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Power to the people, brothers and sisters. I would like to thank you for my presence here tonight because you are responsible. I would be in a maximum security penitentiary if it weren't for the power of the people. So you're responsible, and only you.

I would like to petition you to do the same for Bobby Seale, our Chairman, for ErickaHughes for Angela Davis, for the New York 21 and the Soledad Brothers. For all political prisoners and prisoners of war. Free the people. The 28th and 29th of November we will have a People's Revolutionary Constitutional Convention in Washington, D.C. We cannot have that convention if the people do not come. Because, after all, the people are the makers of world history. The people are responsible for everything. So how can we have a convention if we have no people? Some people think that we can have a people's convention without the people being there. I think that, that was the case in 1777.

Tonight, I would like to outline for you the Black Panther Party's program and also explain how we arrived at our ideological position and why we feel it necessary to institute a Ten-Point Program, A Ten-Point Program that is not revolutionary in itself, nor is it reformist. It's a survival program. We feel that we, the people, are threatened with genocide because racism and fascism is rampant. Not only in this country, but throughout the world. And the ruling circle in North America are the responsible parties. We intend to change all of that. In order to change it, there must be a total transformation. But until such time that we can achieve that total transformation, we must exist. In order to exist, we must survive, so, therefore, we need a survival kit. The Ten-Point Program is a survival kit, brothers and sisters. In other words, it is necessary for our children to grow up healthy, with minds that can be functional and creative. They cannot do this if they do not get the correct nutrition. That is why we have a breakfast program for children. We also have community health programs.

We have a bassing program. We call it the bus for relatives and parents of prisoners. Because we realize that the fascist regime who operate the prisons throughout America would like to do their treachery in the dark. If we get the relatives and the parents and friends to the prisons, they can expose the treachery of the fascists. So this too is a survival program.

We must not take our survival programs as an answer to the problem. We don't even claim it to be a revolutionary program. Because revolutions are made of sternest stuff. We do say that if the people are not here, then, of course, revolution cannot be achieved because the people make revolution. The people make revolution and only the people. The theme of our People's Revolutionary Constitutional Convention is "Survival Through Service to the People." At our convention, we will present our total survival program. The survival program works very much like a first-aid kit, or perhaps the kit that is used when a plane falls and you find yourself in the middle of the sea on a rubber raft. And you'll need a few things such as a first-aid kit and a few protein tablets in order to last until you can get to the shore, until you can get to that oasis where you can be happy and healthy. If you do not have those things necessary to get you to the shore, then possibly you will not exist. At this time, the ruling circle threatens us to the extent that we're afraid that we might not exist to see the next day or see the revolution. The Black Panther Party will not accept the total destruction of the people. Matter of fact, we have drawn a line of demarcation and we will no longer tolerate fascism, aggression, brutality and murder of any kind. Matter of fact, we will not sit around and allow ourselves to be murdered. Each person has an obligation to preserve himself. If he does not preserve himself, then I accuse him of suicide. I accuse him of reactionary suicide because a reactionary set of conditions will cause his death. I repeat, if we do nothing we might die the death of a reactionary suicide. That is, by doing nothing we are accepting the situation. The situation is a condition of reaction, so, therefore, a reaction will cause our death. We will not accept that. Matter of fact, we say that if the alternatives are very narrow, we still will not sit around. We will not die the death of the Jews in Germany. We would rather die the death of the Jews in Warsaw.

Yes, because we feel that where there is courage, where there is self-respect and dignity, there is a possibility that we can change all of the conditions and that we can possibly win. And this is called revolutionary enthusiasm and it is the kind of stuff that is needed in order to guarantee a victory. We say that if we must die, then we will die the death of the revolutionary suicide. The revolutionary suicide that says that if I am put down, if I am driven out, I refuse to be swept out with a broom. I would much rather be driven out with a stick, because with the broom, when I am driven out, it will humiliate me and I will lose my self-respect. But if I am driven out with the stick, then at least I can remain with the dignity of a man and die the death of a man, rather than die the death of a dog. Of course, our real desire is to live, but we will not be cowed, we will not be intimidated.

I would like to explain to you the method that the Black Panther Party used to arrive at our ideological position, and, also more than that, I would like to give to you a framework or a process of thinking that might help us solve the problems and the contradictions that exist today. Today the world is very complicated. There are many things in operation at the same time. It reminds me of a little saying, "When I was a boy, what was so was so, what was not was not. Now I am a man, things have changed a lot. Some things nearly so, others, not. It is a puzzlement". How do we solve this? We must approach the problem attempting to get a clear picture and a clear image of really what's going on, really what is going on divorced from our attitudes and emotions that we usually project into a situation. In other words, we will attempt to be as objective as possible, and avoiding dogma; we will let the facts speak for themselves. But we will not remain totally objective because knowledge and facts are no good if we do not put them to good use to serve our interests. So we will become subjective when we apply the knowledge that we received from the external world using the scientific method. But at that time, we will admit that we will be subjective, continued on next page
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people think they are Marxists when actually they are following the thoughts of Hegel. Some people think they are Marxists-Leninists and they regard as necessary. So, therefore, they’re tied to the past. They’re tied to a rhetoric that does not apply to the present set of conditions. They are tied to a set of thoughts that edges upon dogma, and what we sometimes call, flanneleyism.

Marx attempted to set up a framework. Just as in mathematics you develop certain equations to understand a certain phenomena, and after you learn some things about a particular set of conditions, then you try to move on and apply that framework to other things, or those principles. And you’re not interested in the same thing even one minute after you found it the last time, because then that’s history. And if things are in a constant state of transformation, we will not expect for them to be the same. So, therefore, words that we used to describe the old phenomena perhaps will be useless to describe the new. And if we use the old words to describe events past then we might confuse people. They might think that things are static and therefore contradicting the theory of dialectical materialism.

In 1917, an event occurred in the Soviet Union that was called a revolution. Two classes had a contradiction and the whole country was transformed. In this country, in 1970, the Black Panther Party issued a document. Our Minister of Information, Eldridge Cleaver, who now is in Algeria, wrote the pamphlet and it was called “On the Ideology of the Black Panther Party”. In that work, Eldridge Cleaver stated that the proletarians in this country at this time, or the industrial worker, does not carry the potentialities for revolution. He claimed that the left wing of the proletarians, the lumpen-proletarians, the revolutionary potential and in fact would carry the people of the world to the final climax of the transformation of society, and, therefore, will act as the vanguard. It has been stated by some people, by some parties, by some organizations, by Progressive Labor Party that it is impossible. How can the lumpen-proletarians carry out a successful socialist transformation when they are only a minority? And in fact how can they do it when history shows that only the proletarians have carried out a successful social revolution? I would agree that it is necessary for the people who carry out a social revolution to represent the popular majority’s interests. It is necessary for this group to represent the broad masses of the people. I would agree to that in the Soviet Union, 1917, we analyzed what happened there. I would agree that the lumpen proletarians are actually the minority in this country. No disagreement. It seems that I’ve contradicted myself, it only goes to show that words apparently might not actually be a fact. Sometimes we think a thing is really a contradiction and it’s only paradoxical. It might seem what it’s not, you see. So what we will do is tear this thing apart; we will analyze it. In the Soviet Union, in 1917, the Soviet Union was basically an agricultural society, that of a very large peasantry. There was a set of social conditions existing there at that time that were responsible for the development of a small industrial base. The people who worked in this industrial base, they called them proletarians. Lenin, using Marx’s theory, saw the trends because he was not a historical materialist, he was a dialectical materialist, and, therefore, he was very interested in the ever changing status of things. He saw that while the proletarians were a minority at that time, in 1917, they had the potentiality to carry out a revolution because their nature of things, see that while the proletarians were a minority at that time, in 1917, they had the potentiality to carry out a revolution. They also carried the necessary properties to carry out a revolution that resembled a socialist revolution.

In this country, the Black Panther Party taking care of the dialectical method, taking careful note of the social trends and the ever changing nature of things, see that while the lumpen proletarians are the minority and the proletarians, the majority, we also see that technology is developing at such a rapid rate that we’ll start with automation, go to cybernetics, and then go from there probably into technology. As I come into town I saw MIT over the way. If the ruling circle remains in power, it seems to me that they would go on developing their technological machinery. They would go on developing their technological machinery because at the capitalist’s hands and the ruling circle’s hands, they’re not interested in the people. So, therefore, I would expect from him the logic that he’s always followed. That is to make as much money as possible. And pay the people as little as possible, when the people demand more and finally demand his head. At this time, if revolution does not occur almost immediately, and I say almost immediately because the trend is that technology is making leaps, and that’s why we make a leap all the way to the moon and if the ruling circle remains in power, the proletariat worker, the proletarian working class, will definitely be on the decline, because they will be unemployed and, therefore, swell the ranks of the Lumpens, who are unemployed. Unemployed because the ruling circle does not need them any more. So every worker is jeoparized because of the role of the ruling circle. And this way that the lumpen-proletarians carry the potentiality for revolution and in fact will probably carry out the revolution and, in the near future, will be the popular class, the majority. Of course, I would not like to see a minority of my people unemployed or unemployables. But, being objective, because we’re objective, because we’re dialectical materialists, we must acknowledge the facts and that’s all we’re doing.

I believe Marx outlined a rough process of development of society. Roughly he said society goes from a slave class to a feudalistic class structure to a capitalist class structure to a socialist class structure, and finally to Communism. Of course, ideas from capitalist state to socialist state to non-state. Communism. I think we can all agree, and I would ask for a stipulation, that the slave class in the world has virtually been transformed into the wage slave. In other words, the slave class in the world no longer exists as a significant force, and if we could agree to that, we can agree that classes can be transformed literally out of existence. If this is so, if the slave class can disappear and become something else, or not disappear, but just be transformed and take on other characteristics, then it’s also true that the proletariat or the industrial worker class can possibly be transformed out of existence. Of course the people would not disappear, they would only take on other attributes. The attribute that I’m interested in is the fact that the ruling circle would maintain in power, and that the ruling circle is in control of the means of production, then he will be called an unemployable or a lumpen. So, I think that’s logical, that I think that’s dialectical. I think it would be very strange to say only the slave class could disappear.
You know, Marx was a very intelligent man. He was not a dogmatist because he said, "One thing I'm not: I'm not a Marxist." In other words, he was trying to warn, he was trying to tell Progressive Labor Party and others not to accept the past as the present or the future, but to understand it and be able to predict what might happen in the future and, therefore, act in an intelligent way so that we can bring about the revolution that we all want.

After taking these things under consideration, we see that at some changes and as the world is transformed, that we need some new definitions to the situation. Because if we keep using the old terms people might think the old situation still exists. Therefore, they will get a false picture of the world. They will think that the world is stable. We would be very amazed if the same conditions that existed in 1917 would still be in existence today. Matter of fact, you know Marx and Lenin were pretty much slaves when it came to working for somebody. Matter of fact, they looked at it, working for your necessities, as somewhat of a curse. And Lenin's whole theory after he put Marx's analysis into practice, was geared to get rid of the proletarians, in other words, that by the proletarian class or the working class satisfying the means of production, they would plan in such a way that they would be free from toil. Again matter of fact, Lenin saw a time where man could stand in one place, push buttons and move mountains. It sounds to me like he was a capitalist working class transformed so that they could have that free block of free time so that they could indulge in productive creativity, so that they could think about developing their universe to a higher manifestation, so that they could have the happiness, the freedom and the pleasures that man seems to seek and value.

At this time, the capitalists had developed the machinery to such a point where he can hire a group of specialized people called technicians. In the near future he will be able to do this, and the technicians will be so specialized until he cannot really be identified as a proletariat. In fact that group of men will be so small until we will have to do something to explain the other people; we would have to come up with another definition. Now, sometimes when we theorize we can argue all day. We can argue all day and if we have no practical application of a theory we will come up with nothing worthwhile. So I'm saying that in spite of the criticism that we receive from certain people, we would say in practice many of our activities would be the same. That is because people would not disappear, not with our survival program they will not. They still exist. They will still be around. So, therefore, the Black Panther Party says it's perfectly correct to organize the proletarians because after he's picked out of the factory, because he'll be called unemployed or lumpen, doesn't stop or transform his interest which is to live, and in order to live he has to eat. So his best interest is to seize the machinery that he has produced so that he can produce the abundance so he and his brethren can live. Now, I'm saying, that we will not wait until the proletarian becomes the lumpen-proletarian to educate him. Today we must lift the consciousness of the people so that we can get a clear picture of what is to be done. We need to know that, because the wind is rising and the rivers flow, times are getting hard and we can't go home again. We can't go back to our mother's womb, nor can we go back to 1917.
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formed at the hands of the imperialist and the ruling circle in the interests of the imperialists. So we found that in order to be an internationalist, we had to be also a nationalist, or at least acknowledge nationalism. So all internationalists are also nationalists, because, if I understand that word, "inter" means some inter-relationship between things and "nationalism" or "nationhood" means the relationship between a group of nations. Now if no nation is in existence and in fact the United States is an empire, that would make it impossible for us to be internationalists. We are no longer interstate affairs, we're not afraid about that. Matter of fact we will try to shed light upon it, and we will define the new transformation and the phenomena, and we will call ourselves "Intercommunists", Because nations have been transformed into communities of the world.

So tonight, the Black Panther Party would like to disclaim Internationalism and support Intercommunals. We have a problem. You know Marx and Lenin felt with the information that they had, that when non-state finally came to be a reality, it would be caused, or ushered in by the people and by Communism. A strange thing happened. The ruling reactionary circle through the process of being an imperialist, transformed the world into what we call reactionary intercommunals. They laid siege upon all the communities of the world, dominating the institutions to such an extent that the people are not served by the institutions in their land. The Black Panther Party would like to reverse that and lead the people of the world into the age of Revolutionary Intercommunalism. This would be the time when the people seize the means of production, distribute the wealth and the technology in an egalitarian way to the many communities of the world.

We see very little difference in what happens to a community here in North America and what happens to a community in Vietnam. We see very little difference in what happens, even culturally to a Chinese community in San Francisco and a Chinese community in Hong Kong. We see very little difference in what happens to a Black community in Harlem and a Black community in South Africa, a Black community in Angola and Mozam

bique. We see very little difference. So what has actually happened, that non-state has already been accomplished, but it's reactionary. A community by way of definition is a comprehensive collection of institutions which serve the people who live there. It differs from a nation, because a community evolves around a greater structure that we usually call the state and the state has certain control over the community. It also serves the community, if the administration represents the people or if the administration happens to be the people's commissar. It's not so at this time, so there's still something to be done, I spoke earlier about the negation of the negation, I spoke earlier about the fact of redistribution of wealth. We think that it's very important to know that in the world today that socialism in the United States will never exist. Why? It will not exist because it cannot exist. Also, I would say, socialism cannot at this time exist anywhere in the world. Because socialism would require a socialist state, and if state does not exist, how could socialism exist? So how do we define certain progressive countries such as the People's Republic of China? How do we describe certain progressive countries, or communities as we call them, as the Democratic People's Republic of Korea? How do we define certain communities as North Vietnam and the Provisional Government in the South? How do we explain these communities, if in fact they too cannot claim nationhood. We say this: we say they represent the people's liberated territory, they represent a community liberated. But that community is not sufficient, it is not satisfied, just as the National Liberation Front is not satisfied with the liberated territory in the South. It is only ground for preparation for the liberation of the world, seizing of the wealth from the ruling circle and equal distribution and proportional representation in an intercommunal framework. This is what the Black Panther Party would like to achieve with the help of the power of the people because without the people nothing can be achieved.

I stated that in the United States socialism would never exist. I say that order for a revolution to occur in the United States, you would have to have a redistribution of wealth not on a national level, but an international level, not on an international level, but on an intercommunal level, and this is because how can we say that we have accomplished revolution and redistribute the wealth just to the people here in North America when the ruling circle itself is guilty of trespass de bonas as per tadas. That is, they've taken away the goods of the people of the world, transported them to America, and used them as their very own. That is a tort.

Now remember in 1917, when the revolution occurred, you had a redistribution of wealth on a national level because nations existed. Now, if you have to think in terms of planning an economy on a world wide level, on an intercommunal level, that says something. That says that the people have been ripped off and it's very much like the people in one country being ripped off. And when the people seize the means of production then they redistribute. So we say this: we say reparation will not even serve because the people have not only been robbed of their raw materials, their raw materials have also been invested, their raw materials have been made into a technological machine—the people are responsible for that—so the people of the world will have to have control of that, not for x amount of time, not for a limited amount, but forever. So all I can see in order to plan a real Intercommunal economy is that we will have to acknowledge how the world is hooked up together. We'd also have to acknowledge that some time ago, nations could exist because technology had not advanced to the level it is now.

Some people will argue that nations still exist because of the cultural differences. By way of definition, just for practical argument, culture is a collection, or learned patterns of behavior. We see that here in the United States, Black people, Africans, were raped from the mother country, were brought here, and we've literally lost most of our African values. Perhaps we still hold onto some surviving Africanisms, but by large you can see the transformation. This was achieved through a long stay, but also through the high technological society that has a tremendous mass media and indoctrination center. We see that
And they're there for the same purpose, that is the protection of the ruling circle here in North America. We say that it is true that the world is one community. The world is one community but we're not satisfied where the power is. We want the power for the people.

I said earlier, and I strayed away, that the theory of the negation of the negation is very valid. Some scholars have been wondering why in Asia, Africa and Latin America, the resistance always seek the goal of a collective society. They seem not to institute the economy of the capitalist. They seem to go all the way from feudalism and try to jump to a collective society. And some people can't understand why. Why won't they go from feudalism, develop a capitalistic base, and finally go into socialism? They don't do it because they can't do it. They don't do it for the same reason that the Black community in Harlem cannot develop capitalism, the Black community in Oakland or San Francisco cannot develop capitalism, because the imperialists have already pre-empted the field, he has already centralized the wealth. So therefore, in order to deal with him, all we can do is liberate our community, and then move on him as a collective force.

You know, we've had long arguments with people. We used to call ourselves before we became conscious, a dispersed collection of colonies seen in North America. And people argued with me all day and all night, and they told me how can you possibly be a colony? In order to be a colony, you have to have a nation, and you're not a nation, you're a community. You're a dispersed collection of communities. And because the Black Panther Party is not embarrassed to change or be transformed, tonight I would like to accept the criticism and say that you are absolutely right, that we are a collection of communities just as the African people represent a collection of communities, just as the Korean people, the Vietnamese people, the Chinese people are a collection of communities--a dispersed collection of communities. Because they have no superstructure--The structure--the superstructure of the industrial base that they labor to produce was set the example for us, we know we have to do in order to return Eldridge Cleaver home. We have to liberate communities. That's why the Black Panther Party denounces Black capitalism and say that all we can do is liberate our community, not only in Vietnam but here, not only in Cambodia and the People's Republic of China and Korea, but the peoples of the world must unite as one community and then transform the world into a place where people will be happy, wars will end, state itself will no longer exist, and we will have communism. But we cannot do this right away, because we know that in sociology we say that when transfer-liberated places, when a structural change takes place, the result is usually cultural lag. In other words, after the people possess the means of production we will probably not move directly into communism but we will linger with Revolutionary Intercommunism until such time that we can wash away bourgeois thought, until such time that we can wash away racist and reactionary thinking, and until such time that people are not attached to their nation as a peasant is attached to the soil, until such time that people can gain their sanity and develop a culture that is essentially human, this will serve the people instead of serving some god. You see, it will be necessary to do that because we cannot avoid contact with each other. We cannot avoid contact with each other because of the changing set of conditions, because we can't, we will have to develop a value system that will make us function together in harmony. This will be necessary.

So tonight, I think I've covered some of what I had to say. I will allow ye to talk. We will have a question or answer period. But before I do that I would like to deliver a message you. Our Minister of Information, Eldridge Cleaver, asked me to petition you, to ask you to prepare a place if I return home. And also I would like to tell the peoples of the world for allowing our Minister of Information to rest in their liberated communities, in their liberated territory. So, they've actually set the example for us, we know we have to do in order to return Eldridge Cleaver home. We have to liberate communities.
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