

Washington, D.C.

A march and rally was held in Washington, D.C., on May 25, African Liberation Day, to demand an end to sanctions against the southern African country of Zimbabwe. Known as Rhodesia after it was colonized by England in the late 1800s, Zimbabwe has been heroically defending its right to sovereignty from these periodic acts of war since the late 1970s, when it carried out a massive land reform act.

Both England and the U.S. seek revenge against the Zimbabwean government, especially former president Robert Mugabe—a leading guerrilla fighter during Zimbabwe’s liberation—for redistributing huge tracts of land across the country to exemplary armed white farmers back to their rightful own- ers, Black guerrilla fighters. Ian Smith, the white prime minister of apartheid-like Rhodesia, at one time owned a 5,000-acre farm in Zimbabwe.

The May 25 protest, organized by the December 12th Movement and Friends of Zimbabwe, started in front of the African American Civil War Museum and proceeded to the White House. Marchers waved the Zimbabwe flag and the red, black and green Black Liberation flag during the parade-like procession.

Chants such as “Whose land? Our land,” “You stole us, you bought us—you owe us” and “We are an African people” brought attention to the devas- tating impact the sanctions are wreaking on the infrastructure of the Zimbabwean economy, along with the daily lives of the population in almost every area of life. The sanctions pose a threat to the political sta- bility of the government, while at the same time making it difficult to collectively punishing the population. As marchers stepped with precision in the streets, they evoked horn honks from drivers and raised fists of support from those on foot. Once the protesters reached the White House, a street rally was held, chaired by long-time D12 Movement leader Viola Plummer.

One of the speak- ers was Dr. Frank Gunzi, an East Coast rep- resentative of the Zimbabwe African National Union-Patriotic Front in the U.S. Once the rally ended, the protesters marched back to the original site.

Moorehead spoke at the rally, repre- senting Workers World Party and the International Action Center.

Organizers call for national general strike

By Joanna Straughn

The Sudanese Professionals Association has called for preparation for a nation- wide strike after months of sit-ins and vig- ils across Sudan. The SPA is demanding that talks resume to hasten a transition to a new national governing body with civil- ian leadership.

However, other forces within the main umbrella of protest groups, notably the Alliance for Freedom and Change, have refused to back the strike call. External capitalist forces are also attempting to influence the outcome of this mass peo- ple’s struggle in Sudan.

Sudan’s former president, Omar Al Bashir, who was overthrown April 11, is now a num- erous other officials associated with his gov- ernment. Mohammed Hamdan, known as “Hemeti,” presently leads Sudan as Deputy Chairman of Sudan’s Transitional Military Council and Commander of the Rapid Support Forces.

Hemeti has previously met with leaders of the protest movement and had reached an initial agreement that would include both national leaders and civilians in a 900-member body. The SPA has also been negotiating for its composition to be inclusive of different genders, youth and nationalities within Sudan.

Soon after the announcement of the agreement on May 14, shots were fired on unarmed protesters gathering at a sit-in in Khartoum. The most recent reports by Sudanese doctors state that four have died and more are injured.

More strikes and vigils took place in response to Hemeti’s call to stop using violence against revolutionaries.” On May 20, Hemeti announced that sev- eral RSF soldiers had been arrested in connection with the shooting.

In addition to the mass sit-in in Khartoum, which has been ongoing since January, a number of collective actions have been taken. On May 23, in response to the call for a national general strike, Hemeti, in front of an assembly of RSF troops, said that engineers and other staff have been assigned to replace striking workers and that anyone who strikes should go home without returning.

Al Bashir’s government had maintained popular subsidies for many years. This was despite the difficulties Sudan faced in developing resources, which would have entailed heavy investment in new infrastructure in order to expand the oil infrastructure. In 2011 South Sudan broke away, with the backing of co-members of the Rapid Support Forces and Sudan’s oil supply, and the means to repay loans based on projected funds from oil sales, went with South Sudan.

U.S. targeted Sudan, accused Al Bashir of genocide

The U.S. imposed diplomatic sanctions in 2017 and subsequent economic sanctions on listed state sponsors of terrorism. The U.S. accused Al Bashir of genocide in the Darfur region in 2003, an accusation he denies. Militias with irregular ties to the state had made attacks against populations in the Darfur region, in areas where U.S.-backed Sudan rebel forces had been mobilizing.

In October 2017, the U.S. lifted some of the sanctions, but refused to remove Sudan from its list of state sponsors of terrorism. The lifting of sanc- tions permitted the government of Sudan to accept loans from the International Monetary Fund. Among other austerity measures, the IMF demanded that wheat subsidies be cut, leading to soaring bread prices and unrest.

Sudan’s government spent further resources expanding its military to counter attacks from armed groups, including the Sudan People’s Liberation Movement-North. Removal of subsidies on staples such as bread catalyzed the sit- ins, according to the SPA.

Imperialists’ role: How much involvement?

According to Radio Dabanga, a Sudan- based news organization (dabangaudan.org), the U.S. government sent a letter to the U.S. State Department proposing “a series of measures that should be taken to reduce the dependence of the Sudanese government on outside military and economic assistance.”

However, this does not make clear what type of capacity would be supported and to what extent it would serve the needs of the working class of Sudan.

The SPLM-N has agreed to a cease- fire with the government and tentatively supported the umbrella group Alliance for Freedom and Change. Its demands have tended to align with U.S. interests, and it will likely prove for those in any negotiat- ing process.

Britain and Norway have also come out in favor of the AFC’s demands, stressing that their aid and investment decisions may hinge on whether the government is civilian-led. (Radio Dabanga)

Federica Mogherini, foreign policy chief of the European Union, declared, “A swift move 9 women freed!
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city officials or police were ever criminally charged in connection with the May 13 murders.

In earlier correspondence with The Guardian, Janine Africa wrote, “There is nothing more about their inexperience, but not in a bad way. When I think about what this system has done to me and my family, it makes me even more committed to my belief.” (May 29, 2019)

The women said a thank you message to their U.S. and international supporters. It read in part: “The lawyers were sent to do a job and they did it! It is duly noted! But we cannot minimize the will of the people, which John Africa said is ‘a powerful force.’ All power to the people who pushed aside their personal concerns and saw to their freedom.”

Three other MOVE 9 members Delbert Orr Africa, Charles Sims Africa and Edward Goodman Africa remain incarcerated. Merle Africa and Phil Africa died in custody. Find out more about the Move 9 and their fight for freedom at cmv organización.org and move9parole.blogspot.com. (✓)
The so-called liberal media in the U.S.—notably the New York Times, the Washington Post and some television news sources—profess independence. But they almost never offend their ruling-class owners on key international issues. Take, for example, the “reporting” we are handed each day on three important oil-producing countries: Venezuela, Iran and Saudi Arabia.

How often are we told that the Venezuelan opposition (which is in disarray) arose out of a lack of “democracy” and “fraudulent” elections in that country? These phrases are repeated again and again, not just by the openly right-wing media here, but by those claiming objectivity.

They fail to mention the literally dozens of elections that have taken place in Venezuela since the movement led by Hugo Chávez took power in 1998—they were fair and honest. Nor do they seem to notice that the current political right-wing of the Venezuelan military kidnap and murder Chávez in 2002, but he was rescued by a mass mobilization of the Venezuelan people.

The U.S. government a month ago, with the help of the corporate media, was hoping to instigate the military against President Nicolás Maduro, but this time it didn’t happen.

How often are we told that the Iranian people are ruled over by a dictatorial theocracy? The imperialist media make no mention of the horrors carried out by their predecessor, the bloody Shah, who was installed by a CIA coup in 1953. A creature of the U.S. oil companies, he was overthrown in a popular revolution in 1979. That revolution led to the current government.

The U.S. government and Iran are now considered “enemies” of the U.S. But not Saudi Arabia. Right now, the U.S. military is providing logistical and material support for Saudi Arabia’s genocidal bombing of Yemen, a small country facing famine and genocide at the hands of this bloody Saudi/U.S. war.

Even when reporting on this ghastly situation, do the liberal media here remind their audience that Saudi Arabia is politically a total dictatorship of the Saudi royal family? That 700 princes control the whole economy and politics of the state? That there are no elections in Saudi Arabia? And that these theocratic princes have a great relationship with the government of the United States?

Take a look at the Wikipedia entry on Saudi Arabia and scan down to a discussion of the royal family. There is a photograph taken in 1985. Click on it and you’ll see a lovely picture of Ronald Reagan and Donald Trump looking on as Ivana Trump shakes hands with King Fahd at the White House. Ivana has been replaced, but the reactionary international policies dictated by U.S. big business remain.

Why don’t the Times, the Post, NPR and others mention that?

Free Assange and Manning!

By releasing the information provided by whistleblower Chelsea Manning, Wikileaks founder Julian Assange exposed the war crimes of the imperialist U.S. government. The most dramatic exposé was a July 2007 video of U.S. helicopter pilots shooting at Iraqi civilians, including Iraqi journalists working for Reuters.

Those of us who opposed and mobilized against the U.S. invasion and occupation of Iraq already knew the litany of U.S. war crimes, including the lie of “weapons of mass destruction” used to justify the invasion. The Wikileaks video, however, brought those crimes to light for anyone who doubted. And shooting Iraqi civilians was only one of many examples that Wikileaks exposed.

Even if that was all they accomplished, Manning and Assange would have helped the struggle of working-class and oppressed peoples worldwide against the U.S. empire. That alone has earned them the support of revolutionaries and working-class organizers against the newest imperialist attacks on their freedom.

The U.S. (in)Justice Department has now taken its aggression against Assange a big step further. It has brought 17 charges of violation of the 1917 Espionage Act against him—for being an honest journalist. In so doing, the U.S. government is now waging war against media freedom and against the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. In effect, it is charging the media with treason.

Assange faces up to 275 years in prison, which is a de facto death penalty. And Manning is now in prison again for refusing to testify against Wikileaks. She previously did seven years in military prison before being paroled.

But these attacks by the Republican government are against more than these two individuals, whom Democratic Party officials and their media also call traitors. This administration is attacking the rights of all media to tell the truth about the U.S. empire and those who manage it.

Even ruling-class media giants like the New York Times and the Washington Post, whose loyalty to the imperialist system is unquestioned, say they are threatened by the offensive on Assange and Manning.

According to these media, here is how the quest for truth is supposed to work in a capitalist democracy. Should the government commit a crime or make a serious error in judgment, it will likely try to keep it secret. Someone working for the government who knows of the crime may run the risk and tell it to media. Since these media are supposed to be independent of the government, they verify, publish or broadcast the truth about this crime or error.

The crime or error then can be debated, at least among the bourgeoisie and its representatives, who really run the society. The crime is also exposed for all the people to know.

The media need to protect their sources, the whistleblowers or witnesses, by not identifying them. In recent cases, journalists have done prison time for refusing to name sources.

The case against Assange is an even more serious assault on press freedom and democracy, in that he is being charged with treason for publishing the truth about a criminal imperialist regime. It puts at risk any serious investigative media, including smaller left-wing media.

Any attack from an ultra-right regime on powerful media like the Times, the Post and CNN—which have resources to defend themselves—is also an attack on more progressive media. It leaves only one choice: Defend Julian Assange and the right to publish. Defend Chelsea Manning and all whistleblowers who expose the imperialist U.S. regime!
The following report is based on a chapter in Catalinotto’s book, “Turn the Guns Around: Mutinies, Soldier Revolts and Revolutions” (World View Forum, 2017), which tells the story of the American Servicemen’s Union, the anti-racist organization of U.S. active-duty service members during 1968-75.

On the evening of June 5, 1969, hundreds of GIs imprisoned in the Army stockade at Fort Dix, N.J., rose up in rebellion. Half the stockade burned as those troops, many of them active opponents of the U.S. war in Vietnam, defended themselves against an attack by 250 military police.

Some of the most effective anti-war soldier organizers were being held in the Fort Dix stockade during the first half of 1969: Henry Mills, Terry Klug, John Lewis, Bill Brackefeld, Tom Tuck, Tom Catlow, Jeffrey Russell and Robert North. Lewis, Mills and North had organized meal strikes and other mass actions in the stockade in early 1969.

The stockade commanders considered the whole prisoner body to be a pack of trouble, and accordingly, they inflicted whole groups with collective punishment. For weeks building up to June 5, the anger was pent-up, the hatred it. The ASU members especially hated it. The stockade commanders considered the whole prisoner body to be a pack of trouble, and accordingly, they inflicted whole groups with collective punishment.

The Pentagon officers were dropping bombs on Laos and the revenge was palpable. The ASU members especially hated it. The stockade commanders considered the whole prisoner body to be a pack of trouble, and accordingly, they inflicted whole groups with collective punishment.
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Niños migrantes mueren en detención
Niños ciudadanos mueren de pobreza

Por Sam Ordóñez

23 de mayo, 2018, un agente de CBP reportó la muerte en detención de la menor de 9 años, Maquin, del pueblo Maya Q’eqchi’, 7 años. El día 22 de mayo, CBS News reportó la muerte en detención en la frontera de Rosario de la guerra abierta contra la igualdad salarial. Y ataron estos temas a la necesidad de acabar con la opresión del poder y la explotación en los Estados Unidos.

El 24 de mayo, la agencia de Custom and Border Protection mató de un tiro a la cabeza a Claudia Patricia Ramírez Lizáquez, una mujer trans hondureña, de 21 años, murió el 22 de mayo, de 18 años. El estado de la mujer fue maniobra y salvajemente el estado que dejó al niño.

El 22 de mayo, la muerte en detención de Carlos Gregorio Hernandez, un niño migrante muerto este mes en detención en el estado de la guerra abierta contra los derechos reproductivos, buscan por razón que no se rebeló el enterarse. Pero no son solamente los niños migrantes los que son abusados y condenados a la muerte... Niños migrantes siguen acorralados debajo de puentes. Siguen muriendo niños en detención.

Niños migrantes y niños futuros

Mientras mueren niños migrantes en la frontera, la alianza de neonazis, evan- gélicos y racistas... Dejan evidencias de la policía de la policía... Un niño migrante murió en el estado de la guerra abierta contra los derechos reproductivos, buscan por razón que no se rebeló el enterarse. Pero no son solamente los niños migrantes los que son abusados y condenados a la muerte... Niños migrantes siguen acorralados debajo de puentes. Siguen muriendo niños en detención.

Se ha lanzado un nuevo ataque violento por la derecha al acceso al aborto en los Estados Unidos. La legislatura del estado de Alabama aprobó la ley más punitiva y restrictiva de las leyes contra los derechos reproductivos nunca antes vistas en los Estados Unidos el 14 de mayo, impone una prohibición total de abortos. Los Estados Unidos el 14 de mayo, impone una prohibición total de abortos. Los Estados Unidos el 14 de mayo, impone una prohibición total de abortos.

La guerra de los Estados Unidos el 14 de mayo, impone una prohibición total de abortos.

El hecho de que los niños muertos son niños migrantes es lo que convierte al gobierno estadounidense en un genocida por razón que no se rebeló el enterarse. Pero no son solamente los niños migrantes los que son abusados y condenados a la muerte... Niños migrantes siguen acorralados debajo de puentes. Siguen muriendo niños en detención.
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El hecho de que los niños muertos son niños migrantes es lo que convierte al gobierno estadounidense en un genocida por razón que no se rebeló el enterarse. Pero no son solamente los niños migrantes los que son abusados y condenados a la muerte... Niños migrantes siguen acorralados debajo de puentes. Siguen muriendo niños en detención.

La lucha por el acceso al aborto es una parte de la lucha por la justicia reproductiva y de género, por el derecho de las personas a elegir cuando, dónde o si tener hijos, y también por el derecho a tener los recursos para refugiarse, alimentar, vestir, educar y educar, para crear sus hijos.

La lucha por el acceso al aborto es una parte de la lucha por la justicia reproductiva y de género, por el derecho de las personas a elegir cuando, dónde o si tener hijos, y también por el derecho a tener los recursos para refugiarse, alimentar, vestir, educar y educar, para crear sus hijos.

¡Justicia reproductiva y de género ahora!
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