

MIM THEORY

Number 13
1997 \$7.50

THE OFFICIAL THEORETICAL JOURNAL
OF THE MAOIST INTERNATIONALIST MOVEMENT



CULTURE

IN

REVOLUTION

Plus: New International Section, Letters, Movies...

MIM Theory

1997

Volume 5, Number 2

Maoist Internationalist Movement

Editor: MC12

MIM Theory is the official theoretical journal of the Maoist Internationalist Movement (MIM). Subscriptions are \$16 per year/two issues. Overseas airmail subscriptions are \$32.

MIM also publishes MIM Notes, the party's official voice on current news (\$20/24 issues per year or \$1 each); Notas Rojas, the newspaper of emerging Spanish-speaking parties of MIM (\$4/year); and, Maoist Sojourner, by and for Third World Maoist exiles led by MIM (\$12/year 12 issues). International subscriptions cost more.

MIM is an underground party that does not publish the names of its comrades in order to avoid state surveillance and repression that has been historically directed at communist parties and anti-imperialist movements. In the text, "MC" means a MIM Comrade, "RC" means RAIL Comrade, a member of the Revolutionary Anti-Imperialist League, which is led by MIM.

MIM Theory is not copyrighted. Please credit MIM when copying.

Send cash, check, or money order payable to "MIM Distributors."

**MIM • PO Box 3576
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-3576**

**West Coast info:
MIM Notes • PO Box 29670
Los Angeles, CA 90029-0670**

**Internet:
mim@mim.org
www.etext.org/Politics/MIM**

What is MIM?



The Maoist Internationalist Movement is the collection of existing or emerging Maoist internationalist parties in the English-speaking imperialist countries and their English-speaking internal semi-colonies, as well as the existing or emerging Spanish-speaking Maoist internationalist parties of Aztlán, Puerto Rico and other territories of the U.S. Empire.



MIM upholds the revolutionary communist ideology of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and is an internationalist organization that works from the vantage point of the Third World proletariat.

MIM struggles to end the oppression of all groups over other groups: classes, genders, nations. MIM knows this is only possible by building public opinion to seize power through armed struggle.

Revolution is a reality for North America as the military becomes over-extended in the government's attempts to maintain world hegemony.

MIM differs from other communist parties on three main questions: (1) MIM holds that after the proletariat seizes power in socialist revolution, the potential exists for capitalist restoration under the leadership of a new bourgeoisie within the communist party itself. In the case of the USSR, the bourgeoisie seized power after the death of Stalin in 1953; in China, it was after Mao's death and the overthrow of the "Gang of Four" in 1976. (2) MIM upholds the Chinese Cultural Revolution as the farthest advance of communism in human history. (3) MIM believes the North American white-working-class is primarily a non-revolutionary worker-elite at this time; thus, it is not the principal vehicle to advance Maoism in this country.

MIM accepts people as members who agree on these basic principles and accept democratic centralism, the system of majority rule, on other questions of party line.

"The theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin is universally applicable. We should regard it not as dogma, but as a guide to action. Studying it is not merely a matter of learning terms and phrases, but of learning Marxism-Leninism as the science of revolution." — Mao Zedong, Selected Works, Vol. II, p. 208

MIM Theory

Number 13 • 1997

CULTURE IN REVOLUTION

CONTENTS

What We Want, What We Believe.....2

Letters to MIM Theory3

Race is power struggle.....	3
MIM is pathetic.....	3
Jews are not a nation; Israel is.....	4
Unity and Struggle Responds.....	6
English comrade wants info on N. American left.....	10
Scottish comrade on the labor aristocracy.....	12
Qaddafi falls short of MLM.....	13
Revolution is the main trend.....	14
On prison leadership.....	16
Infanticide: The gift of death.....	17
Burn, Babylon, Burn!.....	18
Social dems learn the hard way.....	19
The last decade's lesson.....	20

Corrections24

Revolution in Culture25

Editor's introduction.....	25
Chinese art in revolution.....	29
Inside an American public high school.....	33
An anarchist critique of education.....	36
The culture of education in China's GPCR.....	38
Globalization and Philippine education.....	39
Revolutionary culture in the Philippines.....	42
Organizing for revolution in the heart of reaction.....	44
Identity politics.....	46
Religion and the anti-imperialist movement.....	47
Corporate concentration and cultural hegemony.....	52
Alvin Ailey in perspective.....	53
The Black Panther Party on culture.....	57
Letter: MIM's cultural revisionism.....	58
Graffiti according to Robbie Conal.....	59
Punk protest bangs a gong for privilege.....	59
Review: rage against the machine.....	61
MIM on revolutionary language.....	62
Letter: Prisoner supports 'Black'.....	66
Pigs vs. cops language.....	67
Review: Shine has lessons for revolutionaries.....	68
Jiang Qing: Great revolutionary leader.....	70
Ultraleft in the Cultural Revolution.....	75
RAIL nonviolence debate.....	76
RVS brings Maoism to the future.....	77
Poetry from Viet Nam.....	79

MIM's Maoist Movie reviews.....	80
---------------------------------	----

MIM Statements and Resolutions88

On the PCP-generated organisms abroad.....	88
On the May 18, 1997 RCP-USA statement on Peru.....	88
MIM responds to CoRIM.....	90
The cardinals, veteran revisionists, liquidationism, & youth.....	94
MIM in the English speaking countries.....	95
Statement on African Liberation Day.....	96
MIM celebrates NPA anniversary.....	97
On the historical role of g. Zinoviev.....	98

Struggle and Review.....99

Yellow-bellied Avakian reveals his colors again.....	99
Petty-bourgeois internationalism.....	100
Isaiah Berlin: Leading Liberal intellectual of imperialism.....	105
Marilyn French debated.....	109
Bob Black's lonerism misses the Third World.....	116
On the communist movement in the Ex-USSR.....	118
Capitalism in the USSR.....	120
H. W. Edwards: MIM must-read review.....	121
Angela Davis history and theory falls short.....	122
How prison politicizes.....	124
Hitler with an eye on today.....	125
Obituary: Karim Essack.....	129
Obituary: Robert F. Williams.....	131
Putting MIM Theory to work.....	133
Yeni Kadin magazine interviews MIM.....	134

International Communist Movement.....136

On armed struggle, peace negotiations, & the ICM.....	136
On monopoly capitalist 'globalization'.....	139
New edition of Philippine Society and Revolution.....	140
Democratic and socialist revolutions in the colonial and semicolonial countries.....	148
TKP/ML celebrates its 25th anniversary.....	157
International conference on TKP/ML's 25th.....	158
Conference resolution on Turkey and Turkish Kurdistan.....	162
Conference resolution on Albania.....	162
Concluding statement of the conference.....	163
The road of the October Revolution.....	164
Universal lessons of the GPCR.....	176
African and Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought.....	180
The communist movement & the democratic movement in Africa.....	182

WHAT WE WANT, WHAT WE BELIEVE

MAOIST INTERNATIONALIST MOVEMENT PROGRAM, AUGUST 1996

1. WE WANT COMMUNISM.

We believe that communism is the elimination of all oppression—the power of groups over other groups. This includes national oppression, class oppression, and gender oppression.

2. WE WANT SOCIALISM.

We believe that socialism is the path to communism. We believe that the current dictatorship of the bourgeoisie oppresses the world's majority. We believe that socialism—the dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry—is a necessary step towards a world without inequality or dictatorship—a communist world. We uphold the USSR under Lenin and Stalin (1917-1953) and China under Mao (1949-1976) as models in this regard.

3. WE WANT REVOLUTIONARY ARMED STRUGGLE.

We believe that the oppressors will not give up their power without a fight. Ending oppression is only possible by building public opinion to seize power through armed struggle. We believe, however, that armed struggle in the imperialist countries is a serious strategic mistake until the bourgeoisie becomes really helpless. Revolution will become a reality for North America as the U.S. military becomes over-extended in the government's attempts to maintain world hegemony.

"We are advocates of the abolition of war, we do not want war; but war can only be abolished through war, and in order to get rid of the gun it is necessary to take up the gun."—Mao Zedong

4. WE WANT ORGANIZATION.

We believe that democratic-centralism, the system of unified application of majority decisions, is necessary to defeat the oppressors. This system includes organization, leadership, discipline and hierarchy. The oppressors use these weapons, and we should, too. By building a disciplined revolutionary communist vanguard party, we follow in the tradition of comrades Lenin, Mao and Huey Newton.

5. WE WANT INDEPENDENT INSTITUTIONS OF AND FOR THE OPPRESSED.

We believe that the oppressed need independent media to build public opinion for socialist revolution. We believe that the oppressed need independent institutions to provide land, bread, housing, education, medical care, clothing, justice and peace. We believe that the best independent institution of all is a self-reliant socialist government.

6. WE WANT CONTINUOUS REVOLUTION.

We believe that class struggle continues under socialism. We believe that under socialism, the danger exists for a new bourgeoisie to arise within the communist party itself. We believe that these new oppressors will restore capitalism unless they are stopped. We believe that the bourgeoisie seized power in the USSR after the death of Stalin in 1953; in China it was after Mao's death and the overthrow of the "Gang of Four" in 1976. We believe that China's Great Proletarian Cultural

Revolution (1966-1976) is the farthest advance towards communism in human history, because it mobilized millions of people against the restoration of capitalism.

7. WE WANT A UNITED FRONT AGAINST IMPERIALISM.

We believe that the imperialists are currently waging a hot war—a World War III—against the world's oppressed nations, including the U.S. empire's internal colonies. We seek to unite all who can be united under proletarian and feminist leadership against imperialism, capitalism and patriarchy.

We believe that the imperialist-country working classes are primarily a pro-imperialist labor aristocracy at this time. Likewise, we believe that the biological-wimmin of the imperialist countries are primarily a gender aristocracy. Thus, while we recruit individuals from these and other reactionary groups to work against their class, national and gender interests, we do not seek strategic unity with them. In fact, we believe that the imperialist-country working-classes and imperialist-country biological-wimmin, like the bourgeoisies and petit-bourgeoisies, owe reparations to the international proletariat and peasantry. As such, one of the first strategic steps MIM will take upon winning state power will be to open the borders.

We believe that socialism in the imperialist countries will require the dictatorship of the international proletariat and that the imperialist-country working-classes will need to be on the receiving end of this dictatorship.

8. WE WANT NEW DEMOCRACY FOR THE OPPRESSED NATIONS. WE WANT POWER FOR THE OPPRESSED NATIONS TO DETERMINE THEIR DESTINIES.

We believe that oppressed people will not be free until they are able to determine their destinies. We look forward to the day when oppressed people will live without imperialist police terror and will learn to speak their mind without fear of the consequences from the oppressor. When this day comes, meaningful plebiscites can be held in which the peoples will decide for themselves if they want their own separate nation-states or some other arrangement.

9. WE WANT WORLD REVOLUTION.

We believe it is our duty to support Marxism-Leninism-Maoism everywhere, though our principal task is to build public opinion and independent institutions in preparation for Maoist revolution in North America. The imperialists think and act globally—we must do the same.

10. WE WANT POLITICS IN COMMAND.

We believe that correct tactics flow from correct strategies, which flow from a correct ideological and political line. We believe that the fight against imperialism, capitalism and patriarchy goes hand-in-hand with the fight against revisionism, chauvinism, and opportunism.

"The correctness or otherwise of the ideological and political line decides everything. When the Party's line is correct, then everything will come its way. If it has no followers, then it can have followers; if it has no guns, then it can have guns; if it has no political power, then it can have political power."—Mao Zedong

copy and distribute • copy and distribute • copy and distribute • copy and distribute • copy and distribute • copy and distribute

Letters to MIM Theory

Race is power struggle

Dear MIM,

In regards to race: right now in American society, "race" is based on certain factors, and boils down to power struggles amongst humans. Yet not all aspects of an individual's character determine or affect their racial categorization. For instance, like or non-like of swimming or playing pool is not considered relevant to racial identification. In other words, that aspect of a person is considered irrelevant to their "race." However, hair color/form, skin tone, facial features, etc., are considered very important factors determining someone's race, as is language, mannerisms, accent, etc.

If/when Communism is ever achieved, the power struggles that give rise to "racial" groups will disappear, and the concept of "race" must disappear along with them. Physical features and old ethnic origins will no longer be relevant to human society. At that time, racists (i.e., those who consider the concept of "race" to be legitimate) must be considered counterrevolutionaries and dealt with, for they would be backwards-looking classists. However, even under Communism, power struggles will still exist, for a time at least: the struggles between Communists and Classists. This conflict will become very apparent, and must be won by Communists in order to make a Communist society (this battle so far has been lost, both in China and the x-USSR). Because of this conflict, a new sort of factionalisation must be real-

ized, and a new "ethnic" must be clearly recognized: Homo Sovieticus. This "type" will be (must be) defined according to a person's nature/character. Just as pool-liking or -nonliking is irrelevant to modern conceptions of "race," physical appearance will be irrelevant to Communist conceptions of "race." The factors contributing to these new "races" must also be recognized, whether they be genetic, cultural, climatic, etc. In the revolutionary stages of Communism, there will be a real "race" war, and Communism cannot be achieved until this very real war is won by Homo Sovieticus. The type of man that is innately fascistic and classist (be they master or slave) must be eliminated, wiped off the face of the earth, before Communism can be achieved and humanity move on.

I would appreciate comments and criticism on these opinions. Thank you!

-An East Coast student

MIM replies: We agree with your long-run goal that race must be abolished and made unthinkable. The question is what will be necessary in the next stage of struggle called socialism, not the more advanced stages of communism.

At this time, the oppressor nation has an interest in asking for peace, because as Muhammad Ali correctly told Mike Douglas in 1974, the whites are for peace now on race/national grounds because they have everything! Steal the land from the First Nations and build wealth with 400 years of slavery and all of a sudden they are for opposing race and national struggle or conflicts?!

The question is: are the oppressor nation people ready for real integration yet? The juries of Simi Valley (Rodney King) and Cincinnati (Vincent Chin) say No.

There will be a stage when the way certain class questions will manifest themselves is through national struggle.

With regard to communism, however, MIM disagrees that the differences between communists and the opponents of communism should be considered racial or need necessarily to be racialized in the way that you suggest. Yes, there will be conflict for a very long time, but not all conflict needs to have a racial definition. We also assume that your term "Homo Sovieticus" is used tongue-in-cheek - or else we would have to disagree with the biological implications of this political-line difference.

MIM is pathetic

Greetings from the frosty city of Boston,

Recently I found myself reading MIM Theory (out of complete boredom of

course, normally I never touch such rubbish!) and was quite disturbed by all the anarchist

bashing within its pages. I'm not sure how "revolutionary" MIM/RAIL is in Ann Arbor, but here in Boston it's a pathetic lecture sponsoring group that is run by shitty rich MIT students (who also make sure there are stacks of MIM Notes unread in every trendy coffee house in town). Granted some lectures are quite good, but hardly "revolutionary." Quite honestly, anything that remotely challenges "the system" with any sort of opposition (aside from the three RCP members and one Refuse and Resist member) comes from an anarchist or anti-authoritarian direction, at least here in Boston anyways. Food Not Bombs, Homes Not Jails, Industrial Workers of the World, Anti-Racist Action, Earth First!, Animal Liberation Front, Lucy Parsons Center, etc. etc. Are all based on anti-authoritarian principles. I guess it's clear why MIM/RAILs find the need to bash anarchists - to try

**Are the
oppressor
nation people
ready for real
integration yet?
No.**

and bait the only "revolutionary" elements (outside of rich sociology students idealizing third world countries and "proletarian" dictators) within the cities into joining its little college social club. (Sorry I'm too poor to pay the tuition to be a proper Maoist.) Before you condemn others you should consider leaving your "theory" in the lecture halls and join the rest of us in the streets! (We might take you a wee bit more serious).

P.S. Anarcho-trots?? If confronted by a trot, any self respecting anarchist should wave a fist in the air with shouts of "remember Kronstadt!"

—Boston reader
1997

MIM responds: We wonder what this anarchist thinks constitutes revolutionary work. Clearly distributing literature that exposes the evils of imperialism and the work we are doing to fight it is not valuable work to this person. We are glad to hear this person has found MIM Notes in many places around town, and we can assure him/her that the papers are being read as we frequently replenish the stacks. If this person ever traveled to the poorer parts of Boston s/he would find MIM literature available there as well as we distribute MIM Notes everywhere that we can find a place to leave them that people will pick them up. We do, in fact, target students and oppressed nations because we recognize the importance of understanding who has a poten-

tial interest in supporting revolutionary work, but that would probably be too much theory for this person.

MIM takes very seriously the need to understand our place in history – to have a correct analysis of class, gender, and nation in the political economy, and to develop our practice around that history and analysis. This is the materialist method, which this writer has little patience for. This is a difficult job – in addition to the daily agitation in the form of MIM Notes, demonstrations, events, and the like that we need to advance. We welcome criticism, but it means a lot more from people who are also helping out.


It is likely that this person has never read MIM Notes or Mass RAIL, which details the rallies, petitioning work, and other actions we have combined with our educational work, particularly focusing on prisons over the past year. While our comrades are standing on the streets, sometimes in blizzard conditions, protesting prison conditions, gathering petition signatures, handling out literature, and talking to people about what's going on and what we can do to combat the injustice system, we wonder where this person has been. Or while we are holding events that educate people about the system and organize them into work fighting imperialism.

Perhaps fighting imperialism in the way that has been proven most effective

through history is not something this anarchist would consider "revolutionary." After all, the anarchists have never ended starvation in a country, overthrown imperialism, or built a society based on the principles of equality, collective work, and social justice. Communists are the real anarchists because only the Communists have a proven line capable of dismantling class society and the power of groups of people over other groups of people. People who want anarchism should work with communists to overthrow imperialism and build a society in which groups of people are equal.

Jews are not a nation; Israel is

On page 14 of MIM Theory 12, MCS writes in response to the anti-Semitic "Western reader":



"As for Judaism as religion or people, Stalin and

Molotov disagreed. Jews are now a nation. Should they occupy Palestine is a different question. We disagree with that, but since Stalin after the war, Jews have been a nation from our perspective.

Subscribe to

MIM Notes

Monthly Newspaper of Maoist News and Analysis

MIM Theory comes out four times a year. MIM Notes comes out 24 times a year. So why wait for your revolutionary tool to arrive? Get MIM Notes and stay current.

Individual

- () 1 year, domestic, \$20
- () 2 years, domestic, \$40
- () 1 year, overseas, \$50

Institution

- () 1 year, domestic, \$80
- () 2 years, domestic, \$160
- () 1 year, overseas, \$100

MIM Notes, PO Box 3576, Ann Arbor, MI 48106. Cash, check or money order payable to "MIM Distributors."

Name: _____
Address: _____
City, State, Zip: _____

That's not a major point and in many cases it will be appropriate to point out that Judaism is a religion not a race."

The overall thrust of the long response from MCS is correct, but it is incorrect to say that Jews are now a nation. Israel may be a nation, but Jews as a group are not.

In 1913, writing for the Party in "Marxism and the National Question" Stalin wrote that "a nation is a historically constituted, stable community of people, formed on the basis of a common language, territory, economic life, and psychological make-up manifested in a common culture."

Much of this document from Stalin is a polemic with Austrian Social-Democrat O. Bauer who argued that Jews around the world were one united nation.

Stalin responded:

"Bauer speaks of the Jews as a nation, although they 'have no common language'; but what 'common destiny' and national cohesion is there, for instance, between the Georgian,

Daghestanian, Russian and American Jews, who are completely separated from one another, inhabit different territories and speak different languages?

"The above mentioned Jews undoubtedly lead their economic and political life in common with the Georgians, Daghestanians, Russians and Americans respectively, and they live in the same cultural atmosphere as these; this is bound to leave a definite impress on their national character; if there is anything common to them left, it is their religion, their common origin and certain relics of the national character. All this is beyond question. But how can it be seriously maintained that petrified religious rites and fading psychological relics affect the 'destiny' of these Jews more powerfully than the living social, economic and cultural environment that surrounds them? And it is only on this assumption that it is possible to speak of Jews as a single nation at all."

And:

"For, I repeat, what sort of nation, for instance is a Jewish nation which consists of Georgian, Daghestanian, Russian, American and other Jews, the members of which do not understand each other (since they speak different languages), inhabit different parts of the globe, will never see each other, and will never act together, whether in time of peace or in war?"

This was a true analysis in 1913. However, after World War II, British imperialism took the land base of the colonized Palestinian people and used it to forge a nation of Jews: Israel. Jews fleeing the formerly Nazi occupied territories emigrated to Israel. As Stalin and Lenin taught, capitalism is the great creator and destroyer of nations. In this case, imperialism created a new Israeli nation with all of the requirements set down by Stalin.

Today, Israel claims that all Jews around the world are Israeli citizens. However, the Israeli practice of denying citizenship to some converts to Judaism, and the second-class way it treats Ethiopian Jews exposes this Israeli policy as just foreign policy. Even that, however, is diversionary because the political purposes that Israeli advances with its definition of nationhood are not consistent with the scientific Marxist definition of nationhood.

The key question here is whether people of the Jewish faith scattered around the world are part of the same political, economic, and cultural unit as Israel. The answer is no, for the same reasons that scattered Jews were not a nation prior to the formation of Israel.

So it's simply incorrect to use the terms "Jews" and "Israel" interchangeably. The anti-Semitic critic is correct that "Judaism is a religion, not a race, ethnic group, or nationality." MIM should have added the analysis I put forth that Israel, however, is a newly formed nation.

-In unity and struggle,
A comrade in the East
March 1997

What is MIM?

What Is MIM? documents MIM's history and origins, including the Main Principles, Program, Constitution and a collection of defining essays. This is 24 packed pages you need to understand MIM.

Send \$2
cash, check

or money order to:

MIM Distributors

PO Box 3576

Ann Arbor, MI 48106-3576.



MIM responds: There is a Jewish nation. That was Stalin's line formed after he wrote the classic theory article on nation to which the writer refers, and is in fact a profound application of his own theory contribution on nations.

If the writer wishes to contradict Stalin, s/he should write a detailed piece explaining why Stalin's recognition of Israel was wrong and submit it to scrutiny.

We condemn as wishful thinking the quoting of articles that opposed the formation of an Israeli state written by Stalin, because those articles were written approximately 30 years earlier than Stalin's concrete decisions on Israel after World War II.

It is metaphysics and empiricism to say that Stalin could only use the word "Jews" to mean only one thing, religion or nation. There are generalizations to make about religion and generalizations to make about nationhood. They may contradict at times, but that is no reason to throw them out unless they are more false than true and that is proved by detailed and researched articles, not by nit-picking.

Likewise, when discussing the national question, we have no reason to start with the false premise that we are obliged to call self-identified Jews in the U.S. a nation if we say Jews are a nation. We can instead decide that such self-identified Jews are not even Jews, and in fact are Americans, just as we handle the Greeks, Italians and Irish already, some of whom may make speak up for their ethnicity from time to time.


We have no obligation to respect the self-identity of oppressor nations. Indeed, we may scientifically decide that the national identity of an oppressed nation is incorrect. An example would be Eritreans in Ethiopia who consider themselves Ethiopian. Though both Ethiopia and Eritrea are oppressed nations, we have an opinion on that question and we do not necessarily respect the self-identity of people even in the oppressed nations, though we are friendly to the oppressed nations peoples of whatever foggy thoughts.

Finally, acknowledging the Jewish Israeli nation does not mean MIM supports its self-determination. The Jewish Israeli nation, like the white Amerikan nation, should be put in receivership by the nations it oppresses as part of the process of national liberation, as we describe in MIM Theory 7 for the white nation in North America.

Unity & Struggle Responds

Dear MIM,

Thank you for your communication of October 6. I am sorry this reply took so long.



We are glad to see that you uphold a correct and revolutionary view on the question of

Comrade Stalin. There is no proletarian revolutionary thought without a revolutionary attitude toward Stalin. Independent thought on this question is all too rare at present. It gives your approach to the subject in your publication a genuinely scholarly quality. This is refreshing, given the foul atmosphere of cant and lies generated by the bourgeois "respectables" like Prof Robert Tucker, Nikita Khrushchev, the *New York Times*, the *New York Review of Books*, Prof. Stephen Cohen, any number of snot-nose petty bourgeois scribblers, and the ilk. We are happy to send you our pamphlet, *Communists Defend Stalin*.

Your statement that you only uphold Stalin 70% of the time is vague, however. Mao said something of the sort. Surely the comrade meant the expression as no more than metaphor and placed it in context. His main criticisms of Stalin went to the treatment of dialectics, the most important single point being Stalin's failure to discern the emergence of a new bourgeoisie within

the Communist Party itself. Mao criticized this as a failure to observe the law of the unity of opposites, a failure to see how a Communist Party could turn into its opposite, a bourgeois party. But then, even Mao was surprised by Khrushchev's self-unmasking, and he had the benefit of observation of the phenomenon of bourgeois emergence within his own Party. If we know something today that Stalin did not know, it doesn't place us above him.

Since the publication of your pamphlet a number of excellent books on Stalin have appeared. There is Ludo Martens' book, *Another View of Stalin*, which is excerpted in the U&S pamphlet, and two books by Harpal Brar, *The Complete Collapse of Revisionism*, and *Trotskyism or Leninism?* Ludo Martens is, as you probably know, the Chairman of the Workers' Party of Belgium (PTB, in its French initials). His book has been out in Dutch and French for a few years and has just appeared in English. You can also download a postscript file in English from the Internet. Look up the author's name on one of the search engines and you will find it. Brar is an Indian Communist resident in Britain. You can get his books through the PTB.

Let me tell you a little about U&S. The original newspaper of that name was published in the 1970s by the Revolutionary Communist League (MLM), a Communist organization led by Amiri Baraka that had developed within the Black Liberation Movement. RCL merged in the late 1970s with a number of other organizations to form the League of Revolutionary Struggle, which published *Unity* newspaper. Some comrades proposed that the LRS newspaper be called *Unity & Struggle*, a dialectical and more correct name. The more metaphysical name was retained, however, and proved to be significant of a tendency toward ideological neglect.

The organization engaged in a great deal of struggle on the side of the masses during the 1980s, a defensive period for proletarian revolutionaries. Defensive adjustments were necessary but were

taken too far. The one-sidedness of the defensive adjustments led to ideological neglect. This in turn led to a social-democratic practice that became fully consolidated in the course of the 1988

Jesse Jackson presidential campaign. After that the dominant leadership faction hid its views during collapse of the revisionist parties of the Soviet Union and eastern Europe. Under the circumstances the current of ideological decay within LRS became a torrent and the organization was liquidated in 1990. The leadership faction responsible for this accomplishment has been well rewarded by the bourgeoisie. Today they are as corrupt and dangerous a collection of renegades as you would ever wish to see: political appointees, corporate types, elected officials, bourgeois academics, and so forth, "successful" to the ruling class and traitorous to the people. Yet, they once were Communists. Some of them were pretty good for a while.

Some of us did not agree with the traitors, however, and resumed publication of *U&S* in late 1990. In 1993 we published a fundamental document, "Revolutionaries Unite!" on the proposal of Amiri Baraka. This document is based on his understanding of the way that the Bolshevik Party was formed by Lenin early in this century within the hodgepodge of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party. The other two members of the original *U&S* editorial board united with this strategy. Two organizations of younger revolutionaries, Black Nia Force and Communist Union, subsequently joined the editorial board on the basis of "Revolutionaries Unite!"

What we have at present, then, is an editorial board comprised of three different groups with different histories and types of development. Since the joint

effort is called *Unity & Struggle*, the original edit board has taken the name *U&S* Publications in order to observe organizational parity.

"Revolutionaries Unite!" is therefore included in this packet. See also Amiri Baraka's "Letter to Organizations," based on "Revolutionaries Unite!" on page 23 of the current *U&S*. I also include a polemic against the man you call "Agent Quispe" and his organization, because it bears on "Revolutionaries Unite!" We found Quispe in practice to be sectarian and devious. After our last polemic Quispe told a CU comrade that his organization would not

reply or further deal with *U&S* Publications because the two are "like oil and water." He still seeks contact with CU, however, in Trot-like contempt of our process of principled unity!

Given the varied origins of the groups on our edit board and our continuing

process of development, I will reply to your three principles in the first person.

As to your three general principles: I agree with you that "after the proletariat seizes power in socialist revolution, the potential exists for capitalist restoration under the leadership of a new bourgeoisie within the Communist Party itself." I doubt that there is serious disagreement on this point anywhere within *U&S*. I think that the question of the continuation of the class struggle under the dictatorship of the proletariat is one to which Mao Zedong contributed fundamental scientific discoveries, comparable in significance to those of Marx and Lenin.

Your second point is really subordinate to the first, however: "MIM upholds the Chinese Cultural Revolution as the farthest advance of communism in world history." It certainly was the most advanced struggle against revisionism under the conditions of the people's democratic dictatorship. Perhaps it is too soon to consider the book closed on the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. There is every reason to believe that vast numbers of people in China remember the experience and its lessons very well,

**'If we know
something
today that
Stalin did
not know,
it doesn't
place us
above him.'**



Maoist Sojourner

A monthly publication by and for Third World Maoist exiles, led by MIM. The goal of *Maoist Sojourner* is to disseminate news and analysis from Maoists in the Third World, in their own words whenever possible. Also includes MIM's analysis of international news. Individual subscriptions are \$12 for 12 monthly issues, domestic. Overseas as \$36. Bundles of 250 are \$20 domestic. Send cash or check:

MIM Distributors
PO Box 3576
Ann Arbor MI 48106-3576

or

MIM Distributors
PO Box 29670
Los Angeles CA 90029-0670

and to hope that this will yet enable the masses to put the new bourgeoisie back where they belong – under the people's dictatorship.

Your third point, that "the North American white-working-class is primarily a nonrevolutionary worker-elite at this time," I hold to be fundamentally, disastrously, hopelessly, wrong. I am sometimes amazed at the number of errors that can be expressed in just a few words. This one is a beaut.

Marx claimed only to have made two basic scientific discoveries: he showed that the forms of the class struggle depend upon the mode of production and must terminate in the dictatorship of the proletariat; also, he elucidated the mechanism of surplus value, that is to say, capitalist exploitation. You throw the latter discovery out, declaring that the bulk of the white workers are bought off by the superprofits of imperialism. Hence, in your view, imperialism has superseded the mechanism of capitalist exploitation as Marx understood it.

Your view is wrong.

You attempt to buttress your view by citing Lenin on the labor aristocracy, which is bribed with a portion of the superprofits of imperialism. Lenin is right about the labor aristocracy of trade union bureaucrats, but you have gotten him all wrong on the main points, the scope of his observation and the practical application of his ideas.

To begin, on form: the political impact of imperialist superprofits on the working class comes from without, from the bourgeoisie. This impact therefore plays some part in determining the conditions, that is, the external contradictions, under which the class struggle goes on. It has nothing to do with the basis of existence of the working class, however, or the internal contradictions of the working class. Hence the existence of superprofits has no bearing on the antagonism of the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, no bearing on the need of the proletariat to overthrow the bourgeoisie in order to abolish all of the contradictions that arise from that antagonism. This confusion of dialectics on

your part leads to many errors in your analysis of the real content of the class struggle in the United States today.

Let us take up your reference to the existence of a supposed worker elite that you call the "North American white-working-class." It is difficult to see what conditions justify you to stick those three words together with hyphens to the

**MIM's 'notion
of the "white-
working-class"
worker-elite
is ... a
venture
into petty-
bourgeois
nationalism.'**

exclusion of other nationalities. Study any large industrial plant in the country, for instance, and you will find a number of things. You will find national oppression: smaller numbers of oppressed nationality workers than their proportion of the general population would represent, discrimination in promotion, etc. Note that it is the bourgeoisie, not the proletariat, that is responsible. Despite this you will also find some number of oppressed nationality workers at all grades and types of employment, enough to disqualify any singling-out of white workers as a "worker-elite." Hence, neither can you characterize your "worker-elite" as "white." (Whatever that is; never can quite pin it down, myself.) In sum, your notion of the "white-working-class" worker-elite is an impermissible "left"-erroneous venture into petty-bourgeois nationalism.

Far more serious is your imagined notion that imperialism can dispense with the exploitation of a significant pro-

portion of the working class by use of the superprofits from plunder abroad. There is no reason to think that the imperialists would use their loot for that purpose even if they could. Imperialism sends capital abroad for lack of profit opportunities at home. Superprofits show up in the bottom lines of corporations. There is no evidence that they show up in wage schedules.

Outside of management ranks, nobody gets hired unless their labor power creates more value than it costs. The capitalists' own studies show that an industrial worker whose wage package works out to twenty dollars an hour adds value at a rate in excess of one hundred dollars an hour. Of course this is better than the deal a worker in Mexico or Brazil gets for the same job – four or five dollars an hour or even less for the same value added. It is still exploitation for the U.S. worker, however. If the rate of exploitation drops much below this level then he or she is laid off.

Further, the U.S. working class, although better off than in most countries, still possesses no significant capital. The sale of labor power is an equal exchange of commodities: it pays for the costs of the worker's subsistence and reproduction. Working people live on what they earn and there is no surplus left over to turn into capital. Even the "labor" banks of the 1920s were really the property of the bureaucrats, not the workers. Nor does the working class possess any measure of political power anywhere under imperialism. Surely it would if the magnanimous capitalists shared out the superprofits to the extent that you think they do.

Your error of falling into petty-bourgeois nationalism follows naturally from this dismissal of the leading role of the working class because there is nowhere else to go except to bourgeois and petty bourgeois ideology. Likewise when you take up the woman question you tend to fall into petty bourgeois feminist patterns: spellings like "womyn," "wimmin," and so forth. This is something quite alien to the masses of the working class and only isolates you from their

struggle for the complete social equality of women and men.

Marx understood all of this a century and a half ago. You are right to study Marx and Lenin, but you are wrong to make such a botch of their ideas. I have to say that your notion of a non-revolutionary "worker-elite" is exactly what Lenin meant by infantile "leftism." I have only dealt with a few of the things that you have said, but the "left" error shows up time and time again throughout your political line.

Excuse me if I drift into old-fogey mode, but I have seen too many people, usually young, become enchanted with the style of "leftism," strike fashionable poses for a while, get bored, and disappear. This is really only a petty-bourgeois cover for disdain toward the working class and an unwillingness to involve oneself in the long, hard, sometimes dangerous, tasks of the day-to-day struggles of the working class. You will never accomplish anything worthwhile like that. Try to do better. Eliminate this fundamental error. The oppressed people of the world need you to do it.

Sincerely,

—U&S critic of MIM

December 30, 1996

Unity & Struggle Publications

Box 1313

Newark, NJ 07101

MIM RESPONDS:

Here we will comment briefly on the content of this letter, and then offer comments on some of the previous publications that we received, and that were not discussed in our review of U&S in MIM Theory 12.

We will not offer a lengthy rebuttal on the critic's faulty political economy here. His comments do not cover our publications MIM Theory 1 and MIM Theory 10, our most in-depth treatments of the labor aristocracy issue. Nor do they address J. Sakai's fundamental work *Settlers: The Mythology of the White Proletariat*, which is where MIM got its start in this thinking. So this letter is apparently criticizing based on a little reading and a lot of what the critic

admits is fogeyism, and what we would call dogmatism on the labor aristocracy.

First, as we often repeat, Lenin himself made it explicitly clear that he was not just talking about trade union leaders when he referred to the labor aristocracy — that's why he specifically said they would "in no small numbers, take the side of the bourgeoisie" in his 1920 preface to *Imperialism*. Further, as we again

The realization of a whole class of labor aristocrats goes back at least to Engels.

often repeat, the realization of a whole class of labor aristocrats goes back at least to Engels, who gave us the idea of "a bourgeois proletariat alongside the bourgeoisie" in England, adding, "For a nation which exploits the whole world this is of course to a certain extent justifiable." That's Lenin quoting Engels in *Imperialism*, and it goes back to 1858. Well, maybe Engels and Lenin were also impatient youths too antsy to do the "long, hard, sometimes dangerous, tasks of the day-to-day struggles of the working class."

Second, for all of the critic's pro-Stalin posturing, U&S should read what Lenin and Stalin's Comintern had to say about the labor aristocracy, as MIM reviewed comprehensively in MIM Theory 10, "Coming to Grips with the Labor Aristocracy." On the cover of that issue there is a Comintern statement from 1919: "At the expense of the plundered colonial peoples capital corrupted its wage slaves, created a community of interest between the exploited and the

exploiters as against the oppressed colonies — the yellow, black, and red colonial peoples — and chained the European and American working class to the imperialist 'fatherland.'" Is that just about a few labor leaders, too?

A lot has happened since 1858 and 1919, and not much of it suggests that the labor aristocracy is *worse off or smaller* than it was then! It is only the blind dogmatism of these head-in-the-sanders that can ignore the hardcore facts of labor aristocracy parasitism and continue to stick up for them while they actively contribute to the pillaging of the rest of the world.

We await U&S's specific comments on our economic analysis from previous issues of MIM Theory, which we will not repeat here.

U&S PUBLICATIONS

MIM received what was then the most recent issue of *Unity and Struggle*, the August/September issue. This issue contains some polemics with the police agents MPP-USA. While the MPP are not a legitimate formation with which to struggle over the fundamentals of Marxism, the statements in response to the MPP by U&S is the best that MIM can find to engage on the issue.

Again in this August/September issue we see the U&S Principles of Unity that don't mention Marx at all, although we do see a pledge to "Win the Advanced to Communism." The 1973 Amiri Baraka document "The Black Nation," which was written by the Revolutionary Communist League (MLM) is more explicit about its ideology. It claims to uphold Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought (p. 53) but nowhere do we see a clear defense of the Cultural Revolution, which is the fundamental difference between Maoism (or Mao Zedong Thought) and Deng's capitalism.

Reading this second issue of the paper gives MIM the feeling that we are giving U&S too much of a benefit of the doubt by not labeling U&S a revisionist organization for falsely upholding Marx. When something quacks like a duck, and walks like a duck, it's probably a duck.

In this case, although for some strange reason they never say it clearly, U&S certainly do appear to uphold Marx and should be labeled revisionist.

In this issue of the paper we see more references to Mao, pictures of Mao and quotations, but absolutely zero discussion of what makes Mao one of the "5 giants of communism" (with Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin), or how Mao's theory and practice is or is not universal-ly applicable.

In a letter to police agents MPP, the U&S. write on page 21:

"Comrade Gonzalo and the PCP have raised the question of Maoism as a new stage of Marxism in scientific and revolutionary fashion. For many years, right up to the present, opportunist phrasemongers of the left and right have thrown the word around like the demagogues that they are. The question of Maoism must be sorted out systematically, in a thoroughgoing way. Adherence without understanding and acceptance is meaningless."

MIM has absolute agreement with the first and last sentence of the quotation, and divorced from the opportunist context, MIM would agree with the statement that the question of Maoism must be sorted out systematically.

MIM views correct stands on the "cardinal questions" of what socialism is and how to get there as absolutely essential to successful revolution. In the fall of 1983, MIM (then under the name Revolutionary Internationalist Movement, before that name was taken by another organization) had its founding congress, and issued three documents. One document, published in MIM's *What is MIM?* pamphlet, "Manifesto on the international situation and revolution," which clearly stated MIM to be a "revolutionary communist pre-party ... struggling to find the line that must lead revolution." Seeing no way around Lenin's contributions regarding a vanguard party (see *What is to be Done?*) the documents state MIM "will either join or form a party with the

necessary political and ideological line to lead revolution." The document states MIM's strategic principles, and also makes clear its defense of Lenin and Stalin and criticizes Trotsky.

Going further, this very early document credits Mao and the "Gang of Four" with leading the Great Proletariat Cultural Revolution against capitalism restoration. The document explains how economism, experts-in-command, and the theory of productive forces lead to capitalism; and the necessity of class struggle against party members taking the capitalist road. Specifically, the document names Liu Shao'chi and Deng Xiaoping as capitalist roaders.

There is no such clarity regarding the Cultural Revolution or Maoism in general in any U&S document that MIM has yet seen. Thirteen years after MIM was formed, and 20 years after the Cultural Revolution ended, Unity and Struggle is continuing to stall on these fundamental questions. Later we see the reason for this 20-year delay: U&S admit they are stupid and get confused because different people with different overall lines say different things about the GPCR:


"The R-r-r-revolutionary Communist Party claims utmost loyalty to Mao and says that it supports the People's War in Peru. The Maoist International [sic] Movement (MIM) says that it is Maoist and that the U.S. working class should be placed under a dictatorship - as if that were not already the case. (What does MIM want - in on the deal?) The Soviet revisionists, back in the days when they were revisionists and not an openly admitted bourgeoisie, used to say that Maoism was a leftist, opportunist, adventurist, this-ist, that-ist and the-other-thing-ist deviation from Marxism-Leninism. Do President Gonzalo's ideas have to be distinguished from this mess or not? If people need only lift their hands, swear to Maoism, and get to work, it is hard to see the difference between one version and another."

Blind swearing to the word "Maoism" wouldn't make U&S's practice any better, just as their blind swearing to Marxism-Leninism doesn't make their theory or practice Marxist-Leninist. Issues of their distortion of MIM's position on the national question aside (See MIM Theory 7 for the most complete discussion of this), the key question for any materialist is to separate truth from fiction and to pick the most correct idea possible. To pick the Soviet revisionist position on Maoism - a case where the quoted criticism is clear and the U&S analysis of the source correct - a materialist would recognize the Soviet criticism as the slander of the enemy and discount its analysis. Somehow U&S manages to get past the bourgeois criticism of Stalin as mass murderer or Marxism as anti-progress, but when it comes to another question key to separating the proletariat's leaders from its enemies, U&S can only play stupid. Just as Deng was put in a difficult spot trying to uphold Mao while dismantling all that Mao stood for, Baraka and U&S are struggling to defend an indefensible position: defending blatant capitalism while calling it socialist.

English 'rade wants info on N. Am. left

Dear Comrades,

I have seen quite a bit of your material and have been very interested and impressed.



I would like to subscribe to MIM Notes and MIM Theory. I would also like

to order the following:

MIM Theory Nos. 1-8 and any numbers after 10. J. Sakai's *Settlers: The Mythology of the White Proletariat*.

I would also be interested in seeing any coverage you have on the death of Robert F. Williams and to know any-

thing from you of the "Provisional Communist Party/National Labour Federation" in New York, which recently received publicity in the press.

I am also very interested in the history of Maoist, would-be Maoist and revolutionary nationalist forces in the United States. I have read a fair bit from you on the Panthers and the RCP-USA as well as a few things on PL and the Young Lords. I would be interested in anything else you have published (or your views) on PL and the Young Lords, as well as other organisations, such as the CP-ML (The Call); The Guardian; the LRS and its antecedents, particularly the organisations that were led by Amiri Baraka, such as the RCL (MLM) and the CAP; the Communist Workers' Party (Workers' Viewpoint) and its antecedents; the CPUSA (ML) (formerly MLOC, published Unite!); the CLPUS-NA; the Weather Underground and such offshoots/related groups as the Prairie Fire Organising Committee; the Ad Hoc Committee for a Marxist-Leninist Party-USA; the APSP/NPDUM; League of Revolutionary Black Workers; Red Guard Party; December 12 Movement; and so on.

Have you published any material summing up why so many apparently (to me and from this distance) promising organisations degenerated and/or disappeared? I know, of course, of the military and COINTELPRO onslaught against the Panthers and have read some of your material (for example in MIM Theory 10) explaining how some of the Panthers' methods of work could have contributed to their vulnerability as well as on how MIM is attempting to learn the appropriate lessons. No doubt, much the same might apply to the Young Lords and the AIM (and maybe Greensboro had a devastating effect on the CWP); but what about all the others? After all, the United States was one of the imperialist countries where Maoism seemed relatively strong in the 60s, 70s and 80s—certainly compared to Britain.

Have you ever published anything on the life of Harry Haywood, or reviews of Black Bolshevik or his reprinted works

from the 20s and 30s?

I would like to see anything you have published on the recent situation in and around Zaire. A number of reports refer to the rebel leader Laurent Kabila as having a Maoist background. The same is also sometimes said about Paul Kagame of Rwanda and Yoweri Museveni of Uganda.

Please work out a list of literature to supply me with on the basis of the questions raised and let me know the cost and your preferred method of payment. (I could, for example, exchange sterling for dollars and send you the cash.) I will send you payment as soon as I know how much you want and how you want it.

I read a 4-page MIM Notes supplement on south Korea. If you do not already see it, can I draw your attention to the People's Korea. It is an 8-page weekly English-language newspaper published from Tokyo by the General Association of Korean Residents in Japan (Chongryon) and is good for news about both north and south Korea as well as overseas Koreans in Japan and elsewhere. I think you would find their line on the national question to be of interest and am sure that they would be interested to exchange publications with you. Their details are as follows:

Editorial Department
The People's Korea
2-4 Tsukudo-Hachiman-cho
Shinjuku-ku
Tokyo 162
JAPAN

I look forward to hearing from you.

Keep up the good work. MIM's stuff is unique!

With comradely greetings,
—A comrade in England
December 13, 1996

MIM responds: Thanks for writing and for your kind words of support. ...

MIM Theory 11 contains a review of PL and its differences with MIM. MIM Theory 7 has an article on the Young Lords/Puerto Rican Revolutionary Workers Organization. We haven't written extensively on the former CP-ML. It was one of the groups that emerged out

of the Revolutionary Youth Movement II (RYM II), which we consider to be the best of the three main factions which emerged from Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), the other two being RYM I (mainly Weather Underground Organization) and PL. MIM Theory 4 has a review of the Guardian and its death. We will be publishing a review of Amiri Baraka's latest group, Unity and Struggle, in the near future [see MT12 and this issue -ed.]. Otherwise, we have not written about the LRS or its antecedents for quite a while. Our bound volume of our earliest publications contains some reviews. Basically, the LRS stuck with the social-fascist Deng Xiaoping regime of China. MIM Theory 5 deals with the incorrect armed-struggle-now line of the Weather Underground. The Weather Underground had a basically correct understanding of the political economy of the imperialist countries, but its political-military line was inconsistent with its political-economic understanding. MIM Theory 6 chronicles the dissolution of the Marxist-Leninist Party. MIM Theory 8 has a review of the APSP. A shorter piece defending the APSP from state attack appears in the enclosed 15 December 1996 issue of MIM Notes. *Settlers*, by J. Sakai, deals briefly with the League of Revolutionary Black Workers, but does not attempt to sum up the LRBW.

On the question of why so many promising (to varying degrees) organisations in the imperialist countries degenerated and/or disappeared, see "A law of degeneration: blaming the united front for labor-aristocracy revisionism," in MIM Theory 6. Later issues expand on the point raised here, which in sum is that "Any communist party that didn't recognize the non-exploited character of the labor aristocracy has degenerated into revisionism." Put another way, imperialists use portions of the super-profits they extract from the neocolonies to bribe the majorities in the imperialist countries. In some cases, the bribes prevent class struggle from arising in the imperialist countries. In other cases, the

bribes work to buy off people who were previously engaged in anti-imperialist class struggle. ...

Thank you for calling our attention to The People's Korea. MIM is always looking for new sources of information.

What is your opinion regarding MIM's dividing-line questions (listed on page 2 of every MIM Notes and MIM Theory)? Do you have any criticisms of or additional questions about the MIM literature you have read?

What is your opinion of the left

groups in England? Our stance is that MIM is currently the vanguard organization in England. In the imperialist countries, it is especially necessary to regard as vanguard those organizations that put forward the most advanced thoughts in a society. Any other formulation of the question has proven to be liquidationist. In England, MIM looks with hope toward the Stalin Society and the Communist Action Group. The latter in particular has taken a serious attitude toward study. Thus far, neither of these groups has taken up MIM's position on MIM's third dividing-line question and the Communist Action Group is soft on MIM's first two dividing-line questions as well. We also hope to continue our polemics with Open Polemic and Red Action. We hope to work out unity with each of these groups, but right now MIM is the vanguard in England. We seek to develop MIM and maintain friendly relations with other organizations.

H.W. Edwards' book which we distribute contains references to groups which in the late 1960s held lines similar to MIM's dividing lines [see review this issue -ed.]. These include England's Camden Marxist-Leninist Group (organ: Camden Newsletter; references refer to 1968), and England's Finsbury Communist Association (organ: Finsbury Communist; references refer to 1968 when its basic orientation was correct, and to 1978, by which time it had changed its colors to become an oppressor-nation chauvinist organization). If you have information about these groups, documents of these groups, or access to such documents, please help us learn more about the lines and fates of these organizations and any others like them which may exist or have existed.

Since you are of the opinion that MIM does "good work" and that "MIM's stuff is unique," we hope you will become a distributor of MIM literature. Contact MIM for information on ordering MIM literature in bulk, and/or for distribution tips.

If you are interested in working under MIM leadership to build public opinion and people's institutions in order to pre-

pare the masses for anti-imperialist revolution, please contact us for information on how to start a chapter of the Revolutionary Anti-Imperialist League (RAIL).

Again, thank you for writing.

Scottish 'rade on the labor aristocracy

Dear Comrades,

I would first like to thank you for sending on the MIM lit. The main problem with distribution of MIM lit here in Scotland is the cost. ...

Your lit list was full of excellent-looking reading material. Most of this stuff is simply unobtainable in Scotland. We did at one time have quite a radical force in Scotland, but like so many, we seem to have drowned in the yoke of imperialism, not to mention reformism. To be a communist now (especially if one is upfront about it) is like entering the darkest tunnel from which we encounter only glimmers of light now and then. Still, as we ought to be well aware, in the struggle with the bourgeois dictatorship, life can never be easy.

If I have any reservations regarding what I have so far read of MIM lit, it is this: you state that the American white working class can safely be written off in so far as a working class-inspired revolution is concerned. Does this mean you believe American imperialism will always be able to buy off this section of the working class? If the answer to this question is yes, I would be interested to know the basis on which you reach this conclusion. I will sign off here for now and will be in touch again soon. (Incidentally, I found MIM Notes and Maoist Sojourner excellent reading).

Communist greetings,
-A Scottish comrade
February 10, 1997

Get MIM Theory 10

And get the latest theory and line on the burning question of the imperialist countries today. The Comintern's differentiation between "working class" and "proletariat" was the first step. Then there was Sakai's Settlers, and MIM's MIM Theory 1.

Now there is "Coming to Grips with the Labor Aristocracy." Who is the proletariat? The answer lies between here and revolution. Send \$6 to get your copy now.

MIM THEORY
THE OFFICIAL THEORETICAL JOURNAL
OF THE REVOLUTIONARY ANTI-IMPERIALIST LEAGUE



Coming to grips with the LABOR ARISTOCRACY

"At the expense of the plundered colonial peoples capital corrupted its wage slaves, created a community of interest between the exploited and the exploiters as against the oppressed colonies — the yellow, black, and red colonial peoples — and chained the European and American working class to the imperialist 'fatherland.'"

— Comintern statement, March 1919

Learn from Comintern • White Working Class Host
Black Panther Party 1968-69 • Double in History

MIM replies: Thank you for getting back to us... We are glad you express some interest in distributing MIM lit in Scotland. We look forward to working out the ... details so we can expand our distribution efforts.

Some of what is on our literature list is indeed rare. Other items from our literature list can usually be found in a good university research library.

We agree with your recognition that we cannot expect the struggle to be easy.

You may be particularly interested in MIM Theory 10 on the labor aristocracy, not only because its central argument is important and rarely heard, but because it has a few things to say about Scotland. Your observations about the political climate in Scotland are in accord with what we said in that issue in the context of a discussion of Ireland:

"The final indignity is the settlement of British peoples themselves in Scottish and Irish territories. The role of the English economy in Scotland and Ireland is a force of assimilation. White-

collar settlers are just one more means in which the superprofits of English imperialism are brought to the commerce of Scotland and Ireland..." (p. 17.). In other words, while the degree of parasitism is greater in Amerikkka than in England, and is presumably greater in England than in Scotland, enough of the embodied labor of the workers and peasants of the neocolonies finds its way into the hands of Scottish workers to dampen class struggle in Scotland.

MIM Theory 10 also contains a MIM interview with an ex-militant of the Workers Party of Scotland, a party with some Maoist leanings. This interview also makes reference to the book *Towards a New Socialism*, by Scottish comrade Paul Cockshott (See review this issue -ed.)

The first thing to understand about our line on the North American white working class is that our materialist understanding is not grounds for despair. The world's vast majority resides in the neocolonies oppressed by imperialism. Barring nuclear catastrophe, the world's majority will destroy imperialism with or without the support of the parasitic classes concentrated in the imperialist countries.

In answer to your question, no, our point is not that imperialism will always be able to buy off the imperialist-country working classes. Our point is that when we examine the conditions of the imperialist-country working classes, there is no way to conclude that they are exploited (paid more than the value of their labor power). Hence, at this time we must base our actions on the interests of the international proletariat, not the parasitic labor aristocracy or petit-bourgeoisie. Whereas the Filipino workers' movement is quite right to focus principally on its own demands as a contribution to world revolution, we in the belly of the beast cannot pretend that there is a basis for revolutionary change at this time within the oppressor nations or we will perform invaluable services for the international apartheid system known as imperialism. Our working class in the imperialist countries must first be made


to understand why it owes a debt to the working class of the neocolonies or we will not be able to make the first step towards socialism. Social-democrats and right-opportunist communists have been saying for a century that the labor aristocracy is going to take a fall, and it hasn't yet. It's like crying wolf. So while it's dialectically true that everything including parasitism passes, we need to work with the material we have at hand.

Imperialism will not be able to buy off the mother-country working classes forever, because the revolutionary struggle will continue to advance against neocolonialism in Asia, Africa and Latin America, so the flow of superprofits to the imperialist countries will decline. Even so, the parasitic consciousness fostered by bribery can be expected to outlast the actual bribery, meaning that when capitalism's crisis hits the mother countries, the formerly-bribed classes are likely to turn not to communism but to fascism. Ultimately, we believe there will have to be a period in which the oppressor nations are subjected to the dictatorship of the oppressed nations until the culture of parasitism is swept into history's dustbin.

Qaddafi falls short of MLM


I think it is important that I let you know exactly where I stand in regards to Qaddafi and the Libyan revolution considering that I was defending it and even upholding it for a short time.

I believe that the Libyan revolution has been an honest and genuine anti-imperialist force since Qaddafi took power. However, given the nature of his seizure of power and some of the mistakes made by Qaddafi and Libya, I can not say that it is really a people's movement nor is it worth upholding as a good model of revolution.



Get MIM Theory 6
The Stalin Issue
Reviewing the post-Gorbachev biographies, and summing up the good, the bad, and the ugly-but-necessary.
Send \$6, cash, stamps or check to: "MIM Distributors"
PO Box 3576, Ann Arbor, MI
48106-3576

Struggle with Gorbachev • Stalin Was Reviewed • The United Front



I was very interested in the Libyan movement for a while because I noticed Libya's fierce anti-imperialism. I became more interested as I learned about the Purification Committees because I thought this really could be some sort of Libyan cultural revolution similar to the GPCR. But at this time I seriously doubt that is the case.

You see, MLM is science not religion, and Mao was a revolutionary not a prophet. I know that you already know this. Science can be developed independently at different times and different places. A re-invented wheel still turns even if the inventor was unaware that it had already been developed somewhere else. For a short while I was thinking this might be the case for Libya, but now I am certain it is not. I thought that maybe the Libyans had developed a theory and practice much like MLM. I don't think that it is absolutely impossible for this type of thing to occur, although I am fairly certain that the Libyans have built some square wheels.

I also believe that just as Leninism was a second higher stage of Marxism and Maoism is the third and currently highest stage of Marxism-Leninism, that we or some other group of revolutionaries will necessarily discover, develop and advance a fourth and even higher stage of revolutionary political science. Science must continue to advance. For this reason I do think it is important to check out other revolutionary theories to see if they have developed any of the ideas we will need to adopt to come to this fourth higher stage. In the case of Libya it is very much the other way around. Libya would have built a much greater nation had they fought and won a peoples' war and developed a socialist economy and society rather than changing government through a coup and allying with the social-imperialist USSR. What we can learn from the Libyans we really already knew: peoples' war is the solution to imperialism.

Also, as a science, MLM must be endlessly compared to other political sciences to leave no doubts that it is truly the most advanced. What Mao taught is

powerful not just because Mao said it, but because it worked so well. I no longer see Qaddafi as very advanced, but I have absolutely no doubts as to the supremacy of MLM.

I never rewrote the article about the Purification Committees because my views on Libya changed so drastically that it no longer made any sense to try to publish something like that. I also happen to agree with you about cheerleading. Revolution should not be treated like a spectator sport. I would like to thank you for your patience while I was studying Libya and for your input on the subject.

I have also been looking at Kim Il Sung and the Korean revolution. I have begun to notice some major differences between Kim and Mao, but this is an entirely different subject and I will deal with it later.

In struggle for unity,
—A RAIL comrade
March 1997

Revolution is the main trend

Sisters & Brothers,

Greetings!... "Revolution is," again, "the main trend in the world today." The revolutionary effervescence is evident

everywhere, in spite of the reactionary attempt to censure it.

This letter is an attempt on my part to continue the dialogue that was started [in another forum] and hopefully will continue for the next 1000 years.

In other words, contradictions amongst the people should be resolved by the method of using words, letters and deeds resorting to persuasion and reason.

This letter is *not* meant to be a criticism, it is meant to ask some questions

for clarification that I have. It may lead to some criticism, but not without my own self-criticism and self-analysis....

What do you folks see as the fundamental(s) and principal contradiction in the development of u.s. society that led up to your conclusion that the white working class is not a revolutionary force (at this time)?

On my part, I see that this stage of development; imperialism (monopoly capitalism), post civil war society, there are two, possibly three fundamental contradictions internal to the u.s.

1. Capital (Imperialism) vs. Labor – the class contradiction

2. Imperialism vs. Oppressed Nations and Peoples – the race contradiction


3. Imperialism vs. All Women – the gender contradiction

I believe that imperialism vs. oppressed nations and peoples has been the principal contradiction driving this society forward for most of its history, except for the 30s and during the organizing phase of the AF of L, which I think was the 1890's. The '30s being the organizing phase of the CIO.

At all other times and most clearly after WWII, racism has driven amerikkka, up to the present. In other words, the u.s. people of color not only represent the internal reserves of imperialism, we also represent the weakest link in the chain due to our position in society. The most oppressed and revolutionary forces in amerikkka.

Which is what I thought I heard you saying in our discussions, although I didn't understand how you got there, except to say that your views were influenced [by J. Sakai] and pretty much as J. Sakai put forward...

The view that the european amerikkkan white working class is not revolutionary due to their bought off economic status, is as the "aristocrats of labor." Which includes both the AF of L building trades and the CIO industrial workers, all of whom are economically middle class. This view was put forward by J. and the weather folks. This view was pretty much agreed to by all the offshoots of the SDS (October League,



Revolutionary Union and of course the Weather Underground) and the Revolutionary Nationalist movements of Third World people here. Which was the reason the Weather and the other folks never got into organizing in the white community in a big way nor amongst white workers, saying that they were too reactionary.

OK so far?

Because of the bought off nature of most white workers, the majority of workers in the country, the class contradiction can't be the principal contradiction. Even when u.s. imperialism attacks labor, such as now, it is still third world people who catch the most hell. Since we are further down on the imperialist food chain and the fact that historically [we] have fought back the most, consciously and unconsciously, such as the '65 and '92 rebellions in L.A.

Therefore, the race contradiction shows overwhelming activity all up and down the line of classes. Not just against the workers of color. Prop. 187, 209, etc. speak to this repressive activity against whole communities and peoples.

If this contradiction is principal, we also would have to say that people of color are not the principal aspect in this contradiction. That imperialism is the principal aspect.

Within the secondary aspect, the people of color, we have to figure out who and what is/are the leading and main forces.

If we analyze the role of immigration to the u.s., it is clear that we are brought here to do labor. Even if we come from pre-capitalist or semi-feudal societies in the lands of our origins. We represent the internationalization of labor and therefore our communities, at least in the beginnings, are overwhelmingly working class. Later immigration sometimes shifts this balance towards the petit bourgeoisie, but the working class always remains the majority.

So, the communities of color are the most potentially revolutionary forces here. The working class of these communities remains, due to its leading role and historic mission, both the leading

force and main force due to its numbers in the communities of color. Pointing to the importance of encouraging and abetting the organizations of workers in their respective communities.

Not only to represent the interests of the majority, but to organize and lead the communities of color out of the reserves of imperialism and into the front lines of the anti-imperialist struggle in the belly of the beast.

So much for my views on the funda-

**'The race
contradiction
shows
overwhelming
activity all
up and down
the line
of classes.'**

mental and principal contradictions here in the u.s., the primary and secondary aspects of the principal contradiction here at this moment and finally the leading role and historic mission of the workers of color in our communities...

Thanks for your time and consideration. I would like to add that although this letter is mainly aimed at MIM, I'm sharing it with other folks, since it also contains positions that I hold.

I would appreciate any feedback, questions, positions, and/or criticisms toward me. I promise to look at, try to understand them and give timely feedback.

With revolutionary greetings/Aluta Continua,

—a friend in KKKalifornia

15 December 1996

MIM replies: Thank you for writing. We, too, hope to see this dialogue continue.

The fundamental contradiction is always the bourgeoisie vs. the proletariat

on a world-scale during the domination of the capitalist mode of production on a world-scale. The principal contradiction on the world scale is between imperialism and the oppressed nations. Within the North America region also (even when Mexico is excluded), the principal contradiction is between imperialism and the oppressed nations. Within the Euro-American nation of North America, the contradiction between young and old is the principal contradiction. For more on the principal contradiction and its relation to the fundamental contradiction and to North American conditions, see MIM Theory 4, pp. 52-53 (\$6 from MIM).

In 1987, a prisoner and another correspondent introduced MIM to *Settlers*, by J. Sakai (\$9 from MIM). Around the same time, MIM was exposed to *Labor Aristocracy: Mass Base for Social Democracy*, by H.W. Edwards (\$10 from MIM). These two works were the main outside influences on our current line on the labor aristocracy. We wrote our initial 12-page summary response in MIM Theory 9/10 in September 1987, before MIM Theory was renumbered in 1992. MIM Theory 11, November 1987, features a 7-page followup. Both of these can be found in MIM's bound volume of early writings (\$15 from MIM). The main MIM-authored documents we distribute on the labor aristocracy now are MIM Theory 1 (\$3 from MIM) and MIM Theory 10 (\$6 from MIM). The other issues of MIM Theory also contain relevant material.

Parallel to our analysis of the majority of imperialist-country workers as labor aristocracy, we see the majority of imperialist-country biological wimmin as gender aristocracy. MIM Theory 2/3 (\$5 from MIM) deals with this question.

We are glad to see that you agree with MIM that the principal contradiction within U.S. borders at this time is imperialism vs. oppressed nations and peoples.

We generally speak of "national oppression" rather than "racism." Racism — the idea that one "race" is superior to another — is an ideological

manifestation and tool of national oppression. But so is racialism – the idea that “race” is a scientific means of distinguishing groups of humans by biological type, or is bound up with “natural” differences between groups. In fact, “race” is a pseudo-scientific term, and the “anti-racist” framework generally fails to break away from the pseudo-science of racialism. The existence of white oppressed nations (Ireland, Albania) and a non-white oppressor nation (Japan), illustrates why it is more useful to talk about “national oppression” than about “racism”. We deal at length with the North American national question in MIM Theory 7.


We see the U.S. empire’s internal colonies as holding a middle position – less exploited and oppressed than the U.S. empire’s external neocolonies, but more exploited and oppressed than the non-exploited oppressor nations.

On the question of the labor aristocracy, you lump J. Sakai and the Weather Underground (RYM I) together with offshoots of RYM II, the October League and the Revolutionary Union (now RCP-USA). This is not in accord with our understanding. On this question of political economy, RYM I held the correct line on the question, while RYM II – which nonetheless was the best of SDS’s three main factions overall – took the incorrect position that white workers as a group are oppressed and exploited. The RCP-USA sometimes acknowledges the relative privilege held by large numbers of people within U.S. borders. But it maintains that the majority is exploited, and it also promotes the century-old line of wishful thinking that those workers the RCP-USA does see as bought off are beginning to join the ranks of the oppressed, exploited, and revolutionary masses.

MIM Theory 8 has an article addressing Asian-descended nationalism and immigration in North America. It describes four waves of immigration from Asia to North America: the original wave, the anti-communist wave, the brain drain, and boat people.

On Prison Leadership

Many prisoners who take up leadership positions against certain injustices



find themselves having little influence or face failure after failure. Many prison leaders

blame the people (other prisoners) for their failure. Rarely ever do they blame themselves, but when something is successful they want to take all the credit and brag about it all day, every day. In fact the opposite should be the case. When something fails the leadership bears the total responsibility of that failure. This is part of the responsibility of being a leader. Instead of becoming discouraged and saying, “the people this, the people that, youngsters this, youngsters that,” etc., one should be more observant of their own shortcomings and ineffective methodology of leadership and analyze what they did or are doing incorrect. You should never get mad at the people because your leadership skills are ineffective.

Secondly, remember that when something is successful it is because of the people. They are the ones who have recognized your method as being correct and have made it into a living, breathing, force of material substance. So one cannot even think of being a leader without being ready to accept responsibility for all failures and ready to hold the people responsible for all success.

There are many prison leaders who tend to take an extremely ultraleftist position who attempt to, as Mao said, “Enforce rather than inspire loyalty to the cause.” These are the ones who threaten other prisoners, via physical force, to get down with the movement. Among others this is one of the contradictions among the people. Mao has instructed us on how to correctly handle contradictions among the people and I shall quote it at length here:

“A strict distinction must be made between the two types of contradictions: those among the people and those between ourselves and the enemy. Contradictions among the people must not be made into contradictions between ourselves and the enemy; nor must contradictions between ourselves and the enemy be regarded as contradictions among the people.

“It is normal for the masses to hold different views. Contention between different views is unavoidable, necessary and beneficial. In the course of normal and full debate, the masses will affirm what is right, correct what is wrong and gradually reach unanimity.

“The method to be used in debates is to present facts, reason things out, and persuade through reasoning. Any method of forcing a minority holding different views to submit is impermissible. The minority should be protected, because sometimes the truth is with the minority. Even if the minority is wrong, they should still be allowed to argue their case and reserve their views.

“When there is a debate, it should be conducted by reasoning, not by coercion or force.

“In the course of debate, every revolutionary should be good at thinking things out for himself and should develop the Communist spirit of daring to think, daring to speak and daring to act. On the premise that they have the same general orientation, revolutionary comrades should, for the sake of strengthening unity, avoid endless debate over side issues.” (#6 of the 16 points)

This should be taken as a guideline when dealing with prisoners who may be reluctant to join a prison move. In fact that reluctant prisoner may have sound reason for not participating, so one should hear him out and one may find out that he has suggestions and ideas that is more effective and beneficial to the movement. A prison leader mustn’t think he has the answers and solutions to

every problem all the time. Prison leaders and his comrades should come together and discuss the situation at hand that they plan to challenge and put forward suggestions of methodology and take a vote upon an agreed upon action (majority rule).

Another problem that prison leaders face is being moved from one joint to another. In order to turn this to his advantage the prison leader should have "stand-by-leaders" at a prison he is in before he makes any move. A stand by leader is a prisoner who remains in the background and refrains from participating in any action for the time being. These stand by leaders should be trustworthy, reliable and responsible due to the fact that as soon as the original leader is moved they can step up and carry on the struggle where it left off; therefore, these (it's good to have several) stand by leaders should be briefed 24-7 concerning the advancements of the struggle. This way it would be harder for the pigs to isolate and simply transfer said prison leaders.

Another case is adventurism: there are some prisoners who do very silly, childish and unnecessary things and then when the pigs pound on that ass they cry uncle. For example a prisoner may need something done or something from the pigs; some prisoners curse out the pigs, may throw shit or spit on the pigs and then when the pigs retaliate by dising their food, deading them on showers, fucking with their mail, etc., etc. they cry injustice but never tell what they did to cause such a reaction from the pigs. Then they want to use the people's struggle to make it look as if they are being repressed solely for their politics. Usually these are the very same prisoners who says that others are not political prisoners. This kind of behavior should be criticized whenever it is displayed. True there are times when we won't have any other choice but to resort to physical force against the pigs, but there are other times when we don't have to and to do so would be counterproductive.

One does not prove their revolutionary

stance by assaulting a pig. All of these individuals that's claiming to be political prisoners / POWs and wants special attention over all other prisoners need to really ask themselves why does these other prisoners (whom they seem to look down upon) "lack" a revolutionary consciousness. [See MIM's essays on political prisoners in MIM Theory 11 and responses in MT12. -ed] There must be a problem with leadership or maybe these other prisoners do not agree to your methodology or assessment of the current problems because you continuously focus on B.C. outdated shit that is very tiresome. As a common saying amongst you so so so righteous revolutionaries (sniff, sniff): "things ain't like they used to be, I don't know what's wrong with today's youth," etc. etc. Well of course things today ain't like yesterday - everything changes. It is not the fault of motion that it moves, that history marches ahead regardless of how you feel. The problem is your failure to adapt to the times and understand how to apply revolutionary method to the changing times. All of your talk of some magnificent utopian pharaonic empire is outdated empty talk.(1)

Everyone knows that the pharaonic class was oppressors and exploiter, they weren't the ones who tilled the land and mined the precious stones and jewels that decorated the clothing and great palaces of the pharaonic family, but these are the very people you identify with that you call your ancestors as if every original (2) person that lived at that time belonged to the pharaonic class. How do you know that you're not the descendants of the toilers, the miners, the slaves that was forced to build the great monuments that stand to this day? You seem to choose to be descendants of the oppressors (kings, pharaohs) rather than the oppressed. You mention nothing of the exploited, but all your talk is of the greatness of the pharaohs that could do no wrong and then you have the audacity to call the youth of today lost. Well, I highly suggest you find your way back to the present times, the real times, before you offer any criti-

cisms of today. Your leadership will be forever ineffective if you do not realize that the failures that you encounter is your failure of leadership; therefore you must go back to the drawing board and find out where you went wrong at. As times change you must change with them.

Marxism-Leninism-Maoism is key, check it out!

Power to the Peeps in the Streets

-A New York Prisoner

Notes:


1. As materialists we recognize that during these B.C. times there was no real (or historically observable) alternative to rulership that we know of; therefore when dealing in these past eras we uphold the most progressive and beneficent class(es) that ruled, while maintaining unity and identity with the oppressed, exploited and toiling classes/genders/nations.
2. Original person: meaning non-European person

Infanticide: The gift of death

A Black womyn strangles her baby to death. A Latino womyn dumps her baby down an incinerator. A Black womyn stabs her baby to death, chops it up and then disposes of it in an abandoned lot. A Latino womyn kills her baby and then kills herself.

"How could she?!" a womyn cries. "They oughta kill that dumb bitch" a man seethingly says. "What sickness" another person says disgustingly. News like this bombards us every month. To some it's shocking, to others it's sickening, but to all it's nothing new.

Why? is the main question. What has driven these wimmin to carry out such acts against the child they have given birth to? Many people ignore the conditions under which these acts occur.



Infanticide is nothing new to humanity. It has, in fact, existed wherever patriarchy has flourished.

The Euro-American media – that great propaganda machine – assaults us with stories of Black and Latino wimmin practicing infanticide. They portray these wimmin to be deranged cracked out lunatics on welfare. The Euro-American propaganda machine does not stop at vilifying just Black and Latino men, but carries their vilifying propaganda campaign to Black and Latino wimmin: Undoubtedly anyone who cares to can see that the Euro-American media is used to support the policy of national oppression and to engender the sentiment that not only should Black and Latino men be locked up but Black and Latino wimmin are just as crazy and violent and need to be locked up too.

The fact of the matter is that patriarchy and capitalism play a large part in infanticide.

Let us realize that many wimmin give birth against their will under the threat of their husbands or boyfriends, i.e., men. Many wimmin have heard the threat, "bitch, you kill my kid and I'll kill you," when she has brought up the issue of abortion. Of course there are wimmin who are bold and brave enough to go and get an abortion without their spouse's knowledge or on defiance of their spouse's threats. But the consequences of this act, when found out by their spouse, are undoubtedly dire. Many wimmin have experienced severe beatings, stabbings and even being shot because they have carried out an act that was forbidden by the man. Many wimmin put up with this abuse because they regard it as a normal part of their existence as being a woman. These wimmin who find themselves in this situation are coerced to bear children,(1) and does so out of fear; therefore maternity is enforced and "enforced maternity brings into the world wretched infants, whom their parents will be unable to support and who will become the victims of public care or 'child martyrs.'"(3)

We find that it is more than likely that wimmin who commit infanticide belong

to the proletariat class of the oppressed nationalities. This is where the three strands of oppression come into play and dovetail into one another: Nationality, Class, and Gender. All three of these factors must be taken into consideration because they all take their toll upon the nationally oppressed proletarian womyn. The nationally oppressed proletarian womyn soon finds out that having a "child is such a social and economic handicap ... that many girls may commit suicide when they realize they are pregnant, and some ... mothers kill their newborn infant."(3) It is not surprising to hear about mothers who kill themselves along with their child. "A whole complex of economic and sentimental considerations makes the baby seem either a burden and a hindering or a jewel.... there are cases in which hostility becomes open hatred, expressed by extreme neglect or bad treatment"(4) and in turn giving rise to child abuse.(5)

The wimmin who practice infanticide are not sick or crazy cracked out wimmin who need to be locked up or killed.

Back during slavery times, and during the mid-Atlantic passage African wimmin willingly jumped overboard with child in hand or strangled their newborn baby with the umbilical cord or the African slave wimmin on the plantation would kill their baby and bury it in the bushes or woods. Crack wasn't even out then nor was these wimmin crazy. The conditions that they existed under drove them to act in such a way. Many would rather give the gift of death than to see their children grow up under the throes of the peculiar institution.

In these days and times it is the patriarchal capitalist system that is decadent and regressive towards human development and so it is this system that needs to be smashed, a system that drives wimmin to the edge of hell. Just like African wimmin during the slave trade that committed infanticide; among other reasons, some wimmin now-a-days would rather see their child dead than to come up in poverty and misery. Patriarchy and capitalism is a system that makes the oppressed and exploited view the gift of

death as being more attractive than the gift of life.

Struggle to build scientific socialism and communism

Fuck Patriarchy and capitalism

Power to the oppressed wimmin of the world

Fear not we got ya back!

—A New York Prisoner

End Note: Undoubtedly adoption as an alternative to infanticide seems to be much more desirable; however there are many factors involved in the process of adoption, that I have not gone into here, that steers the mother away from that particular institution. This essay just serves as a prelude to said topic that I plan on elaborating on much more in-depth and adoption will be analyzed on a much more profound level.

Notes:

1. If we are to accept the fact the sex is rape i.e. coerced then we must accept that childbirth via coitus is also coerced.
2. *The Second Sex*, by Simone de Beauvoir trans. & edited by H. M. Parshley: Vintage Books, Random House N.Y. p. 542.
3. Ibid., p 432.
4. Ibid., p 568.
5. Those who are interested in a much more in-depth look at child abuse under patriarchy, I refer them to an excellent essay written by that comrade that be droppin mad mega bombs, MCB52, "The oppression of children under patriarchy" in MIM Theory 9, Psychology and Imperialism, p. 14.


Burn, Babylon, Burn!

Dear MIM,

You can help me in saving millions of American lives. In the Holy Bible in the

New Testament in the book of Revelation's chapters 17 and 18 is the great city of

Hollywood, Los Angeles. In Revelation chapter 17 verse 5, the name upon her forehead is Hollywood the sign and Revelation chapter 17 verse 10 was the 1984 Presidential campaign. In



Revelation chapter 17 verse 8, the beast was the Space Shuttle Challenger known to us as it was destroyed on January 28, 1986. Revelation chapter 18 is next.

—Reader in KKKalifornia,
January 1997

MIM responds: Thank you for writing. The Bible is an interesting historical document, but we do not find it to be a useful guide for living, nor do we find it to be a useful tool for predicting future events. The Bible was authored by a number of humans, not by any superhuman entity.

The Biblical passage you cite talks about the fiery fall of Babylon, "the great city that rules over the kings of the earth." Treated as metaphor and not as prophesy or literal fact, MIM likes this passage. When Lin Biao was correct, he pointed out that Comrade Mao Zedong's strategy of seizing state power through Protracted People's War, surrounding the cities from the countryside, had its corollary on the world scale. Lin pointed out that the neocolonies of Asia, Africa and Latin America were analogous to the countryside, and that the imperialist countries were analogous to the cities. The leading imperialist country is Amerikkka, so a modern reading of Revelation lends itself to seeing Babylon as metaphor for the U.S. empire, not just Hollywood which is merely the U.S. empire's cultural propaganda arm.

Indeed, Babylon will fall. "The merchants of the earth will weep and mourn over her because no one buys their cargoes any more — cargoes of gold, silver, precious stones and pearls; fine linen, purple, silk and scarlet cloth ... and bodies and souls of men ... The merchants who sold these things and gained their wealth from her will stand far off, terrified at her torment." But we don't need the Bible to tell us that, and we should not wait for a god to bring imperialism

down. "God helps those who help themselves," and the masses need justice right now on this earth, not in heaven and the hereafter. Even Revelation sees humans as playing a key role in the destruction of Babylon: "Then I heard another voice from heaven say: 'Come out of her, my people, so that you will not share in her sins. ... Give back to her

as she has given; pay her back double for what she has done. Mix her a double portion from her own cup. Give her as much torture and grief as the glory and luxury she gave herself."

MC12 adds: maybe a lot of people try to find contemporary correlates to Revelation Chapter

17, because they want to believe Chapter 18 is just around the corner. The "prophecies" the writer sites are telling about the writer's ideology, however. When it says "upon her forehead was a name written, mystery, Babylon the great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth," why think of Hollywood? Is that the "mother of harlots?" Prostitution as a creation of patriarchy goes back a lot further than Hollywood. The imperialist system itself — and its systematic prostitution of wimmin — might be better represented by this imagery, for example.


As for the 1984 presidential campaign: "seven kings: five are fallen, and one is, and the other is not yet come; and when he cometh, he must continue a short space." Well, this could just as easily refer to the NCAA basketball playoffs. And why is the beast that "shall ascend out of the bottomless pit, and go into perdition" the Space Shuttle? The shuttle launched from the ground, not from a pit. These are like the predictions of the psychic who says, "change is in your future." MIM prefers the science of revolution to the whims of prophetic religion.

Social dems learn the hard way

The degree to which evidence proving the accuracy of Stalin's philosophy has been amassing in recent years is nothing short of astounding. If there is any constructive

enlightenment to have emerged from events in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe since the mid-1980's it is that Joe had it right from the start and all deviations since his demise have been nothing more than detours down Losers' Lane. Besides millions of citizens at large, the latest group to be sent this message with unmistakable clarity are those former communist parties which have reconstituted themselves in Eastern Europe. Instead of proceeding on the fundamental Marxist thesis that only those in control of the means of production, distribution, and exchange are really driving the vehicle, they have sought to rejuvenate their cause through riding an essentially capitalist conveyance.

In Lithuania, Poland, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Slovenia the pattern has been remarkably consistent. After the initial collapse of the Iron Curtain in general and the Berlin Wall in particular, the capitalist sharks invaded in droves. Land, factories, equipment and other productive facilities were bought up for a song by the thousands. Simultaneously, the social welfare benefits involving such items as free education, free medical care, guaranteed employment, secure retirement and pension payments, etc. were either abolished or drastically reduced. The living standards of ninety percent of the population declined precipitously while 10% became rich. Because this generated mass resentment, parties of the left won electoral victories in subsequent elections. The problem with these victories



**The Bible
is not
a useful
tool for
predicting
future events.**

by alleged communists, however, is that they were hollow and without substance because the winners lacked the wherewithal by which to do much of anything significant. Instead of being communists executing Marxist programs, they became nothing more than social-democrats enacting social-democratic programs within a capitalist framework in which the means of production, distribution, and exchange were owned by a small clique. The outcome was preordained from the start and could only have been one of defeat.

As the social-democratic governments restored the social benefits and the other humanities that are inseparable from socialism, the capitalists became increasingly incensed. The bourgeoisie's attitude toward the masses became one of: You think you had pain and suffering before, now I will show you what real agony is all about, such that you will beg for the expulsion of those social-democrats you recently installed. And with that stance the capitalists proceeded to cut foreign loans, restrict foreign investment, fire, terminate, and layoff workers working within privatized firms, reduce the amount of taxes paid to finance social-democratic programs, and close less productive enterprises. In addition, the IMF and World Bank demanded additional unemployment and balanced governmental budgets as the price of continuing loans and guarantees. Because the capitalists were in control of the wealth, i.e., the means of production, distribution, and exchange, they were able to call the shots, set the pace, and name the tune. The result was a foregone conclusion. The Social-democratic parties were doomed from the outset and their programs had no chance of success. They were dealing from a position of weakness, if not actually begging.

Nearly all leftist parties in Eastern

Europe calling themselves "communist," "Marxist," or Marxist-Leninist" are something else while those with other names make no pretense. Leftist parties obtaining electoral victories are nothing more than social-democrats of the Menshevik variety and their programs have no possibility of enduring success. When these reconstituted parties lowered the Iron Curtain that Joe had so wisely and meticulously erected and allowed the villains to invade unopposed, they signed their own death warrant.

Zyuganov's program in "Russia" is nothing more than a variation on what the parties in Eastern Europe have unsuccessfully tried to implement, and without dramatic alterations would no doubt endure the same fate should he and his colleagues ever come to power. There is no avoiding, evading, or omitting the overriding fact that you must first seize or control the means of production, distribution, and exchange before you can implement a program that will realistically and materially improve the living standards of the people, regardless of your party's designation. The capitalists don't care what nomenclature parties in Eastern Europe apply to themselves as long as their policies have no possibility of success. Monikers are of far less importance to them than what left-leaning parties intend to do or are able to accomplish. If members of leftist parties want to call themselves "communists" while instituting programs that are foreordained to failure, then so much the better. All they will succeed in doing is dishonoring and discrediting the names of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, as well as the words "socialism," and "communism."

As I have said repeatedly: the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe are not in their catastrophic condition because they followed the philosophy of Joe Stalin but because they left it.

And they started leaving it almost from the very moment he died. Khrushchev and his cronies saw to that.

—A Stalin supporter on the Internet
February 2, 1997

The last decade's lesson

I now fully realize the superiority of socialism over capitalism as never before and nothing has made that clearer than what has occurred in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe in the last decade. For sheer eye-openers events in recent years have no equal. I can't think of any event or any possible series of events that could have been more informative, more enlightening. That is one of the few definite positives that has arisen out of this whole experiment in social regression. Nothing else even comes close. An entire library of anti-Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist trash got thrown in the fires of Gehenna because of what has occurred since 1985. Never in my lifetime have I seen tens of millions of people sink so far, so fast, so horrendously as I have witnessed since the ascendancy of Gorbachev. And all because millions are in the throes of jettisoning socialism in favor of capitalism. Millions gave up the bird in the hand to pursue five in the bush. Now they have no birds in the hand and the bush has been trampled with no prospect of growth. Every evil under the sun has blossomed and grown at such a fantastic rate in the former Soviet bloc that you would think they had been heavily sprinkled in stinking fertilizer.

For the edification and illumination of those who may question the veracity of these comments the following list of cascading decadence, decay, and deterioration is offered.

- Unemployment has risen to double digits
- Inflation has skyrocketed
- Crime has become rampant
- Murders and contract killings are commonplace
- Political kickbacks, bribes, payoffs, and graft are pandemic
- Prostitution has been spreading

MIM Theory wants to publish debate over theory and practice. If you're reading this, shouldn't you either be working with MIM or writing us with your criticisms?

- Teenage pregnancy has been growing quickly
- Gambling has been growing
- Pornography has become widespread
- The growth of venereal diseases and aids has been accelerating
- Sex and violence have been taking over the media
- Drug addicts and pushers have been increasing rapidly
- The birth rate has been declining
- Infant mortality has risen significantly
- Free day cares have all but vanished
- Free medical care has vanished, private costs are ridiculous, and the best care goes to those with money
- Retirement facilities are being abolished and inflation is destroying the value of whatever retirement benefits remain
- Millions of youngsters no longer have summer camps to go to and they spend their summers roaming the streets
- Fences and other barriers are spreading everywhere with more and more lands and buildings becoming available only to a few rich
- Beaches, parks, playgrounds, resorts, and other recreational areas formerly available to everyone are being restricted to the rich or those who pay an absurd fee
- The school dropout rate is growing
- Increasing numbers of parents are giving their children to orphanages because they can't afford to take care of them
- The government is selling children in orphanages to foreigners to raise needed funds
- Life expectancy for men and women has dropped drastically
- Suicides have increased markedly as have mental illnesses
- The national debt has gone through the roof
- The gross national product (GNP) has been cut in half
- Production of almost every major manufacturing item has dropped 10-50%
- The national infrastructure is declining terribly

- Research and development in such areas as medicine and space has been greatly restricted
- The wealth gap between the top 10% and the bottom 90% is skyrocketing
- Exploitation is growing exponentially
- Wage increases are not keeping up with price increases
- Many goods have become more available but only for the 10% that can afford them
- Child labor is growing
- Enforcement of the few environmental laws is so pathetic that the man in charge resigned
- Persecution of minorities is prominent
- Different nationalities are being expelled
- Anti-Semitism is growing
- Only capitalists who pay the right amounts to the right people are allowed to export and import products.
- Tax evasion is directly proportional to political and economic influence
- The national media is nothing but a mouthpiece for the government
- The Soviet Union went from a world class power to a pitiful pit.
- Large numbers of military personnel are not adequately fed, clothed or housed
- Hundreds of millions of dollars worth of lands and property owned by, and available to, everyone were sold to a few individuals and small groups for a pittance
- Elderly people are being thrown out of low rent housing so real estate speculators can rent properties at far higher prices or sell them for a windfall
- Millions of dollars that can't be repaid have been borrowed from the IMF and the world bank and the accompanying interest payments can only drain the Russian people further and garish, gaudy, and gross advertisements and posters appealing to the basest elements in humanity now besmirch the landscape.

The fact of the matter is that every item in this litany has thousands of proponents and advocates because easy money can be made by each. Capitalists

try to give people the impression that these problems are mere appendages to bourgeois society that can be excised if we just work hard enough, when anyone with an even remotely accurate conception of the world at large knows that they are an inseparable part any private property system. They can no more be separated from private property systems than water can be separated from H₂O. They go with the suit.

Moreover, the current clique of corrupt con-men ruling the land represents nothing more than government by gangster. When he seized power in 1991 and consolidated it with tanks in Oct. 1993 Yeltsin:

- Outlawed other political parties
- Shut down their offices and seized their property
- Banned opposition newspapers
- Jailed members of the opposition
- Destroyed the legal parliament
- Illegally destroyed the constitution and wrote one of his own giving himself dictatorial powers over everything that matters, including a politically anemic parliament
- Fired people who opposed his seizure

And in the recent election he:

- Used government money to finance his private campaign
- Spent more on his campaign than was legally allowed
- Had his stooges bribe hundreds of print and electronic media writers and editors to write articles favorable to himself
- Appointed the head of one of the major tv networks to head his campaign
- Tried to buy millions of votes by promising hundreds of millions of dollars to cover wages months in arrears which could only be done by raising the debt even further
- Systematically kept all opposition parties and candidates away from media exposure during the campaign
- Prevented other parties, especially thy, from displaying their posters and ban-

ners

- Directed his hand-picked cronies in charge of public facilities from granting permits for opposition parties to hold rallies in public auditoriums, etc.
- Added votes he did not get during the final tallies, trashed those of the opposition
- And used tax funds to pay for buses and other transportation to bring his rent-a-crowds to rallies and transport his hired propagandists throughout the nation

Now you can see why Yeltsin belongs in prison, not in power.

And that ladies and gentlemen is what the capitalist world would have us believe is democracy in action.

What a travesty! What a tragedy! And all because so many alleged communists in key positions throughout the Soviet bloc thought they had better ways of doing things than Stalin and Lenin and saw opportunities to feather their own nests. To make matters even worse, the deterioration continues at a steady pace and in order to stay afloat and forestall total collapse the former Soviet bloc governments are steadily devouring the capital goods and resources created during the socialist era and borrowing increasing amounts of money from the IMF, the World Bank and other capitalist agencies. Inventories and infrastructure are declining faster than they are being replaced.

Listing everything that has degenerated in the last six years in the Soviet Union would require an entire book, but that is unnecessary, since the message is clear. Under Yeltsin's dictatorship you would be hard-pressed to find one aspect of soviet society that has not deteriorated drastically for 90% of the population.

For corroboration we have the following three commentaries:

Matthew Fisher of the *Toronto Sun* on December 26, 1996 stated:

"Russia is bankrupt. Tax collection is a bad joke. Violent crime is commonplace. Corruption infests all levels of government including the

presidential administration. Plants are idle. Russia manufactures almost nothing today. Transport infrastructure is collapsing. The army is good for almost nothing which means it's several times better than the police. Chechnya has become a bandit state. Living standards continue to decline."

Alan Woods and Ted Grant in their new Marxist book on the USSR and Russia state:

"Now that the Russian people are sampling the joys of capitalism, they are finding out what it means to have a huge and uncontrolled budget deficit, meaning that wages are not paid for months on end. The move to introduce capitalism into the former Soviet Union brought with it a nightmare for the mass of the population. The gains of the October Revolution are being systematically dismantled, leading to an unprecedented collapse of the productive forces. It comes as no surprise that the same Western observers who exaggerated every defect of the Soviet economy, and deliberately suppressed all evidence of its successes, remain stubbornly silent about these glorious achievements of the 'market economy.'"

"Not since the Dark Ages after the collapse of the Roman Empire has Europe seen such an economic catastrophe in peacetime. In particular, the collapse of production in Russia resembles the effects of a massive defeat in war, or, more correctly, in two wars. It has no parallel in modern history. In the last six years production has plummeted by around 60%. It can only be described as a historic wipe-out of productive technique and industry. The steep fall in American production of 30% in the Great Depression of 1929-33 was relatively minor by comparison. Each year of life in Russia is equivalent to the deepest depression ever experienced in the West. Nor is Russia the worse case. In the five years to 1994, the economies of the ex-republics of the Soviet Union

have plummeted by up to, in the case of Georgia, an astonishing 83 per cent. Last year there were further falls."

And Stanislav Menshikov, a Russian economist and political analyst, and author of the "Monthly Strategic Report on Russia and the Eurasian Commonwealth states:

"The Russian economy is not in the process of turning around towards recovery nor will it in the foreseeable future. In 1996, GDP fell another 6%. There is nobody in Russia, even in the government, who believes that growth will start in 1997. It is easy to understand the current quandary of Russian wage earners and pensioners whose average incomes are substantially below world levels but who have to pay close to world prices for most consumer goods. Their real incomes are down from Soviet times even when the relatively low rents, educational and medical costs remaining from socialism are taken into account to adjust purchasing power parities. And the long queues today is for wages, something unheard of in the Communist times. Effective aggregate demand deteriorated sharply."

Equally important is the fact that none of this disintegration occurred while Stalin was leading the Soviet Union, because he kept in check precisely those elements that would have unleashed all this sewage for their own personal gain. The very few aspects that did exist under Stalin and Lenin were only present in order to make sure all the rest did not occur. Compared to present conditions the Soviet Union prospered under socialism.

For corroboration we might again cite Woods and Grant who state:

"Despite the loss of 27 million lives, the USSR succeeded in defeating Hitler, and went on, after 1945, to reconstruct its shattered economy in a remarkably short space of time, transforming itself

into the world's second power. From a backward, semi-feudal, mainly illiterate country in 1917, the USSR became a modern, developed economy, with a quarter of the world's scientists, a health and educational system equal or superior to anything found in the West, able to launch the first space satellite and put the first man into space. As late as the mid-1980s, the CIA was compelled to admit that the Soviet space programme was ten years ahead of that of the USA.

"Such astonishing advances in a country which set out from a level more backward than present-day India must give us pause for thought. One can sympathise with the ideals of the Bolshevik revolution, or oppose them, but such a remarkable transformation in such a short space of time demands the attention of thinking people everywhere.

"Yet history, in the Marxist sense, has by no means ended, and the future of world capitalism is no more secure now than it was before the fall of the Berlin Wall. In fact, it is much less so.

"In a period of 50 years, the USSR increased its gross domestic product nine times over. Despite the terrible destruction of the Second World War, it increased its GDP five times over from 1945 to 1979. In 1950, the GDP of the USSR was only 33% that of the USA. By 1979, it was already 58%. By the late 1970s, the Soviet Union was a formidable industrial power, which in absolute terms had already overtaken the rest of the world in a whole series of key sectors. It was the world's second biggest industrial producer after the USA. However, the USSR was the biggest producer of oil, steel, cement, asbestos, tractors, and many machine tools. The Soviet space programme was the envy of the world.

"Nor is the full extent of the achievement expressed in these figures. All this was achieved without unemployment or inflation. Unemployment was virtually

unknown in the Soviet Union. In fact, it was legally a crime. (Ironically, this law still remains on the statute books today, although it means nothing). Moreover, for most of the post-war period, there was no inflation. At the beginning of perestroika, meat and dairy prices had last risen in 1962. Bread, sugar and most food prices had last been increased in 1955. Rents were extremely low, particularly when compared to the West, where most workers have to pay a third or more of their wages to the landlord. Only in the last period, with the chaos of perestroika, did this begin to break down. Now, with the rush towards a "market economy", both unemployment and inflation have soared to unprecedented levels.

"The USSR had a balanced budget and even a small surplus every year. It is interesting to note that not a single western government has succeeded in achieving this result (as the Maastricht conditions prove), just as they have not succeeded in achieving full employment and zero inflation, things which also existed in the Soviet Union. The western critics of the Soviet Union kept very quiet about this, because it demonstrated the possibilities of even a transitional

economy, never mind socialism."

All of the above highlights a very important fact of life. A significant number of people couldn't care less about society at large or their fellow man. They have no social consciousness whatever. They are out for #1 and that's all that matters from their perspective. How much they destroy the lives of others is of no concern to them. All that counts is lining their pockets and getting the most for themselves. Granting license to these animals to operate unhindered would be a one-way ticket to perdition for over 90% of the population and Russia is bearing that out incontrovertibly. If there is any lesson to be learned from recent history, it is that if you don't keep the maggots at bay they will turn any society into a stench-wrenched, pock-marked, decaying corpse.

We need more Stalins and less Yeltsins because there is no third option.

As I have said on numerous occasions, the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe are not in their current catastrophic mess because they followed the policies of Stalin and Lenin but because they left them.

—A Stalin supporter on the Internet
February 1997

MIM's New eMail List

Subscribe to mim-news and get news and feature articles from MIM Notes. mim-news contains anti-imperialist global and local news coverage, letters from revolutionary prisoners in Amerikan gulags, reviews of Internet politics and sites, and cultural analysis — all from a Marxist-Leninist-Maoist perspective. mim-news is not a discussion list, and it is free.

TO SUBSCRIBE, JUST SEND AN E-MAIL MESSAGE TO:

majordomo@mim.org

IN THE BODY OF THE MESSAGE, WRITE:

subscribe mim-news

Corrections

Incorrect criticism of Avakian passage

MIM Theory 6, contained the following passage in a review of Bob Avakian's book *Democracy, Can't We Do Better Than That?* (p. 96):

"Avakian paraphrases Lenin: '... Lenin's answer to the accusation that he was a dictator ... can stand as an answer to Mill and all other apologists of this system: better me than you, better the dictatorship of the proletariat than the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. When such apologists ... insist on equality for all opinions and denounce attempts at dictatorship not only in the sphere of action but in the ideological sphere as well, they are actually...insisting on the continued domination of the bourgeoisie in the domain of ideas—and in society as a whole.' (*Democracy: Can't We Do Better Than That?*, p. 250)

"But under socialism, especially after a certain amount of extended mass struggle, the ideas of the bourgeoisie are no longer the dominant ideas; they still exist, but they no longer dominate. When the bourgeoisie has lost its previous hegemony over popular thought—lost control over schools, mass culture production, and so on—and when the state apparatus is used to keep the bourgeoisie from gaining influence greater than its numbers, then a freer flow of ideas is better, not worse. Thus the dictatorship gets stronger even as it is required to act less in its repressive capacity. As the people gain strength, letting the bourgeoisie express itself politically—letting them

speak with their mouths, not with their money—will result not in the resurgence of bourgeois ideas, but in a strengthening of the masses' ability to create and advance their own socialist ideas. At the same time, when the dictatorship has less work to do to repress the bourgeoisie, the masses will be able to have a more productive political debate among themselves, in a freer environment."

Although MIM believes Revolutionary Communist Party, USA (RCP-USA) Chairperson Bob Avakian is a crypto-Trotskyist in general, that particular passage cited in MIM Theory is a wholly correct defense of the dictatorship of the proletariat and needs no rebuttal. MIM erred in criticizing this Avakian quote. This passage in MIM Theory was particularly incorrect to argue that Avakian overemphasized the need for dictatorship to act in its repressive capacity. This argument is based on the false premise that under socialism, the struggle for dominance has already been won in society, popular thought, schools, mass culture and so on. The argument based on this false premise is an incorrect attack on the repressive aspect of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

This acknowledgment does not imply that MIM has changed its position about Avakian and the RCP in general; we are instead correcting a mistake that we made in a criticism of Avakian's book on democracy.

Unnecessary identification of MT critic

MIM Theory carried an ongoing debate about anarchism from MIM Theory 8 to 11. In MT9 (p. 65) we published an "Open Letter to Maoists" by a member of the Love & Rage Revolutionary Anarchist Federation, who we did not identify by name, as is our practice unless there is an overriding reason to do so or the person requests it specifically. However, in a subsequent response which appeared in MT11, we allowed a critic of the anarchist not only to identify the anarchist by name, but also to reveal alleged personal details about the person's background and identity.

In this regard MIM Theory made two mistakes. First, we should not have printed the name of the anarchist critic, since there was no overriding reason to do so, even if this name was well known in some circles. Second, we should have made it clear that MIM does not judge political lines based upon the background of the speaker. In general, of course, political lines reflect class, gender and nation interests. But in specific individuals — who do not necessarily represent the interests of their groups of origin — we will always judge the political line independently of the person's background.

Culture in Revolution

Editor's Introduction

Maoists understand that China's Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (1966-1976) was the furthest advance of communist theory and practice yet. Marxist-Leninists before the GPCR knew the importance of culture, but it was only during the development of socialism – and contradictions within that development – that culture took on a principal role. The Chinese experience therefore teaches us not only of the fundamental importance of culture, but also of culture's role in different historical circumstances. We cannot mechanically or uncritically apply the policies or theories of diverse times and places – which would be to abandon the method of dialectical materialism.

A revolutionary movement is itself a feature of the superstructure. Revolutionaries organize by taking advantage of the old and weakening economic and political structures and win the masses' allegiance away from these crumbling institutions. Thus, for example, in the GPCR the principal task of the revolution was the transformation of the superstructure – ideology, religion, art and state power. Our principal task right now in the imperialist countries – building public opinion for revolution – is ideological, or cultural – broadly speaking. Nevertheless, MIM would be foolish to think we could win the aptly-titled "culture wars" without state power.

Take a recent example. The quote from a Yiddish scholar – made with reference to Ebonics or Black English – is well put: "A language is a dialect with an army and a navy." (1) Languages such as Black English are "minority dialects" while the people who make and speak them are subjects of domination. They are liberated as languages only when their people are free. So it is with culture in general.

So we must guard against the error – an error of left opportunism – of thinking that we can successfully advance beyond

the current stage in cultural struggles. Our cultural struggle is extremely important, and must be waged relentlessly. But although it prepares the ground for the inevitable military struggle for power, it is not a replacement for seizing power through war, and then for transforming a capitalist economy into a socialist economy, and so on. The cultural victories of the oppressed will always be constrained by the dominance of imperialism and patriarchy as long as they retain power.

Consider this passage from China's *People's Daily*, a




'DOGMAIC' ART, OR SERVING THE PEOPLE? *Organizing Notes* (Fan Rending, 1952). Proletarian-feminist politics in the art of revolutionary China offended bourgeois sensibilities.

Communist Party organ, on June 1, 1966, at the start of the GPCR: "In every revolution the basic question is that of state power. In all branches of the superstructure – ideology, religion, art, law, state power – the central issue is state power. State power means everything. Without it, all will be lost." (2) For socialist societies, the formerly-dominant ideology of the exploiters is a time-bomb set to go off after a revolution. Without state power, the revolutionaries can't protect against its resurgence and fight for a new, communist dominant ideology. At the same time, once state power is won, without cultural struggle there is no way to prevent the reactionaries from returning to power.

In 1923 in the Soviet Union, V. I. Lenin criticized a movement that sought to declare the estab-

lishment of a "proletarian culture" in a clean break from the existing or past dominant culture. Lenin said he would rather consider it progress to even emerge from pre-bourgeois culture into a "real" bourgeois culture. (3) That does not mean that there was not a proletarian approach to culture, or proletarian cultural products, because there were. But proletarian culture was not yet dominant. So we take from this the importance of the stage we are in. In the imperialist countries today bourgeois culture dominates, but its purveyors still do use pre-bourgeois motifs when it serves their purposes: in the form of reli-



**AMERICAN
LYNCHING**
One of MIM's principal tasks in art creation is undermining the patriotic symbols of the state and its supporters. Here, historical images are used to show the police carrying out a lynching under the approving eye of the Klan, all under the US flag, and in its name (by MC12).

gious mysticism and postmodern idealism, for example.

MIM recognizes the importance of revolutionary cultural work in three important ways: studying old and existing culture, actively criticizing the dominant cultures of the systems we oppose, and creating new revolutionary cultural expressions.

STUDY

First, we study culture. The development of dominant and resistant languages over time, Hollywood movies, the literature of the oppressors' culture, and preserved art from regimes of the past – all these are windows into society that revolutionaries ultimately must understand if we are to grasp the essence of today: the revolutionary imperatives we face, the obstacles in our path, and so on.

One myth about Maoists is that we are opposed to cultural expression in general, and seek to wantonly destroy the artifacts of the oppressor culture, as if to remove their every trace. In this view, communists fear culture because culture is assumed to be opposed to communism: culture represents "freedom," and communism represents "totalitarianism." They think culture represents freedom because they think "pure" culture is devoid of politics, and communists seek to impose politics onto culture, thus ruining culture. Through the many layers of myth, obfuscation and hypocrisy prevalent in bourgeois ideology, the political contentlessness of "pure" art or culture is one of the most pernicious. We return to this below.

Although there is no reason to waste the people's resources preserving every piece of reactionary culture, Maoists also

oppose their immediate obliteration. In the conversation between Mao Zedong and his niece Wang Hai-jung, published in 1970, she complained about a student who reads reactionary old literature, but Mao replied that they should read it: "not for its story but as history," to learn about feudalism.

Then, when he further suggested a poem for her to read, she asked, "What precaution should I take against its influence?" And he answered: "You are always metaphysical. Why should you take precaution? No. You should receive some influence. You should go deep in it and then emerge from it." He went on to tell her to read the Bible and Buddhist sutras, so she might learn translation and foreign affairs. He told her there were kind-hearted characters in another classical story, that it was "well-written" and "worth reading."⁽⁴⁾ Mao did not fear exposure to the old culture but instead demanded that it be taken seriously – and then overcome.

As for integrating Western and past cultures, Mao used the metaphor of eating that we can apply to our own consumption of imperialist culture:

"We must treat these foreign [cultural] materials as we do our food, which should be chewed in the mouth, submitted to the workings of the stomach and intestines, mixed with saliva, gastric juice, and intestinal secretions, and then separated into essence to be absorbed and waste matter to be discarded. Only thus can food benefit our body; we should never swallow anything raw or absorb uncritically."⁽⁵⁾

As with any study, however, Mao and all Maoists are careful not to divorce study from struggle and practice. Mao did say

people should not read too many books, because they would become bookworms and dogmatists.

If we are to study old and existing dominant cultures, we will do so with new methods that serve the interests of the people's revolution, however. Thus, Mao said exam grading should stress creative thinking rather than rote memorization. How else could the people critically learn without merely following the ideologies of the oppressors? He also said exams should be open-book and without surprises – to treat students as friends instead of as enemies.(6)

Lenin agreed that studying culture and preparing for a new culture does not mean obliterating past culture. Quite the contrary, Lenin said in 1920:

"the teaching, training and education of the new generations that will create communist society must proceed from the material that has been left to us by the old society. We can build communism only on the basis of the totality of knowledge, organisations and institutions, only by using the stock of human forces and means that have been left to us by the old society."(7)

In Lenin's view, this was necessary before proletarian culture could take hold:

"We shall be unable to solve this problem [of proletarian culture] unless we clearly realise that only a precise knowledge and transformation of the culture created by the whole development of mankind will enable us to create a proletarian culture. The latter is not clutched out of thin air; it is not an invention of those who call themselves experts in proletarian culture. That is all nonsense. Proletarian culture must

be the logical development of the story of knowledge mankind has accumulated under the yoke of capitalist, landowner and bureaucratic society. All these roads have been leading, and will continue to lead up to proletarian culture, in the same way as political economy, as reshaped by Marx, has shown us what human society must arrive at, shown us the passage to the class struggle, to the beginning of the proletarian revolution."(8)

The old schools still had to be abolished and destroyed, but in the process communists would have to decide what in them was necessary for capitalism, and what was necessary for communism.

CRITICIZE

Second, we criticize the dominant culture through artistic as well as other political means. We review and criticize the cultural products of the system we seek to destroy in ways that build public opinion for revolution, socialism and communism. The cultural products of our enemies offer the ideological justifications for their crimes against humanity, even though they do so with forked tongues: the ideology is often concealed, and always distorted. Most pernicious of all is the hegemonic art that is of high artistic quality yet reactionary political content — including the art that pretends to have no political content at all.

MIM's criticism of culture materials includes both outright reactionary products of the dominant culture such as Hollywood movies, as well as progressive products such as radical bands like Rage Against the Machine or Paris.

Also in this category are MIM's distortions of oppressor-culture language and terms: our use of United States, calling police "pigs," and the gender terms womyn and wimmin, for example. These are not comprehensive attempts to create new language, but rather efforts to undermine existing dominant culture and show the way toward a people's liberation language in the future. In the case of Black English, a so-called "minority dialect," we uphold this as the language of an oppressed nation that is underdeveloped because of the constraints put on it by imperialism. We lead by example in this area, as the pages of our publications are open to linguistic subversion and creation of all kinds.

CREATE

Finally, cultural creations — art, literature (including language), music — are expressions of class, nation and gender ideology. Maoists therefore attempt to create cultural expressions that speak for and to the oppressed, that help to unify the allies of revolution, and that expose the horrors and

STREET PANTHERS: Graffiti, like this in New York City, puts the people's art in public view.



hypocrisies imperialism and patriarchy. The culture of revolution is about tearing down the old and creating a vision of the new society that is to come.

Mao saw artists and writers as teachers or political leaders – people who gave the masses the culture that met their immediate needs, which feudal culture had not. “Only by speaking for the masses can he [every artist or writer] educate them, and only by becoming their pupil can he become their teacher.”(9)

MIM is itself undeveloped in this regard. Besides the black-and-white-on-newsprint artwork of our major publications – often cartoons or representations of article content, we write and publish some poetry, and make banners and posters. One goal of this issue of MIM Theory is to stimulate more revolutionary cultural expression in MIM circles, to encourage submissions of artistic work, and find new ways of getting this stuff out.

Mao insisted that actors and writers live and work in the countryside instead of sitting in offices separate from the toiling people. Learning to be a “great” artist in isolation from the masses produces art that appears “empty” but is in fact supportive of the oppressive status quo or idealized utopias. In this issue we review the movie *Shine*, which (perhaps inadvertently) shows the true emptiness of “greatness” in artistry – or virtuosity – when it is removed from meaningful social life.

In the original artwork of the revolution that we hope to produce, we will have to practice the balance of what Mao called the “political criterion and the artistic criterion.” We quote him at some length from the Yenan forum on literature and art in May 1942:

“There is the political criterion and there is the artistic criterion; what is the relationship between the two? ... We deny not only that there is an abstract and absolutely unchangeable political criterion, but also that there is an abstract and absolutely unchangeable artistic criterion; each class in every class society has its own political and artistic criteria. [This implies that there is “proletarian culture” in once sense, but not in the hegemonic sense. –MC12] But all classes in all class societies invariably put the political criterion first and the artistic criterion second. The bourgeoisie always shuts out proletarian literature and art, however great their artistic merit. The proletariat must similarly distinguish among the literary and art works of past ages and determine its attitude towards them only after examining their attitude to the people and whether or not they had a progressive significance historically. Some works which politically are downright reactionary may have a certain artistic quality. The more reactionary their content and the higher their artistic quality, the more poisonous they are to the people, and the more necessary it is to reject them. A common characteristic of the literature and art of all exploiting classes in their period of decline is the contradiction between their reactionary political content and their artistic form. What we demand is the unity of politics and art, the unity of content and form, the unity of revolutionary political content and the highest possible perfection of artis-

tic form. Works of art which lack artistic quality have no force, however progressive they are politically. Therefore, we oppose both works of art with a wrong political viewpoint and the tendency towards the ‘poster and slogan style’ which is correct in political viewpoint but lacking in artistic power.”(10)

While it is important to raise artistic standards, which are often neglected, Mao added, “the political side is more of a problem at present.” So it may be one or the other, depending on conditions. Again the question of the stage of struggle is crucial. In the present in imperialist society, it is the content that is principal, precisely because of the worship of contentless art that dominates in the bourgeois culture. In fact, if we go up against the imperialists on the artistic quality criterion, we will surely lose at present, if only because they have the better computers, the years of exclusive training with the right materials, and endless study and practice subsidized by imperialist exploitation. So, while we appreciate artistic quality, content comes decisively first for us. MIM will not restrict art work we publish or distribute on the basis of its artistic quality. We will work to improve artistic quality to enhance the impact of our work when possible, but ahead of doing this we place encouraging young cadres to engage in revolutionary culture production, distributing our materials to the greatest numbers of people.

Just as analyzing the content of reactionary art is a great way for us to reach people and argue with them about “experiences” we have in common – Was it “the right thing” for Spike Lee’s character to throw that garbage can, Why are the aliens in *Independence Day* bad? And so on. Anyone who saw these movies can answer like we were there – so it is with revolutionary culture also, only more. We can create situations and scenes, pictures and music, to instruct upon or raise questions from a revolutionary perspective, and these will stimulate public opinion, inspire, and lead the masses into revolutionary work.

Notes:

1. Washington Post, 7 January 1996.
2. *People's China*, David Milton, Nancy Milton, and Franz Schurman, eds. Vintage: New York, 1974. p. 253.
3. “Better Fewer, But Better,” V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works in One Volume*. International Publishers: New York, 1971. p. 700.
4. *People's China*, pp. 243-44.
5. *The Political Thought of Mao Tse Tung*, by Stuart Schram. Praeger: New York, 1971. p. 357.
6. *People's China*, pp. 246-248.
7. Lenin, p. 607.
8. Lenin, p. 610.
9. Schram, p. 362.
10. *Selected Readings from the Works of Mao Tsetung*. Foreign Languages Press: Peking, 1971. pp. 275-276.

Chinese Art in Revolution

Among the bourgeois charges against communists is that we subordinate art to politics. Among the specific bourgeois charges against the Chinese Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (1966-1976) is that artists, along with other intellectuals, were persecuted; that great art from the past was destroyed; and that art was judged by political criteria alone. This article will explain the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist line on art, defend the political practice regarding art in revolutionary China (1949-1976) and expose the hypocrisy in bourgeois thinking about art in general. It will also demonstrate that the GPCR represented the period of greatest social participation in art in all of history, and the greatest social support of art as well.

China's practice was firmly rooted in the Marxist tradition. Mao wrote, "As far back as 1905 Lenin pointed out emphatically that our literature and art should 'serve ... the millions and tens of millions of working people.'"(1) MIM is similarly committed to developing proletarian art which serves the people, and to applying the same dialectical materialist analysis to art and literature as we do to any other aspect of society. As Mao said at the 1942 "Talks at the Yenan Forum on Literature and Art": "Works of literature and art, as ideological forms, are products of the reflection in the human brain of the life of a given society. Revolutionary literature and art are the products of the reflection of the life of the people in the brains of revolutionary writers and artists."(2)


Creating literature and art is a legitimate and important activity among the people, and it is important for revolutionaries to encourage and promote it:

"While both [life and art] are beautiful, life as reflected in works of literature and art can and ought to be on a higher plane, more intense, more concentrated, more typical, nearer the ideal, and therefore more universal than actual everyday life. Revolutionary literature and art should create a variety of characters out of real life and help the masses to propel history forward."(3)

This revolutionary statement about art, which laid much of the foundation for art theory and policy during the Maoist era, is a social appraisal of a social process. It is in direct contradiction to the bourgeois notion that art progresses along a separate plane from everyday human social relations, which are rooted in the mode of production.

'NO ART FOR ART'S SAKE'

One of the petit bourgeois fabrications about art is that pro-



ART ROOTED IN THE MODE OF PRODUCTION: Some traditional elements used to celebrate the revolution's accomplishments (*Southern Oil City*, Guan Shanyue, 1971).

letarian art is "political" whereas art reflecting the dominant, bourgeois values is just aesthetic. Liberals refuse, for example, to see the creation of celebratory/simple landscape portraits, in the middle of a national liberation struggle, as a political act. As an article in *Chinese Literature* put it in 1974, "In feudal China paintings, whether of human figures, landscape or flowers and birds, reflected the life, views and sentiments of the feudal ruling class but ignored the major role of the labouring classes."(4) The bourgeoisie does not see anything wrong with producing art at the expense of the toiling masses, that has nothing to do with the masses' experience, that the masses will in most cases not be able to see or participate in, and that celebrates a beauty that comes with privilege and prosperity that they do not have.

Depictions of nature are no less political than depictions of people. There is reactionary landscape painting that celebrates the mystical beauty of nature, and, in a different context, there

is landscape painting that celebrates "the victory of socialist man over nature." (20)

Rather than understand all art as political, but with different political lines attached, the bourgeoisie looks at the people's art, which explicitly champions that liberation struggle with portraits of heroic figures defeating imperialism, as introducing politics into an otherwise purely aesthetic terrain. Mao debunked this lie at the Yanan Talks:

"In the world today all culture, all literature and art belong to definite classes and are geared to definite political lines. There is in fact no such thing as art for art's sake, art that stands above classes, art that is detached from or independent of politics. Proletarian literature and art are part of the whole proletarian revolutionary cause; they are, as Lenin said, cogs and wheels in the whole revolutionary machine." (5)

In the Talks, Mao explained that all classes in all class societies have both artistic and political criteria by which they judge art — and all classes put the political criteria first. This the bourgeoisie will never admit, but it is constantly shutting out, censoring and destroying proletarian art no matter how high the artistic merit or quality. There is no clearer proof of this hypocrisy than the mountain of Western literature denouncing the destruction of feudal and bourgeois art during the Cultural Revolution — a time when a tremendous amount of art was encouraged and created *among the people*.

For example, in an exhibition about post-Mao Chinese art, bourgeois Western art historian Joan Cohen claims that the so-called Gang of Four wanted to destroy "all" art, and that "all" art creation between 1966 and 1972 "ceased." She later admits that there was art created "for propaganda purposes" but doesn't evaluate its merit, proving Mao's admonition that all classes put politics ahead of artistic criteria. (6) Finally, the bourgeois scholar rejects the policy adopted during the Cultural Revolution of "making the foreign serve China" by rejecting the proletarian "politicization" of art as lacking in technical merit.

BOURGEOIS ART VS. PROLETARIAN ART

In an e-mail exchange MIM had with someone seriously grappling with Maoism, the correspondent asked us if there was ever an instance in which art should be considered separate from politics. MIM responded:

"We must be dialectical materialists in our evaluation of art as of anything. Our task as Marxist-Leninist-Maoists is to analyze the world for the purposes of applying that knowledge to revolutionary struggle and the building of a new society — one based not on oppression and profit but on human need and equality. In contrast to the internal ideology of Western, classical art, Maoists do not view art as a separate endeavor from other fronts of human struggle. It is one front on which the class struggle is carried out.

The bourgeoisie promotes the study of aesthetics by pro-

moting the myth that emotions, feelings, and appreciations for art and culture can transcend class relationships and consciousness. So they would say that there is "good art" separate from these relationships, and that appreciation thereof comes from some transcendental consciousness which is not determined by being, as in the Marxist formulation. In other words, the evaluative criteria for art is just as contingent on social and historical circumstances as the production of the art in the first place.

"The difference between bourgeois art and proletarian art can be looked at as the difference between the celebration of abstract ideas of love, freedom, human nature — and materialist formulations of these concepts, which are rooted in human struggle. Maoists are not trying to subordinate art to political struggle — rather, we see art as a component of political struggle. So we apply political criteria to its judgment."

The bourgeoisie is constantly shutting out, censoring and destroying proletarian art no matter how high the artistic merit or quality.

Maoists also have a materialist view of the *process* of art creation, in contrast to the bourgeois, mystical view. The bourgeois view touted throughout history, and picked up by Lin Biao during the GPCR, is that "art comes with a flash of inspiration rather than deriving from and reflecting integration with the masses as the basic source for art." (22)

ART POLICY NOT DOGMA, BUT ARENA OF STRUGGLE

The 1942 Talks outlined some fundamental principles by which we understand art and literature, and in that speech Mao introduced the dialectics between remolding the old art forms and developing the new; as well as between the popularization of art and the raising of artistic standards. These were dynamic contradictions that would be applied with different emphases during the revolutionary struggle for state power, and during the mass campaigns such as the Hundred Flowers and the Cultural Revolution. Anti-Maoist critics, in their insistence that communism and Maoism are dogmatic ideologies, are forever looking for inconsistencies in the application of Maoist ideas in practice. Instead, they should understand that political line is applied to actual struggle, and that the meaning of art and literature is highly contextual.

Understanding this dialectic helps to explain the apparent contradiction between China's move to "destroy" old feudal art and art forms, and its sometime assertion that aspects of

China's national heritage were worth remaking into proletarian art forms that served the people. So in the 1942 talks, Mao explained:

"We should take over the rich legacy and the good traditions in literature and art that have been handed down from past ages in China and foreign countries, but the aim must still be to serve the masses of people. Nor do we refuse to utilize the literary and artistic forms of the past, but in our hands these old forms, remoulded and infused with new content, also become something revolutionary in the service of the people." (7)

During the Cultural Revolution on the other hand, a sharp class struggle against the forces of revisionism and capitalist restoration, art was more sharply scrutinized, and the leaders of the GPCR put less emphasis than before on the potential uses of China's pre-Revolutionary artistic legacy, and more on new forms created by the people. It is not true, however, that they ignored those older art forms, and in fact they aggressively promoted uses of older art forms to serve the people.

In the 1972 National Art Exhibition the painting "Newcomer to the Mine," a painting with proletarian content, was praised:

"because it successfully blended Chinese traditional painting techniques and certain methods of Western painting, in particular that of depicting light and the use of perspective, and [the artist] 'develops the broad strokes of Chinese traditional painting to bring out the girl's pride at become a miner against the background of morning sunshine.'" (21)

GPCR leaders were also more critical of art created during the Hundred Flowers Campaign and in the early 60s, insisting on a higher standard of proletarian politics during this time of heightened political struggle.

Similarly, the sending of artists to the countryside to live and work among the people was applied to varying degrees in revolutionary China. At Yenan, Mao was insistent that:

"If our writers and artists who come from the intelligentsia want their works to be well received by the masses, they must change and remould their thinking and their feelings. Without such a change, without such remoulding, they can do nothing well and will be misfits." (8)

Although artists had been sent to live among the people before the GPCR, according to Arnold Chang in *Painting in the People's Republic of China: The Politics of Style*, the focus had been on them gathering materials, rather than submerging themselves in the lives and work of the people and genuinely remolding their thinking. "Now writers and artists were sent to factories, rural areas, and the armed forces, for periods of one-third to one-half year at a time, to toil alongside the people. It was reported in 1966 that 160,000 literary and art workers were living among the people." (9)

Artists' exposure to physical labor enhanced their under-

standing of their new society and thus improved their art. Furthermore, during the early 1970s, "young artists and old often went directly to factories or to farms to live and work with workers and peasants and to seek their criticisms for their paintings of worker and peasant life and heroes." (23)

People who complain about sending artists or other intellectuals to work in the countryside reveal their contempt for the masses whose lives are characterized by this work. They thus reveal their contempt for the masses' suffering.

ART CREATED OR DESTROYED; A CLASS PERSPECTIVE

From the 1919 May Fourth Movement through the Cultural Revolution, communists aggressively promoted artistic production. At about the time of the Great Leap Forward, when the Party was strongly emphasizing self-reliance, "was the promotion of amateur literary and artistic activity among the masses themselves. Spare-time writing, drama, music, and art groups were established to encourage the people to create their own art." (10) During the GPCR, "painting was especially encouraged among workers, peasants and soldiers." (11) Worker and peasant art was both encouraged and widely exhibited throughout revolutionary China.

That communists encouraged art among the people the bourgeoisie will begrudgingly admit. But in their mystical worship of "natural talent" — which is in fact the product of particular education and training — they focus on the loss of art from artists being integrated into the productive labor of building socialism, and disparage the outpouring of new art from a population previously shut out of artistic production.

GPCR China was a dictatorship of the proletariat over the formerly-exploiting classes. Just as the big landlords and bourgeoisie were repressed and prevented from exploiting the masses, some artists were repressed and prevented from glorifying the masses' exploitation. We also have no basis to deny that some art was outright destroyed during the GPCR. But instead we emphasize that in pre-revolutionary China, art and literature were absolutely restricted terrains that the majority of people were totally locked out of. They couldn't view, create or learn traditional art, and there should be no tears shed when this entire aspect of society is turned upside down to genuinely incorporate the feelings and criticisms of the people.

What the anti-Maoist Western accounts of art destruction also fail to mention is that art sequestered inside landlord's private houses was effectively "destroyed" — if no one but the private owner could view it and it served no social good, and only served to heighten the class contradictions between the disfranchised old ruling class and the people. The crime is not in destroying hidden art, it is first in the circumstances of its creation — an unequal society in which some have access to the creative arts and others do not — and in the profit-making and hiding of the art from the broad masses of people.

The anti-Maoists also portray the Cultural Revolution art policies as tightly controlled and dictated exclusively by Jiang Qing. In fact, like the rest of the Cultural Revolution, art policy

was developed through mass struggle and the application of the mass line. Jiang also had mass support among the proletarian pole of the artistic community. "On November 28, 1966, at a massive rally of more than 20,000 literary and art workers held in Beijing to repudiate the bourgeois reactionary art line, Jiang Qing was appointed advisor on cultural work to the Chinese People's Liberation Army." (12)

The notion that everything old and foreign was censored or destroyed is also bourgeois hype. As Mao stressed in 1942, the old and the foreign elements in art should serve the people. They should be transformed, as all of society was being transformed, into socialism and eventually communism. During the GPCR, there were five "model revolutionary operas" that had Jiang's official approval, all of which were performed in Beijing during 1967 — the 25th anniversary of the Yanan Talks. According to Liang, "the Western music and staging incorporated into the operas were evidence of making the foreign serve China." (13)

Finally, the production of these revolutionary operas was thoroughly proletarianized by the incorporation of the "three-levels" of participation that were adhered to in the army and in the factories during the GPCR. The three levels were: the Party, the "experts" (writers, actors, musicians) and the "masses, who served as teachers and critics." (14) Taking an art form traditionally revered for its lack of change, and transforming it into revolutionary content with mass participation and continuous improvement was a substantial contribution to revolutionary practice.

Bourgeois art historian Joan Cohen admits that paintings labeled counterrevolutionary were not summarily destroyed but exhibited — "in official art galleries in major cities. Long explanatory labels listed counterrevolutionary elements in the paintings." (15) Liang writes that during the Cultural Revolution, "art exhibitions were vast in scope and were attended in record numbers." (16) Compare this practice with the wholesale censorship of subversive or revolutionary art under capitalism — as bourgeois and corporate sponsors of museums will simply not fund art which challenges the political status quo.

THE RENT COLLECTION COURTYARD

Modern bourgeois concepts of "interactive museums" are laughable compared to the advanced application of the mass line during the GPCR in the arts. In 1965, the provincial leadership assigned "a group of sculptors from the Sichuan Institute of Fine Arts" to create a giant sculpture garden, with life sized figures depicting peasants bringing rent to the tyrannical landlord. The Rent Collection Courtyard was created, produced and installed in the courtyard of a landlord's old mansion, which had been converted into a people's museum (17) to educate the masses about the transforming social order.

According to Liang, whose book does not uphold Maoism but at least takes it seriously:

"The sculptors listened to comments and criticisms of the local peasantry, who often stopped by to see how the work was going. The peasants, some of whom had actually been tenants of this landlord, described the grim real-life situation in the old days, and they suggested ways of improving the figures, such as the use of glass eyes to provide a more realistic facial expression. Thus, the sculptors were educated politically and artistically by the masses. The sculptural panorama also satisfied the demand to make the old serve the new because the figures utilized traditional techniques once used for making religious images." (18)

This participation of the peasantry in the creation of art of high technical merit enfranchised a previously "inarticulate" population and gave them national representation. In the case of the Rent Collection Courtyard, the party gave it wide publicity by photographing the sculptures and exhibiting them throughout China. Again, with the input of soldiers, workers, cadre, peasants and Red Guards who saw the photographs, the work was improved upon and changed. (19)

Only the bourgeoisie, desperate to discredit developing socialism and preserve capitalism and semi-feudalism, could study this period of the masses' heightened political and social activity and complain about the repression that was part of it. The masses are not out for blood and are not out to harm the bourgeois intellectuals, because the oppressed understand better than anyone what it means to impose violence on people. For this reason the proletariat would never call the GPCR "violent" in comparison with other historical periods, and MIM will not allow the bourgeoisie to go unchallenged in its slander of this period of great proletarian political and artistic freedom in China.

Notes:

1. "Talks at the Yanan Forum on Literature and Art" (May 1942), in *Selected Readings from the Works of Mao Zedong*, Peking: Foreign Language Press, 1971, p. 258.
2. Yanan Forum, p. 265.
3. Yanan Forum, p. 266.
4. Ellen Johnston Liang, *The Winking Owl: Art in the People's Republic of China*. University of California Press, 1988, p. 72. emphasis MIM's
5. Yanan Forum, p. 271.
6. Joan Lebold Cohen, *Painting the Chinese Dream: Chinese Art Thirty Years After the Revolution*. Northampton, Mass. 1982, p. 6.
7. Yanan Forum, p. 259.
8. Yanan Forum, p. 255.
9. Arnold Chang, *Painting in the People's Republic of China: The Politics of Style*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1980, p. 43.
10. Chang, p. 16.
11. Chang, p. 41.
12. Liang, p. 60.
13. Liang, p. 61.
14. Liang, p. 61.
15. Cohen, p. 6.
16. Liang, p. 65.
17. Liang, p. 62.
18. Liang, p. 62.
19. Liang, p. 62.
20. Liang, p. 80.
21. Liang, p. 76.
22. Liang, p. 82.
23. Liang, p. 76.

Inside an American Public High School

This was submitted to MIM by an East Coast high school student—ed.

I attend a public high school in a medium-sized city on the East Coast, and have attended this school for three years. The student body consist of rich whites, poor blacks and Hispanics, and a mix of foreign kids. It is a medium-sized school, of maybe two thousand kids for four, and its curriculum includes not only regular high school courses, but also Advanced Placement (for college) classes, technical training (e.g., auto body and electronics), vocational training (e.g., cosmetics, hotel management), honors classes, etc. This author's experience has been primarily in honors and AP academic classes, plus the regular stuff (Gym et al), and discussion will be limited to what I have personally experienced.

My public high school demonstrates the ways in which America's white ruling class keeps its internal colonies under firm submission, and indoctrinates its own children with racist, classist, imperialist ideology in order to mold good soldiers (drones) fit to protect America's fascist regime.

The teachers in my school, especially for academic subjects, are whites. Despite propaganda promoting shallow "multiculturalism" by many, the curriculum remains the same old spiel of Eurocentrism, which extends into all areas of study, including History, Science, Art, English, foreign languages, etc. Students are expected to cough up the accepted bourgeois ideology, or face flunking and perhaps disciplinary action.

Perhaps the most overt arena for bourgeois indoctrination is History classes. In ninth grade, one learns world history, focusing on Europe and the Middle East (whose heritage "whites" lay claim to), while skirting over and downplaying the civilizations of Asia and Africa, and barely mentioning the Americas. No mention is given of the non-settled, orally transmitted, egalitarian hunter-gatherer cultures of the world, which are given the usual bourgeois treatment as "primitive uncivilized savages", undeserving of study. The course concentrates on giving as few concessions as possible to non-European people for the creation of Western culture. Although the European Renaissance is taught as springing from Europe's contact with the Middle East (which is not mentioned as being under the rule of Saracens from a Turanian nomadic culture), no mention is made of the fact that Chinese civilization easily surpassed all others technologically until the last few centuries. The white teachers also try to downplay, or, more commonly, outright ignore or lie about, the "shameful" parts of their history (which happen to be the majority of their history), such as the holocaust Christianization inflicted on Europe (not to mention

Africa, Polynesia, America...). Emphasis is always on the "geniuses" and "great rulers" (read: fascist oppressors) of history, such as Akhnaton, Peter the Great, etc., and history is always taught from the perspective of monarchs, and, later, the bourgeoisie; in other words, the oppressor. Even Hitler is called a "genius", albeit an "evil" one. Students are taught to criticize aspects of other cultures, for example, why the caste system of India "didn't work", but this escape-goatist criticism is never directed at the sacred cows of modern Western culture, and only serves to further imbue Eurocentrist bourgeois ideology. Needless to say, Marxism is taught as some sort of a quack ideology, despite the fact that Marx's economic predictions exceed, in scope of time and accuracy, any predictions by any other economists or school of economics.

Eleventh-grade US History is no different, although the college textbook used in AP classes gives a more frank discussion of this culture's "dirty laundry" than high school texts. Even so, classes are steeped in idealist Americanism and "our great American heritage", despite the fact that many students to not even come from an Anglo-American background. First Nations are discussed vaguely, but are treated as of tertiary importance, and their systematic extermination at the hands of America is treated as a series of "accidents." Great care is taken not to blemish the sterling reputation of Amerikkka's Great Heroes, who are not to be held accountable for the actions. The course gives the impression that 500 nations of indigenous North American peoples must have slipped on a banana peel, or maybe tripped and poked their eye out with a tomahawk. Slavery is treated as the vice of evil Southerners, which the good Northerners did their damn-diddily-damndest to put an end to, as if America did not built its entire economic base on the forced labor of black slaves. No mention (much less protest) is made of how right now in 1997, third-world workers endure slave-like conditions as bad or worse as those endured by American blacks before the Emancipation Proclamation. Instead of teaching these basic facts of American history, entire class periods are spent on the sordid petty trifling details of Thomas Jefferson's alleged affair with his slave Sally Hemmings.

Seniors learn "US Government", which discusses law etc. The establishment uses this class to fill students' heads full of capitalist, imperialist, and pro-American jingoist propaganda of the glories of "freedom" in America. Although I have not taken this class, I doubt they teach the United States' long history of consistent oppression and non-application of the so-called rights delineated in the US Constitution, or the system

of imperialist capitalist exploitation used to secure this so-called freedom.

Another prime area of blatant Eurocentrism and racism is English classes. Students go through school without ever being taught formal English (i.e., White-Anglo-Saxon-Protestant-Oppressor-ish) grammar, and then are penalized in high school for not knowing it. This is an excuse to flunk non-white students, who do not usually grow up speaking WASP English, and therefore do not know it. Of course, there is not requirement for white kids to learn a foreign language in order to get a diploma. (If there was justice, white kids would be required to pass mandatory Ebonics classes, where they would be penalized for incorrect use of "motherfucker" and misspelling "honkey"). Classes focus on Western literature taught from an Anglo-WASP perspective, (Anglo-)American literature, and Anglo-English literature. Students must write essays and pass tests based on regurgitation of the bourgeois WASP interpretation of literature (which is not even recognized to be subjective), and are passed or failed based on their ability to agree with the teacher's racist imperialist honkey opinions and interpretations of literature. This can snare even WASP kids once in a while, but is a formidable obstacle to non-whites, who must psyche out the teacher (think like an Anglo) in order to make the grade. Very few are able to do this, and the difficulty is proportional to the student's cultural similarity to American whites, which promotes racist ideas that equate intelligence with whiteness and the "genius" of acting like a Great White God.

Foreign language classes are another way of white America to promote its political agenda and imperialist values. Foreign languages are not required for a diploma, but many students take them in order to "look good" for college. The three basic foreign languages taught are Spanish, French, and Latin, all European languages, all languages widespread due to imperialist expansion and oppression. Despite the large number of Hispanics in the area, most Spanish classes are taught by white teachers who speak Spanish as a second language. Latin students learn the glories of imperialism and classism, and French students learn an obscure and virtually useless language which gave us the "bourgeoisie." Secondary languages are German and Japanese, two more empire languages. German apologist teachers sweep Nazism under the rug and teach despicable German culture with nary a mention of Avars, Tatars, Khazars, Marx, or Engels, while promoting such "Germans" as Friedrich Nietzsche and Albert Einstein. No courses are taught for Chinese or Russian, despite the fact that these two languages are spoken by one third of the world's population, let alone African, Native American, or other non-Western-European (i.e., oppressor) languages.

Perhaps the establishment's most insidious method of pushing their ideology is through Biology class. Here students are supposedly taught "objective" and "scientific" (hence, unquestionable) "facts", and the ruling class takes full advantage of this opportunity to indoctrinate students with bourgeois ideology. Students are taught that some animals and traits are objectively "better" or "worse" than others, for example, that an insect's vascular system is "inferior" to a human's, despite the fact that insects far outnumber humans. This is bourgeois ide-

alist humanism, and projects classist ideals onto nature, without regard to material reality. Teachers also speak of "race" as if it is a biological reality (instead of a social construct arising from power struggles), and how certain human traits, such as musculature, are "better" than others. *When taken together with the rest of the school's curriculum, these ideas unavoidably add up to racist white supremacy!* This is Nazi ideology being taught right here in America's public schools!

This sort of intellectual tripe and hateful fascist ideology is taught in all classes throughout the school curriculum, in various degrees. But fascist racist oppression in school does not stop there. There are many small, individual actions that combine to create a hate-filled racist, fascist atmosphere in

the school. While teachers are banned from making overt racial epithets, they vent their petty hate on other targets; the currently favored punching bags are gays and fat people. This demonstrates their desire to oppress people whenever they are able; if hate speech against fat people and gays is banned, the bullies will be sure to find new targets. The whole administration consists of mostly white males, and the most oppressive individuals naturally join the ranks of the most piggish and swinely jobs, where they can sign away student's lives if it pleases them, trumping up charges on select targets if they so desire. Some of the most swinely teachers also vent their racism on students, provoking fights and then punishing students who talk back, and often effectively railroading them out of school and thus ruining their lives. The school code is also covertly racist, with its puritanical dress codes, rules against "foul" language, etc. These rules are the prudish social norms for the most WASP-y white people, and their application in a public school whose student body is dominated by non-whites merely demonstrates who really has the power here.

Another way that the school system keeps oppressed nations down and rewards white nation youth is through college admissions. Although nowadays colleges make a big fuss about how they are "multicultural" and whatnot, they remain places for the white elite. They do this through their admissions policies. There are many things that are said to "look good" on college applications, and they all come down to either being a white oppressor, or acting like one. For example,

**'This is
Nazi
ideology
being taught
right here
in America's
public
schools!'**

joining organizations such as the "Key Club" is a "sure thing" to "look good" to college admissions people. Key Club is an organization where rich white kids and their lackeys give token pennies to "charity" etc, which usually consists of raising money for their own bourgeois scum pastimes, such as The Prom, Homecoming, etc. Other activities encouraged by guidance counselors are sports teams (male bully oppression gangs and closet homosexual support groups), cheerleading squad (female exploitation rings), National Honor Society (bourgeois fascist classism clubs), etc. Entrance to "Honor" societies depends on demonstrating "Character", "Leadership", etc; in other words, ability to be a good kiss up to the fascist establishment. Spending (wasting) one's free time in these organizations demonstrates that one is a "well-rounded" student to college admissions boards. Poor (which usually means oppressed nations) students who are forced to work after school do not have time for such activities even if they have the will to endure them. This is one BIG way the fascist establishment makes sure bourgeois white elites are the first ones to get into college.

To be fair, there are many teachers and administrators who are not racist etc., and are very nice and liberal people. But the fact remains that the system itself is just one more arm of the fascist, racist, imperialist system that dominates this country, and outstanding individuals might make things nicer, but they do not solve the inherent problem of the system. The fact remains that non-whites in America must either kiss up or kiss off; they are not permitted to be themselves and at the same time prosper, and even if they do put on nice honkey clothes and an ass-licking grin, they are still spat on, shit on, and fucked over by the system.

MIM RESPONDS:

Thank you for this important essay. We hope you will send us more writing on this subject. Below are some comments that explain where we partly disagree with what you have written.

MIM disagrees with the characterization of Amerika's regime as "fascist." Although there are strong fascist elements among Amerikans, we do not define the government or system as fascist at this time. See MIM Theory 11 for a more detailed discussion of fascism, using the prison system as its catalyst. That does not mean the government is not an imperialist and oppressive one.

We do not disagree with calling Hitler a "genius," as long as it's clear he was an evil genius. However, the greater point is that it is the masses who make history, not individual leaders, geniuses or otherwise — as Hitler's ultimate failure makes clear. As the masses make history, the individuals who appear

to take the lead will often appear to be geniuses or otherwise unusually capable.

We also disagree with the sarcastic depiction of Ebonics as a language based on insults and slang. As we explained in MIM Theory 7, Blacks in North America have an independent language, which is both similar to and different from other English-based languages.

We believe it is important for North American students to study foreign languages. However, we do not disagree with the choice of imperialist languages offered. Precisely because imperialism has popularized French and Spanish, they are important to learn. As the basis of French, Spanish, English, and more, Latin is also valuable. We do not think French is "obscure and virtually useless." Besides "bourgeoisie," of course, it also gave us — via the French Revolution — "proletariat." More importantly, French is spoken in Canada, France, Belgium, and many parts of the Caribbean, Africa, and Asia. For that matter, we also think it is important to learn English, despite its imperialist baggage — and we also change these languages in our own usage to make various points in opposition to the dominant use of the language.

Likewise, although German and Japanese are empire languages, they are also both useful to learn. If MIM had fluent speakers and writers in all these languages, MIM and the whole international communist movement would be better off. We have to work with the realities that we have, and one of them is that the imperialists control the major languages on the planet. Although you are correct that Russian and Chinese would be good additions, we can't fault the school's choices all things considered. On the question of language selection, this high school is reflecting reality more than it is shaping it.

On science, we don't think all of your derisive quotation marks are deserved. The study and teaching of science is definitely not value-free. Nonetheless, the teaching of science except by creationists inevitably includes plenty of genuinely objective and scientific facts. We agree that it does not make sense to describe humans as "better" than insects, but it would be correct to describe humans as "more complex," and to make distinctions based on that difference.

We think that overall teachers are among the more honorable of the professionals under imperialism, so we resist blanket condemnations. In fact, although it is true that the education system is an arm of the oppressive system, we also find that it is porous and inefficient enough that it makes progressive inroads on a small scale possible. If you're not going to work full time for the revolution, or get a high-paying job to earn cash for the revolution, we think teaching is an honorable choice.

**The U.\$
government
is imperialist
and
oppressive,
but it is
not fascist
at this time.**

An Anarchist Critique of Education

by Otis

This information is meant to serve two purposes: 1) To disperse the ignorant misconception that Anarchy is a chaotic, selfish, and violent way to live, and 2) to help people who already consider themselves to be anti-authoritarian recognize and practice the respectful compassionate ethics of everyday living that help forward the revolutionary struggle. The viewpoints are not meant to represent any vague manifesto as to world view and can hardly be said to represent the view of even one, evolving, anarchist. This is not mere theory about a better world that will or will not arise, but more rooted in the practices of the just and egalitarian people that dwell within the inequitable and oppressive capitalist system as it stands today.

These views about anarchist learning are intentionally somewhat vague and I probably did not address all the atrocities of school that need to be shattered. The important thing is that school should be about learning. School need not be a building or even a collection of people. It should, however, be a process of growth for youth in which they can learn how to respect other living creatures and the earth in which they live. Alternative schooling need not wait for the abolishment of government, it is possible and necessary now. Many kids dread school and the endless repression they endured "for their own benefit." Why should something as genuine and beautiful as knowledge be turned against the innocent?

INSTITUTIONALIZATION

Being an institution means carrying on distracting concerns such as profit, funding, order, discipline, etc. and often denying the real purpose. We will give "educational" facilities the benefit of the doubt and say that they truly intend to expand the minds of their children. But, in reality, this concept exists only in the fairy tale land of "liberty and justice for all." Being a "good" little boy or girl is synonymous with silence, repression, fear, intimidation and shame - not learning. With the ROTC's signing up innocent youth for warfare, the true purpose of institutionalized learning becomes clear: *obey*. With mindless obedience, armed

guards, metal detectors, random locker searches, and so on, the secondary goals of profit and order, become primary and all inclusive. Instead of recognizing and celebrating the wonder and creativity of children, schools shame them for their imperfections, their curiosity (ironically, an impulse to learn) and often for the parents' neglect and abuse.

To teach children without coercing them or condescending to them is quite basic, simply because learning is quite basic. It is our natural tendency to explore, to observe, and understand the world around us. Each of us learns at an individual level, with individual interests (for some math is enthralling, for others it is mere rote, etc.). In an anti-authoritarian place of learning, youth would be at all times recognized as free and worthy humyn beings. Teachers would be people to bounce questions

off of, guides into the mysterious earth that is foreign to children. As for order and discipline, the ethical practice of mutual respect would be upheld. Acceptance, and understanding build whole, and self confident people. The students would be taught the lessons of self-reliance, but also the ideals of compassion and giving.

INDOCTRINATION

From day one the school works to instill certain values in children, shaping and molding small minds into servants of the status quo. From day one the tradition of "learning" begins with the humiliating joke of the pledge of allegiance. The children are not taught what the words coming from their mouths mean, they are merely taught to recite them. Psychologists have determined that it takes children to about age eight to grasp abstract concepts such as the pledge, yet by eight they are perfectly willing to recite it and 100% ignorant of its definition. By the time they do learn what they are pledging, they have no motivation to change their lifelong process of obedience. School then continues this general pattern for 13 years. While male history omits, twists, or completely rebuilds the truth to serve the interests of the society. Passive acceptance is key and it is ensured through the pressure of tests and other hierarchical practices. The process of "learn/repeat, learn/repeat" leaves students too numb to even consider true knowledge. The important thing is a slot in corporate america.

From day one the school works to instill certain values in children, shaping and molding small minds into servants of the status quo.

It should be clear to most people that not everyone wants a "secure" job. Not everyone wants to pledge allegiance, and so on. Knowledge should not be an oppressive tool, it should be liberating and invigorating. Truth is almost strictly subjective, thus one-sided education is the same as brainwashing. It leaves students *more* ignorant, not less. The cure then, is obvious – teach as many sides of the truth as possible. This goes for religion, history, sexuality, politics, economics, nutrition, and well, everything. Although reading is extremely useful for enlightenment, it does not and cannot replace direct experience. Also, by exposing the world to children, their uniqueness and perceptual differences are respected and enhanced.

COMPETITION AND APATHY

The two go hand in hand. When students are taught to view their peers not as separate and special individuals but rather as competitors, they learn not to care about the rest. Children learn to rank and isolate themselves. Tests, supposedly instilled to encourage excellence merely reinforce the society's need for inequity and oppression. Children learn to fit into constraining classifications, numbers and letters. They lose appreciation of their own self worth because their existence is centered around being "better" than the rest. Why, with such diversity among the humyn race would this be so? Essentially the roots of this dehumanization lie in the capitalist ideal. The

misconception that life is rankable, and basically has little purpose above the profit value of the working body.

Anarchist education would work to instill respect and understanding of other people. Children naturally associate with people of all races, sexes and so forth, just out of curiosity. Their free association is a process of warmth and sharing – often peers are excellent teachers due to their natural similarities. Children would learn strictly at their own rate, for their own benefit.

MC12 RESPONDS:

This essay has the pitfalls and some of the progressive ideas of anarchists. Otis would have schools stop trying to impose "truth" on students and just let their "natural" interests, cooperative spirit, and so on, come out from where it is now being suppressed.


There are several fundamental mistakes here. First is the attribution of the evils perpetrated on children to "institutions" without an analysis of their class basis. There is no institution that is not a class (and gender) institution. So from this essay there is no way to tell the difference between capitalist schools in the U.S. and socialist schools in China in 1971. Is there no difference? Both sought to teach values. Does that make them both equally bad "institutions"? This is one recurring problem with anarchism, and one of the big reasons why it can never get anywhere as a liberation movement. As soon as someone recognizes the need to set up schools and teach children new ways of thinking, the anarchists cry "institution!" and go back to the woods.

And what of children's "natural" goodness and interests? The first time children grow up with no social contact at all, we will be able to tell what their "natural" inclinations are. This has yet to occur in human history, so anyone who wants to can claim that children are "naturally" the way we want them to be, if only "institutions" would leave them alone. This is in fact abdication of leadership, another recurring trait of anarchist analysis. Rather than recognize that in any society there are many pressures on children to learn and do certain things – pressures which emerge from hierarchies of the society – the anarchists want to just leave them alone, to only help them do what they "naturally" want to do. That ignorant approach leaves children – or anyone else – at the whim of the pre-existing power and culture. Anyone who daydreams that truth is "subjective" will never be able to combat the hardcore reactionary institutions that oppose the liberation of children.

The anarchist critique of bourgeois schools is of course correct on many points. But the anarchist suggestion for practice is a useless regurgitation of idealism, doomed to a repetitive cycle of failure/blame others, failure/blame others. MIM wants to cut that cycle short, and encourages anarchists like this writer to study and struggle with MIM to find the best way *forward* from here, rather than argue over the best utopia – and then wait for communists to get the ball rolling in that direction.

Find Out More Get MIM Theory 8 'The Anarchist Ideal & Communist Revolution'

and read MIM's in-depth treatment of the anarchist movement as well as anarchist winds within the communist movement. Historical articles, reviews, and polemics make this a must-read for the anarchist debate. Send \$6 to the address on the inside cover.



The Culture of Education in China's GPCR

The culture of education is one of the most important institutions to attack when talking about building a revolutionary society because this is the training ground of the future leaders of society. During the Cultural Revolution Mao Zedong said "teachers should not only teach and students learn, but they should learn from each other" (p 141).

In China students were encouraged to criticize their teachers during the Cultural Revolution. This served to break down the divide between teacher and student which had previously held teachers far above their students. The teachers had been trained to expect special privileges and students spent considerable time during the Cultural Revolution attacking this privilege. This went along with the general attacks on "experts" who supposedly know all there is to know in their fields. Instead, China encouraged students to learn from experience and for teachers and students to learn from one another.

The importance of being amongst the students and not leading a life separate from them was evidenced by the experience of the young teachers relative to the older teachers during the Cultural Revolution. While the old teachers were defending their privilege, criticizing the radical students, and waiting for the return of Confucianism, the young teachers were still living in dormitories with the students and did not enjoy many privileges as teachers. Many of these younger teachers joined in the struggles against bourgeois ideas alongside the students.

Another important lesson about education was the value of learning through practice. Many people think of the Cultural Revolution as a time when education stopped: at times schools suspended classes and students were sent to the countryside or to factories to work. But in fact, students probably learned more during this time than they did while in their traditional classes. Classes were suspended in times of heated political struggle so that students could devote all their time to studying and struggling over ideas with one another and with members of other social groups. During this time recreational activities were even suspended. This was a period of intense learning in the truest sense of the word.

Similarly, the journeys to the countryside were not breaks from learning but rather important educational experiences. Students in the countryside spent time working alongside the peasants and also joining in study and struggle meetings after work. They were able to put their book learning into practice where the lessons were applicable to the working of the villages. But they were also able to learn something they could not get in the classes: about the lives of the peasants, the struggles they endured, and the ways they as students could con-

tribute to these struggles. Frequently the students would be put in the role of educator in the villages, helping to lead the peasants into freely criticizing their leaders who had strayed from the revolutionary path. But just as often, the students were humbled by the tragic stories of the peasants' lives and the heroic strength with which they approached their revolutionary tasks.

Today in Amerika we can see how education has become a reactionary tool for indoctrinating the youth. Speaking out in disagreement with a teacher is usually considered disrespectful. Earning good grades is often a test of how well a student can memorize what a teacher or book has said, rather than learning to think critically about the world. While there are some teachers who deserve credit for encouraging their students to think critically, this is not the norm for education nor is it what is stressed in the schools of education where teachers are trained.

A more correct approach to education would not place the teacher in a role superior to the students but instead would understand that all people can learn from one another. A teacher in one class should expect to learn from his/her students and may be a student in another class. While one individual may have more extensive knowledge of a subject than others, there is no way to pour this knowledge from one brain into another. And even if there were, this would not be ideal because the importance of ideas is in their application. Without applying and constantly challenging ideas, we would become dogmatists, just as the old teachers in revolutionary China.

In a revolutionary school students should be teaching one another, working in groups and learning together through struggle and practice. This model can apply to the study of computer programming as well as it can to study of political theory. Teachers might play a more useful role facilitating the work of the class and serving as a resource person who already has a lot of experience and knowledge in the field. A teacher in one field may be a student in another and this would further equalize the relations between students and teachers and promote the idea of people learning from their peers rather than learning from their "superiors."

But this model of education that Maoism set out in China cannot be successful without a complete restructuring of society. Although it is possible for individual teachers and schools to challenge their students to learn through practice and to learn from one another, it is not possible for teachers or students to escape from the culture of imperialism while living under an imperialist system. Even for an individual teacher in

the public schools, straying from the prefabricated curriculum that requires students to "learn" certain facts they will be required to use the next year may mean that their students do poorly the next year. In this way, the current system punishes creative teachers who strive to challenge their students to think critically and learn interesting material. Similarly, the current educational system enforces strong divisions between teachers and students so that even calling a teacher by his/her first name is considered disrespectful.

Beyond these pressures on teachers placed by the educational system under imperialism, there is a bigger barrier to radically changing education under this system. This barrier is the

interests of imperialism in educating the people in both "facts" and practices conducive to capitalism. This means teaching youth about the superiority of individuals with knowledge, discouraging creative thinking, and reinforcing imperialist cultural norms.

Reforms to teaching practices under capitalism may improve the education of a few students but will not change the fact that in general they still must pass standardized tests, perform on meaningless scales, and have the right background, skin color, and accent in order to succeed.

Notes: *China's Socialist Revolution*, by John and Elsie Collier. Monthly Review Press: New York, 1973.

Globalization & Philippine Education

This essay was written by a member of the legal left in the Philippines. It is printed here with permission from the author.

THE COLONIZATION OF PHILIPPINE EDUCATION

Education in the Philippines has been controlled by foreign interest from its colonial period up to the present. During the Spanish colonial era, schools were under the dictation of the religious orders and curricula were directed towards perpetuating and propagating the Catholic faith. Though the 1863 Education Decree was issued by the liberal-minded governor general Carlos Maria de la Torre, requiring compulsory elementary education and the teaching of Spanish in all school, the friars were able to easily subvert this policy.

When the United States subjugated the Islands at the turn of the century, it established a public education, which justifies and molded the Filipinos to emulate American rule. The Americans recognized the crucial role of education in turning a people to become a subservient race; thus, they required the teaching of their language and made English the medium of instruction in all school. The first batch of American educators, the Thomasites, because hundreds of them were transported in a ship called Thomas, imbibed on the Filipinos the American ideology of liberal democracy, which emphasized the value of individualism. Such value was antithetical to the principle of collective democracy with its strong social commitment, the solid basis of the baranganic tradition of the Filipino masses, which served as the impetus of the 1896 Katipunan revolution, the first rebellion against foreign colonialism in Asia. Subsequently, Filipinos were trained to disseminate American values in teachers schools established by the U.S. colonial regime, such as the Philippine Normal College and the National Teachers College. Also an extensive scholarship program, called the pensionado system, was launched, which sent bright

Filipino students and the children of the elite to American universities in order for these people to inculcate US ideals on their countrymen when they go back home. (All [the author's] five uncles were grantees under this pensionado program.)

The U.S. systematically tried to stamp out all cultural legacies of the Philippine revolution through repressive measures. It passed the notorious Flag Act, which prohibited the exhibiting of the emblem used by the Katipunan on their flag, forbade the publication on and staging of anti-American nationalism. In this regard, American soldiers forcibly halted the nationalistic play "Kahapon, Ngayon at Bukas" written by Aurelio Tolentino and staged at the Old Opera Theater. US troopers arrested all the members of the cast of the play and sentenced Tolentino, under the Sedition Law, to life imprisonment in 1905.⁽¹⁾ To disseminate American culture in schools in lieu of the literature of the Philippine revolutionary period, Filipino students were exposed to the thoughts of Abraham Lincoln, Longfellow and other American writers.

The U.S. colonizers were fearful of the Filipino character, which they believed was more formidable than that of the Spaniards,⁽²⁾ and through the aforementioned repressive policies, they hoped to prevent the resurgence of Filipino fierce nationalism in order to carry out their plan of transforming the Philippines into a colonial agricultural economy. Corollary with their deliberate destruction of nationalist values, the U.S. gave priority to setting up agricultural and vocational schools in the Islands. Foremost among these schools were the U.P. Los Baños, founded in the same year (1909) when the U.S. Free Trade Law in the Philippines was passed by Washington, and the Munoz Agricultural School in Nueva Ecija, the largest school in the Islands to teach Filipino young men and women to be good farmers. The 1916 report of the Bureau of Education (now the Department of Education, Culture and

Sports) states that: "One of the most important developments of the educational system of recent years has been the success of the Munoz Agricultural School and plans are now under way of similar institutions in other parts of the islands. To carry on the interest thus being taken in agricultural work more than 300 boys and girls agricultural clubs are now in existence in the islands. Special attention was given to the gardening work of school children." (3)

Together with emphasizing agricultural schooling, the U.S. colonial regime geared Philippine education towards vocational subjects to produce graduate skilled in the making of products for exports like embroidered materials and other handicrafts, much wanted by American consumers. (4) In the overall, U.S. colonial program in education was to orient this sector to serve the export activities of American business in the Philippines. The educational superstructure being established by the US in the Islands aimed to produce Filipinos who uphold the values of American individualistic liberalism, but who are made to believe that the US economy is the saviour of backward agricultural societies like the Philippines. When the Philippine economy was turned into an appendage of that of the U.S., Filipino politicians and intellectuals who were educated in the American way, hailed this even as ushering a new era for the country.

Because of the strategic role of the Department of Education in maintaining the subservience of Filipino minds to American values, it was the last department to which a Filipino was appointed as head by the U.S. colonial administration. After the nominal granting of Philippine independence in 1946 by the US, the Philippine educational system was transformed into a neo-colonial conduit to mold the Filipino youth particularly to serve US monopoly capitalism. Year after year, Philippines schools turn out excess graduates, around 750,000 annually as of the last few years, who become a reserve army of cheap labor to transnational corporations, specifically American, doing business in the Philippines. Filipino skilled workers are also supplied to Transnational Corporations (TNCs) abroad, particularly in the Middle East. However, because of the large surplus labor produced every year by the Philippine educational system, unemployment continues to increase in the Islands, with the latest count at 30%, unemployed and underemployed. Filipino workers have also the second lowest wage in Southeast Asia.

GLOBALIZATION AND PHILIPPINE EDUCATION

Is the slogan that was foisted before the Filipino people during the American colonization of the Philippines was "benevolent assimilation" into modern civilization, the new shebolleth now is "globalization." After World War II, U.S. TNCs grew by leaps and bounds due to the fact that the American economy emerged relatively unscathed by the just concluded war. The U.S. government took advantage of the devastated conditions caused by the war to become supreme in world trade and investment through the capitalist institutions it primarily estab-

lished, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank (W.B.). But the mechanisms set up by the capitalist nations at Bretton Woods to regulate world trade and investment eventually broke down in 1971 due to the rapacious activities itself of American TNCs, which flower dollars out from the US territory to the Euromarket and the Third World in search of higher profits. With the intense aggressiveness of the giant U.S. monopolies in the late 1970s with their gobbling up of lesser companies and the crisis of overproduction which came soon after, U.S. TNCs turned to their government to push for a more stringent international trade treaty under GATT called the Uruguay Treaty. U.S. TNCs intend to penetrate more widely the markets of Europe and Japan through the eliminations of barriers to U.S. trade and investments. In the process, the Uruguay Treaty, which was formalized under the World Trade Organization (WTO) in 1995, replacing the GATT, would subsume the lesser economies of the Third World. The U.S. through the Uruguay Treaty was also zealous in protecting its technology through the so-called Trade Related Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) by threatening trade sanctions against countries it suspects of copying U.S. inventions. This is of course contrary to the avowed principle of "globalization" through free trade or trade without boundaries as espoused by WTO.

"Globalization" as a paradigm propagandized by American neo-liberal theoreticians in the 1980s is simply an economic tactic to pry open the markets of other countries, particularly the developing nations. The policy makers in the European Union and Japan, rivals of the U.S. in carving out economic enclaves in the world, do not take globalization seriously as they are aware of its original US intent. This is to be seen in the fact that in spite of WTO, the European Union and Japan have still remained hesitant to opening wider their markets to US surplus products, particularly agricultural. The APEC with Ramos assuming the role of leading bogeyman for the U.S. call for liberalization in trade and investment is only meant to secure U.S. hegemony in the Asia Pacific region vis-a-vis Japan and the European Union. However, Europe and Japan have rolled on the U.S. initiated rhetoric of "globalization" to also penetrate more effectively the economies of more gullible Third World governments like that of the Philippines.

Since the framework of globalization is a superstructural instrument of subjugation by a nation-state, which is the U.S. of weaker nations, it is in the educational sector where this concept is further refined and disseminated. It comes in varied forms as "global competitiveness," "the information highway," "the Third Wave Theory," "post modern society," and "the end of history." It is to be noted that all this welter of ideas was concocted by American neo-liberal intellectuals, who stand to profit from corporate dole outs through consultancies and study grants.

THE PHILIPPINE EDUCATION 2000

The Philippine government, ever obedient to U.S. prodding,

has launched its so-called Philippines 2000 to promote "global competitiveness" above all else. This is echoed in a subprogram dubbed Philippine Education 2000 with its 10-point agenda, also pushing for global competitiveness, which means the training of more skilled workers and technicians in Philippine schools. The Philippine national university, the University of the Philippines, has likewise formulated its own version of UP2008 (the U.P. was founded in the year 1908 by the U.S. colonial regime) to promote globalization among its constituents.

The Philippines, including its educational sector, is controlled by U.S. monopoly capital through loan politics. This task is accomplished by the IMF, the World Bank and a consortium of transnational banks, called the Paris Club, supervised by the W.B.. The IMF-WB in order to help resolve the crisis of overproduction as manifested in the ongoing recession wracking the international capitalist market, which started in the US economy in the late 1970s, have implemented their structural adjustment programs (SAPs), conditions for structural adjustment loans (SALs), in the Third World. SAPs basically require liberalization, deregulation, and privatization in a recipient country, which tri-policies benefit the TNCs in the host territory. SAPs also call for austerity measures by a government, which often affect appropriation for social services, in order for a borrower country to effectively amortize its loans to the IMF-WB and the TNBs.

As transplanted into the education sector, the tri-policies of deregulation, liberalization and privatization are expressed in the 10-point agenda of Education 2000 which will deregulate (spell reduce appropriation) the financial assistance to public schools through so-called fiscal autonomies (spell commercialize education), liberalize government supervision of private schools and privatize state colleges and universities to save on fiscal expenditures. In the primary and secondary schools, the power of the school principal will be increased to insure the orientation of Filipino education to "global competitiveness" (which means the training of a surplus Filipino manpower for foreign corporations to reduce their costs of production). While espousing the "upgrading of instruction to improve the quality of education (agenda 3), Education 2000 calls for the "organization of multigrade classes (MAC)" (agenda 4), which will further burden Filipino teachers, not allowing them time for research and socialization. In fact, laws to increase the number of working hours of public school teachers from 6 to 8 hours and school days from 185 to 220 per year have been passed.

To make the Filipinos a literate working force for foreign corporations, the teaching of English is again being given priority to like during colonial days in the Philippines. And to insure the effective implementation of Education 2000, the Congressional Commission on Education (COCED) approved the separation of supervision of (1) primary and secondary education under a Department of Basic Education or DBE; (2) tertiary education by a Commission on Higher Education or CHED; and (3) technical education by a Technical Education and Skills Development or TESDA.

THE WORLD BANK AND PHILIPPINE EDUCATION

The World Bank has been very active in turning Philippine education into one big factory that manufactures cheap labor since the 1970s. It finances the Educational Development Project Implementing Task (EDPITAF) created in 1972 under the martial law of Marcos to implement the proposals of the Presidential Commission to Survey Philippine Education (PCSPE) in turn (funded by Ford Foundation) to generate agricultural and technical manpower through foreign assisted educational projects totaling \$200.7 million. Among these were the establishments of training centers (10 in all) to assure foreign-owned industrial and agricultural enterprises of a ready supply of skilled workers, the integration of vocational and technical school in the Philippines into a National Polytechnic System, the production of textbooks geared to the values and needs of foreign business under the guise of "national development" and a ten-year program (1981-90), called PRODED, to orient elementary education for "on-the-job training as well as through agricultural and industrial extension programs" (in the words of then W.B. president Robert Macnamara.) The Education Act of 1982, the overall legal basis for the policy recommendations of the PCSPE, allowed private schools to increase tuition fees annually in an apparent big by the government to buy off these schools to implement their WB version of "national development." As of the present, the WB has earmarked \$200 million for Philippine education to gear it to global competitiveness.(5)

Education 2000 will surely lead to a continuous deterioration of Philippine education as was the case of all such similar educational programs in the past. It is to be noted that because of the lowering of the quality of Philippine education, even the Philippine Congress created the Congressional Commission on Education to examine the roots of this deterioration. This sad state of Philippine education can be attributed to the government shirking its primary obligation of advancing education to support a basically self-reliant nationalist industrialization and promoting a cultural identity for Filipinos. Instead of improving the quality of education through basic research and development, Education 2000 is just meant to provide more assembly line workers, technicians and managers for private corporations, notably US TNCs. It will also further emasculate the already impoverished Filipino teacher. A policy that sets a so-called "global competitiveness" in business as the primary aim of education and not the progress in the sciences and the arts of the Filipino people shall militate against genuine national development.

Notes:

1. R. Constantino, *A Past Revisited*, 1975, p.251.
2. Rear Admiral Bradley A. Fiske, U.S.N., *Wartime in Manila*, 1913, p. 64.
3. 1916 Report of the Governor General, U.S. Government
4. *Ibid.*
5. Monthly Operational Summary of Bank and IDA Proposed Projects (as of March 1996), World Bank.

Revolutionary culture in the Philippines

In 1942, Mao said, "To defeat the enemy we must rely primarily on the army with guns. But this army alone is not enough; we must also have a cultural army, which is absolutely indispensable for uniting our own ranks and defeating the enemy." Mao was talking about defeating the culture of feudalism and squashing the imperialist lackey comprador culture.

In 1997, the Filipino masses are waging a fierce struggle against imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism propped up by U.S. imperialism. This struggle is being waged in all spheres of society with a high level of unity among the masses and with a pinpoint focus. The highest form of struggle is armed struggle waged by the peasants in the countryside. The support for this struggle is seen in the focus on mass work both in the countryside and in the urban areas. Besides organizing the masses to meet their needs which the Manila government ignores, activists organize the masses to extend their specific struggles to fighting against imperialism entire.

Creative activists organize the masses through making sure that there is a cultural expression of the struggle. As MIM witnessed in the protests against the APEC conference, music and art creatively help to tell the story of the oppression and struggle of the masses. The music helps open the door for masses bombarded with American cultural icons and the cultural of a neocolony which is dominated by large multi-national corporations. Through revolutionary culture, activists tell stories of how the masses can unite to stop their exploitation. Revolutionary culture shows the masses that they do not have to bow down to imperialist culture thrust upon them. That is not their only choice. The masses can tell the history of the people through revolutionary culture.

During the People's Caravan Against Imperialist Globalization, the masses lined up long the highway to see the standoff between the activists and the Philippine police were at first mostly quiet. But as speakers told the reason that the people must organize to protest the war against the Filipino people and as students talked among the masses to encourage their involvement, the crowds became more sympathetic with the Caravan. Then as cultural groups sang songs which expressed a true people's culture, the masses continued to become more involved, dancing on their shanty roof tops and using pots and pans as drums to join in the expression of the people's culture.

During the rallies and conferences, activists sang songs about struggle between the peasants and landlords and acted out skits depicting the brutality of the Ramos regime and illustrating its crimes against the masses. The songs and skits were not

just about love of an individual, but love of an entire people. As activists fighting for a revolutionary culture sang in Tagalog, it was obvious to see the emotion bubbling from other Filipinos. Revolutionary culture is increasingly providing the masses the ability to be proud of Filipino culture. It provides an alternative to soaking up imperialist inundated foreign culture so that the makers of *Independence Day* and people American pop music can make money off of the impoverished Filipino people.

One rallying song with a marching rhythm shouts: Ang tao, ang bayan, nagayon ay lumalaban! (The people united, will never be defeated!) Now, how many songs imported from Amerika provide such expression of the people?

During the rallies and conferences indigenous cultural groups performed expressions of their culture and history of their people. Others performed skits telling the story of comprador, landlord and imperialist rule climaxing to heroic scenes of peasants fighting back, workers organizing and the masses carrying red flags to symbolize the strength and unity of the people.

"Carry on the Fight" is a recording by Tambisan sa Sining (Interaction in Arts). The lyrics and the group's purpose in providing expression of the masses and their struggles is one example of how revolutionary culture is an intricate part of the people's struggle against oppression.

In the title song, the activists sing that the oppressed are struggling and will be victorious:

Workers are marching around the world
With their banners flying high
'Cause they only have a world to win
If they'll fight with all their might

Through all the twists and turns of time
They will carry on the fight
Like the workers of the Paris Commune
When they sacrificed their lives

Build a thousand modern barricades
To withstand the force of the eagle's rage
While the piercing vanguard storms the gate
Of the palaces of greed

So now let's march triumphantly
With a clenched fist to the sky
With the working class solidarity

And a strong resolve to fight.

"Kasama Ko" is a song addressing old comrades who have left to struggle. The song speaks to them to encourage them to join the masses in their struggles and unite in creating a humane society. "Bagong Kababaihan" is a song celebrating the role of women in struggles against oppression all around the world. "Naglahong Paraiso" is about the "human desire to see and experience the colorful and fruitful environment which the future children could not longer experience." Another song's title translates to "Long live the Working class." The only love song in the tape is a song for "comrades' lovers who swore in the name of the masses, that their love to each other will serve as an inspiration in strengthening their struggle for freedom."

In "Freedom" Tambisan sa Sining sings:

All around the world today our cause is burning bright
Freedom for all people
is a thundering battle cry
Waging raging struggles
to be strong and to be free
Time will come and people will be making history.

The workers and the peasants will be surging endlessly

Crushing all the obstacles that stand along their way
United they will break the painful chain of slavery
They will march wave by wave until the world is free

"Save Her" is about the way greed for capitalist profit has destroyed the environment. Speaking of a beautiful river, the song asks, "Will business allow it to flow forever for the future's children to see?" This song addresses logging and nature in a way that many environmentalists in the First World miss. Land is the people's land and the people must be free. "We can only live a life of bliss If mother earth is at peace If man and nature live in harmony All around the world ... If nature's endangered what can we do. To save her for me and you." The masses live off the land and capitalist destruction affects not only the various life forms in the forests, but the livelihood of the basic masses of the oppressed nations.

Rallying the masses to stand up and organize, "Trials of our Time" illustrates history and the strength of the masses.

Lenin's statue crumble down
Some of our dreams fell to the ground
The Judases have caused the changes
While the western winds blowing 'round.

Then everyone talk about democracy

What do you know about the Philippines?

The Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP) is leading a revolution in the Philippines today, in alliance with anti-imperialist and nationalist forces throughout the country.

Find out more about the Philippine revolution. MIM distributes these materials by the CPP and allied organizations:

- *Liberation International*. A publication of the International Office of the National Democratic Front of the Philippines (NDF). Bi-monthly news and analysis of the revolution, including international news. \$3 per issue.
- *The Philippine Revolution: The Leader's View*, by Jose Maria Sison. CPP founder's account of the revolution. \$15 post-paid.
- *Rebolusyon*. Theoretical journal of the CPP. \$4 per issue.

Send cash, check or m.o. made out to "MIM Distributors" to PO Box 3576, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-3576.

While the people's stomachs running empty
Gone are the days of workers glory
That once inflamed the hearts of man

Now we have to strive with all our strength
Face the trials of our times
Hand in hand we must unite
And regain the grounds we lost.

As tempered as the hardest steel
The workers' heart had never feared
To crush the wrath of greed's monstrosity
Just to reach the dawn of victory."

As the skits and songs like "Trials of our Time" recount historical struggles as well as current fights against oppression, songs like "Our Union" rally the masses with revolutionary emotion – far superior to getting 100,000 people in a stadium to do the wave during a football game.

We are a union struggling in our time
A time of darkness and survival
Through our persistence we will reach our goal
A goal of people and revival.

We'll weave the future together with our hands
Hands that were deprived for so long
We'll place tomorrow under our command
Command that will put and end to the slavery of man

Today we are here with our voices ringing loud
To be heard from east to west from north to south
Today we are here with our vision to be free
And a mission to bind humanity.

The objective of Tambisan sa Sining is to "awaken, organize and activate the workers and other deprived sectors of society, through different art forms." Since 1986, Tambisan sa Sining has been the cultural arm of the Kilusang Mayo Uno (KMU). The group not only performs but organizes other cultural groups at the local unions.

In the United States there are a few artists who send out some pretty revolutionary messages, but few work among the masses organizing them against imperialism. The integration of art and mass work is something that MIM looks forward to developing as we lead struggles against imperialist aggression against internal colonies and build support for anti-imperialist struggles in the neo-colonies.

Organizing for Revolution in the Heart of Reaction

MIM is a semi-underground organization because we believe that the lessons of recent leftist history in Amerika show the necessity of careful security policies. This means that we don't tell people information about our personal lives. This includes where we live, our phone numbers, and what we do with all of our time. But this is not only about security, being semi-underground means that many people are turned off by our responses to personal questions. And this is a part of Amerikan culture that MIM takes on in this and other articles about individualism and irrational reactionary culture.

WHY ALL THE PERSONAL QUESTIONS?

Most of the time someone asks me a question about my personal life while I'm talking to them about Maoist politics, they are interested in sex. Some are interested in a personal friendship. And some of those questions are genuinely political, such as someone trying to find out where communists can get good jobs. Of course, any of these motives can also just be the cover behind which a paid or unpaid cop could be operating.

I'm really sick of being hit on while I'm trying to struggle

over serious issues of life and death. In some people's eyes, revolution is sexy and a serious dedicated comrade is a sex object. This is not new, or unique to imperialist Amerika, but this country has a unique history of this problem about which MI has read and written extensively, and shaped our practice accordingly. We don't engage in romantic relationships with potential political recruits. If we have sexual relationships, they are permanent and monogamous. The 1960s was the latest round of serious self-destruction of leftist movements over issues of sex and romance, as we have explained in MIM Theory 2/3, for example.

Significantly, sex became the perfect destructive tool of infiltrators and agents provocateur, because it is such a sure-fire method to divide and undermine organizations – and it's also a good way to keep the police informers happy without having to pay them as much.

I remember one political event where a womyn comrade went to sell papers outside a big political event. The cops came to harass everyone selling papers (the ISO, the Sparts and this MIM comrade). While this was happening, one of the ISO members asked the MIM comrade what she was doing after the

event and if she was interested in getting a drink. Another time a hard core Trotskyist repeatedly asked a womyn comrade if she was married, had kids, wanted a date, every time she saw him until she finally told him that she did not date enemies and Trotskyists are enemies. And how about that time a comrade was stopped mid-sentence while explaining something about the cultural revolution so that the womyn she was talking to could ask if she's a lesbian.

Everyone who has ever hit the streets with MIM Notes or any other political newspaper knows that sex sells politics. The young attractive women sell way more papers. Maybe we should just send all our womyn comrades above ground wearing bikini's to make the money for us.

FRIENDSHIP OR COMRADESHIP

Does knowing that Mao was not monogamous make you respect his political work and theory less?

If you want to tell me you can't trust me 100% because I won't tell you where I live and where I work, that's great because you should never trust anyone 100% when it comes to politics and state infiltration. But you can look at my practice, work with me, struggle with me, and see if I don't dedicate my life to revolution and have the most correct line overall on making politics the number one priority in my life – and then decide whether you can trust me politically as much as any other person you know.

When it comes down to it, that's not really what it's all about. There is a political line out there that says that you can't be comrades without being friends as well. If you don't know where I work then our comradeship has been compromised. One person told me s/he was hurt because I would not say where I worked after we ran into someone I worked with. "But she knows where you work..." She sure does, and there is no way in hell I would ever tell her what I do with my "spare" time. Who does that mean I trust more? The reactionary woman I work with who sees me every day but doesn't know shit about my life or you, the person I trust enough to spend hours with doing everything we can to overthrow imperialism?

It's not really that different from sex. Wanting friendship out of political relationships means eroticizing politics. How does it help our political relationship for you to know that I sit at a computer all day or that I'm a student or that I'm a carpenter? Will this help you understand why I'm a Maoist and so make you that much more committed to working with me? Does it give you a warm feeling to know that you know something personal about my life? Who taught us that this warm feeling should come from sharing meaningless personal information instead of from saving lives, doing the day to day work that is necessary to build an anti-imperialist movement?

MIM is trying to put forward a different political message. Amerikan culture teaches us to trust individualism. We have been indoctrinated into irrational, emotional responses. Facts are not so important when rumor can substitute, and everyone is judged by what they wear, how they do their hair, and who

they spend time with. This culture tells people they can't trust their brains to figure out what is politically right and wrong, what is revolutionary and what is reactionary. Instead they need to know someone personally before they can decide if they trust that person's politics.

Only problem is, the FBI is just as good at playing sex and friendship games. If they want to send someone to seduce you, to tell you everything about their supposed life, and to convince you that they are a communist, they can do it. If I wanted to make up another identity and then let you in on that as "who I am," I could do it. If this is how you decide who you trust, you're an easy target for the pigs and not serious enough about political line. Could a pig fool you about his line on Maoism? If you really got into long struggles, and if you carried out practice together? Are you convinced by Bobby Seale when he spouts revolutionary rhetoric right before asking for \$40,000 to make a flashy film and sell his cookbook? Maybe a cop could pull it off. There was a cop on the Central Committee under Lenin, but the only way he was able to get that high in the party was by doing lots of genuine communist work. We struggle to always put politics in command in part so that even when we are subject to infiltration, the party will suffer the least damage possible in its line and organization.

Can't you look at the political line I am supporting, look at my practice, see the work my organization does and its commitment to supporting the oppressed – and then make a judgment about which side we are on? Or do you need to know how many mistresses Mao had before you can decide if Maoism is correct?


Gender & Revolutionary Feminism

A special double issue of
MIM Theory, Nos. 2/3

With more than 200 pages of Maoist feminism on all questions: sex & rape, psychology,

identity politics, reviews of major feminist writers, and more.

Back issue priced at \$5. Send cash, stamps, check or m.o. made out to MIM Distributors at the address on the inside cover.



Identity Politics: How Subversive is Cultural Subversion?

Elsewhere, MIM has referred to "identity politics" as the view that people's political views are correct because of who they are rather than what they say, in particular with regard to pseudo-feminists who assert that "women" know how to end sexism or patriarchy because they are women, even when their ideas are wrong. Here, MT reprints an essay in which we talked about identity politics as the practice of putting cultural identity forward as the principal tool of political struggle. Clearly, these two aspects of identity politics are closely related. —ed.

Reprinted from MIM Theory 4
Winter 1993

by a comrade

Identify politics is the name of a political trend which has emerged in gay, lesbian, bisexual, queer, white feminist, and countercultural (e.g., punk, skinhead) communities. Identity politics place an emphasis on creating and/or maintaining a distinct cultural identity as a means of opposing the dominant culture.

The very notion of a "Queer Nation" (the name of a liberal/radical queer liberation/rights group) is an example of identity politics. The idea of queers as a nation or of national liberation for queers is a manufactured idea with no historical basis. The title is basically an appropriation of Black Nationalist rhetoric. The difference between Black Nationalism and "Queer Nationalism" is that the idea that a Black nation exists inside U.S. borders has a historical basis, while the idea of a queer nation has no such basis. The historical basis of Black nationalism is that there has been a colonial relationship first between the white Amerikan nation and the Black nations of Africa, then between the white nation and the forcibly relocated Black Africans. Revolutionary Black nationalists maintain that the colonial relationship continues to this day, and that a Black struggle for national liberation from Amerikan colonization is no different from any other revolutionary struggle for national liberation for oppressed colonies.

Queer nationalism, by contrast, is not based on a history of queers as a nation. "Queer Nation" is a militant-sounding name for an organization whose membership do not argue that a queer nation exists, except as the name of their organization. Furthermore, the reason that the name Queer Nation sounds militant is that it imitates the rhetoric of Black nationalism, a political trend with revolutionary practitioners, martyrs, political prisoners, and prisoners of war. Queer Nation claims as its own the image of identity and revolution: death and glory, heroes and martyrs. But the identity is all that Queer Nation, a

predominantly reformist organization, claims.

Without revolutionary practice, Queer Nation reduces itself to all glory, no death: One "Queer National" who plays a leadership role in Queer Nation/DC said that "every time you make love in the District of Columbia you are breaking the law. Every queer kiss is a revolutionary act! This is your revolution and Queer Nation needs you to put those kisses on the line." His speech continued with a number of reformist demands, mostly for changes in laws.(1)

To call kissing "revolutionary" when the kiss is queer — i.e., contrary to the dominant culture's understanding of what a kiss is and should be — is, in my opinion, an insult to the many real revolutionaries (including queer revolutionaries) who have died in struggle or been "buried alive" in prison. Subversion is subversion, revolution is revolution, and identity politics, due to its emphasis on image over substance, often elevates cultural opposition to the status of "revolutionary."

The difference between revolutionary politics and identity politics is that revolutionary politics emphasize material conditions and the political practices necessary to change those material conditions, while identity politics emphasize identity and cultural practices. An example of revolutionary politics is the ten-point program of the Black Panther Party (BPP), which calls for self-determination for the Black community, repayment of financial debts owed to the Black community, full employment, decent housing, honest education, exemption from service in the U.S. military, an end to police brutality, freedom for Black prisoners, trial by jury of racial/socio-economic peers, and "land, bread, housing, education, clothing, justice and peace." (2)

This program does not concern itself with what is and is not "a revolutionary act." Rather, it recognizes the material conditions of Black people's lives in the inner cities. In the full text of the tenth point, the BPP program quotes Amerika's Declaration of Independence to explain that the aforementioned demands should be met by the means of national liberation through armed revolution if necessary. Further BPP texts indicate that the Panthers did indeed believe that revolutionary violence would be necessary for the attainment of their goals. They did not believe that their goals could be met through cultural subversion.

The Panthers, in fact, polemicized against cultural nationalism, which is the New Afrikan/Black community's equivalent of identity politics: "The Black Panther Party, which is a revolutionary group of black people, realizes that we have to have an identity. We have to realize our black heritage in order to

give us the strength to move on and progress. But as far as returning to the old African culture, it's unnecessary and it's not advantageous in many respects. We believe that culture itself will not liberate us. We're going to need some stronger stuff." (3)

An organization of queer people could follow the model of the Panthers by studying what material conditions affecting queer people's lives need to be changed, and what methods would work best to change these conditions. Whether such an organization opted for reform or revolution, it would have no need for empty, decontextualized rhetoric about national oppression and revolution. The Panthers used such rhetoric only in the context of explaining their politics, whereas the use of such rhetoric by Queer Nation and other practitioners of

identity politics tends to obfuscate, not enlighten. Queer Nation's use of the word "revolution," for instance, obscures the reality of their basically reformist stance. Their use of the word "nation" obscures the differences between the Black liberation and Queer liberation movements. Identity politics place an emphasis on image which interferes with the clear advancement of a substantive political agenda.

MIM calls on progressive activists to reject identity politics in favor of an analysis of material conditions and how to change them.

Notes:

1. Washington Blade, 10/25/91.
2. Philip S. Foner, ed., *The Black Panthers Speak*, p. 2-4.
3. Huey P. Newton in *The Black Panthers Speak*, p. 50.

Religion & the Anti-Imperialist Movement

As the Maoist Internationalist Movement (MIM) and the Revolutionary Anti-Imperialist League (RAIL) expand their work among the broad masses, we will encounter more and more progressive individuals and groups under the influence of religious thinking. Questions such as, "Should we struggle against religious thinking?" and, "How should we struggle against religious thinking?" have naturally arisen and need to be answered.

Of course religious ideology takes some blatantly reactionary forms. Some religion blesses the status quo as ordained by god, and as a result forbids all challenges to it or encourages its followers to "turn the other

cheek" and accept oppression. This may take the form of placing hope in a life hereafter, or by saying that "vengeance is the Lord's" (see article in this issue on Louis Farrakhan's "crypto-pacifism"). Other reactionaries use religion's alleged "supra-class" nature to cover up their own reactionary agendas - which are often fascist or feudal. (1)

MIM and others have tackled such blatantly reactionary ideas elsewhere. (2) This article focuses primarily on religious ideology within the anti-imperialist camp, and why and how we struggle against it. Here we review the position of Marx, Engels, and Lenin on

religion and explain MIM's basic position:

1. Maoism and religion are opposing ideologies.
2. This does not imply that religious people cannot make great contributions to the revolutionary struggle of the international proletariat. Many people may remain religious even under socialism.
3. MIM combats religious ideology among the masses through persuasion and example, not through repression. A brief summary of MIM and RAIL policy follows.

WHAT IS RELIGION?

The principle that human productive activities determine all other human activities is central to the Marxist method of analyzing society. In particular, ideological forms, such as religion, philosophy, and literature, are determined by practical human activity. Marx described this approach to the study of ideology in *The German Ideology*:

"We set out from real, active men, and on the basis of their real life-processes we demonstrate the development of the ideological reflexes and echoes of this life process. The phantoms formed in the human brain are also, necessarily, sublimates of their material life-process, which is empirically verifiable and bound to material premises... Life is not determined by consciousness, but consciousness by life." (3)

Religion is a social phenomenon which reflects the social relations between people and between people and nature. This is the meaning of Marx's statement that "Man makes religion, religion does not make man." (4) But we can not simply say that "religion is a social way of thinking," because then science, communism, and atheism would all be forms of religion.

Religion reflects the social relations between people and between people and nature.

We must be clear that religion is a particular ideological response to a particular set of material conditions.

Engels summed up the particularities of religion in the *Anti-Duhring*: "Religion ... is nothing but the fantastic reflection in men's minds of those external forces which control their daily life, a reflection in which the terrestrial forces assume the form of supernatural forces." (5)

The material basis for religion is the fact that external forces master people, and not the other way around. Engels explained that these "external forces" could take the form of natural or social forces. When human society was young it was completely at the mercy of the weather and other natural forces which it did not yet understand fully. Under capitalism, people are dominated by economic conditions which appear independent of them, even though they themselves have created these conditions.

The religious response to this domination is to assume that people will always be mastered by external forces, that is, there are some aspects of reality that people will never understand and therefore never be able to "control." This assumption is contrary to dialectical materialism, which MIM upholds both as a method of investigation and as an accurate representation of objective reality. Dialectical materialism says that – despite the fact that at a given point in time we may know next to nothing about certain aspects of objective reality – humans can indeed learn all that we need to know through practice. "From the standpoint of modern materialism, i.e., Marxism, the limits of approximation of our knowledge to the objective, absolute truth are historically conditional, but the existence of such truth is *unconditional*, and the fact that we are approaching nearer to it is also unconditional." (6)

Because MIM upholds dialectical materialism and therefore struggles against all idealism, MIM struggles against religious ideology. Of course this does not mean that MIM refuses to work with all religious individuals or plans to outlaw all religion under socialism – far from it. We discuss which forms the struggle against religious ideology takes in the next section.

MIM also struggles against religious agnosticism as part of its struggle against idealism. Here is what Engels had to say about religious agnostics:

"What, indeed, is agnosticism, but ... 'shamefaced' materialism? The agnostic's conception of nature is materialistic throughout. The entire natural world is governed by law, and absolutely excludes the intervention of action from without. But, he adds, we have no means either of ascertaining or of disproving the existence of some supreme being beyond the known universe. Now this might hold good at the time when Laplace, to Napoleon's question, why in the great astronomer's *Mécanique Céleste* the Creator was not even mentioned, proudly replied: 'Je n'avais pas besoin de cette hypothèse.' (I had no need for that hypothesis.) But nowadays, in our evolutionary conception of the universe, there is absolutely no room for either a creator or a ruler; and to talk of a supreme being shut out from the whole

existing world implies a contradiction in terms, and as it seems to me, a gratuitous insult to religious people." (7)

Religious agnosticism essentially leaves the door open for idealism and prolongs the life of religious ideology. Debate about whether or not there are universes parallel to this one has no real effect in this universe other than to waste time or divide people pointlessly.

HOW DO WE COMBAT RELIGION?

In "The Attitude of the Worker's Party Towards Religion" (1909), Lenin wrote: "We must combat religion – that is the rudiment of *all* materialism, and consequently of Marxism. But Marxism is not a materialism which stops at rudiments. Marxism goes further. It says: we must know *how* to combat religion, and in order to do so we must explain the source of faith and religion among the masses *materialistically*." (8)

As long as the material basis for religion exists, that is, as long as people are truly dominated by nature or social relations, belief in "supernatural forces" will continue to exist. Engels explains:

"It is still true that man proposes and God (that is, the alien domination of the capitalist mode of production) disposes. Mere knowledge, even if it went further and deeper than that of bourgeois economic science, does not suffice to bring social forces under the domination of society. What is necessary for this is a social act. When this act is accomplished, when society, by seizing all the means of production and using them on a planned basis, has freed itself and all its members from the bondage they are now kept in by these means of production which they themselves have produced but which they themselves have produced but which confront them as an overpowering alien force; when man no longer merely proposes, but also disposes – it is only then that the last alien force which is still reflected in religion will vanish and that the religious reflection itself will also vanish with it, for the simple reason that there will be nothing left to reflect." (9)

Join MIM's Book-of-the-Month Club!

You send a **book a month** to us, we send a book a month to **prisoners**. No **gimmicks**. Or use our **alternative plan**: you send us a **million dollars**, we send a book to **EACH** of the **million prisoners** held in **Amerika's Imperialist dungeons**. Choose from a wide selection of **Marxist classics**, **Chinese history**, & revolutionary **Black, Latino & First Nation** literature.

THEN WRAP IT UP AND MAIL IT TO:

PO Box 3576, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-3576, or
PO Box 29670, Los Angeles, CA 90029-0670.

We would be foolish to call the people who lived in ancient Mesopotamia "stupid" or "genetically deficient" for believing in wrathful demons who preyed upon puny and insignificant humans. The ancient Mesopotamians did not have access to more than 4,000 years of human study of the weather, agriculture and irrigation, disease, etc. To a great extent, the reason we can talk about atheism at all is the fact that the seeds of communism – a society which the people themselves truly control – already exist today in the proletarian movement.

So while we do carry on scientific and atheist propaganda, the fundamental way Marxists combat religion is by developing the proletarian struggle itself, teaching the masses through practice that there "are no gods outside of humanity."

This is the thrust of Marx's famous statement, "religion is the opiate of the people":

"Religious suffering is at once the expression of real suffering and the protest against real suffering. Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the heart of a heartless world, just as it is the spirit of spiritless conditions. It is the opium of the people.

"The overcoming of religion as the illusory happiness of the people is the demand for their real happiness. The demand that they should abandon their illusions about their conditions is the demand to give up conditions that require illusions. The critique of religion is therefore in embryo a critique of the vale of tears, whose halo is religion.

"Thus the critique of heaven turns into the critique of earth, the critique of law, and the critique of theology into the critique of politics." (10)

RELIGION AND SOCIALISM

Because Marxists combat religious thinking among the masses through persuasion and example, not repression, the socialist state will regard religion per se as a private matter. That is: there will be complete separation of church and state; churches will not be subsidized any more than amateur basketball leagues, if at all; people of like beliefs will be able to associate freely; and all people, regardless religious beliefs, will enjoy the same rights.

Of course, if some reactionaries continue to use religion as a cover for their anti-socialist activities, the socialist state must expose and combat them. If reactionaries take up arms against socialism in the name of religion, the socialist state would be justified to respond with force of arms in self-defense. At the same time, the state and the proletarian party at its helm would explain to religious people that the action taken against these reactionaries were not aimed at religion, but at their anti-people activities.

We should also be clear that even though a socialist state led by Maoists should regard religion as a private matter, the Maoist party itself should not. For the reasons outlined above, the struggle against religion and all kinds of backwards superstitions is a duty for a Maoist party, something which all comrades should support. Certainly, under socialism, the party will

continue to carry out propaganda in favor of atheism and foster the development of a scientific culture.

Under communism, a society where no one group of people has power over other, there will be no religion. This is because once the material basis for religious thinking has disappeared, religious thinking itself will disappear. As Engels says above, once people can truly control their lives themselves and are not subject to "overpowering alien forces," they will have no need to believe in mystical powers beyond their understanding.

HOW TO UNITE WITH PROGRESSIVE RELIGIOUS PEOPLE

As part of the superstructure, religion reflects contradictions in the substructure. It consequently may reflect the aspirations of an oppressed class or the vested interests of a ruling class. For example, many religious people believe that their religion demands that they serve the oppressed masses here and now. These people understandably drift towards socialism and armed struggle as means for realizing this service. Also, the demand for national liberation often expresses itself through religion.

Lenin taught us that we must subordinate the anti-religious struggle to the struggle against the exploiters. We should concretely examine different trends among religious people; there is a big difference between creepy fascists like the Scientologists and Black church-goers organizing against police brutality. When dealing with religious progressives, we shouldn't keep our criticisms of idealism or, say, reformism to ourselves, but at the same time we shouldn't damn all religious people to hell, so to speak, and make unity around atheism principal over unity on exposing American imperialism or building the independent institutions of the oppressed.

Lenin gives an example of how communists can concretely lead religious people who are discontented with the fascism:

"Even the Russian orthodox clergy has now been awakened by the thunderous collapse of the old medieval order in Russia. Even it is joining in the demand for liberty and is protesting against the officiousness and arbitrary actions of the government officials, against the police spies imposed upon the 'servants of God.' We Socialists must support this movement and bring the demands of honest and sincere clergymen to their logical conclusion, taking them up on their talk about liberty and demanding that they resolutely sever all connection between religion and the police." (11)

Our principal ideological task in organizing such religious progressives – as well as those people who take the bourgeoisie's idealist talk of "eternal truths" like fraternity, equality, and liberty at face value – is to explain our slogan that "there are no rights, only power struggles." That is, these rights are denied the oppressed masses through economic exploitation and outright violent suppression. The only way to realize rights is to overthrow the material systems of imperialism, capitalism, and patriarchy – and the only way to combat these material forces is to scientifically analyze the contradic-

tions in society and build a secular revolutionary movement, a movement without religious bias which can unite all the oppressed. Religious people who believe that the anti-imperialist revolution is wholly a secular matter and are convinced of or open to the efficacy of the Maoist path towards that revolution can and should work with and join RAIL.

POLICY

1. MIM comrades uphold dialectical materialism and the slogan, "the masses make history," both of which were at the heart of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. Members have a duty to propagate the scientific outlook of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, which includes appropriately combating religious ideology.

2. MIM seeks political unity with those who accept MIM's political leadership, even though they may not agree with MIM's atheist line. MIM encourages religious people who accept that MSG and RAIL are secular organizations and do not seek to propagate religious ideas within them to join MSG and RAIL.

3. Those groups and individuals who believe that religion is a central component of anti-imperialism and agitate for a religious orientation for the anti-imperialist movement should remain separate from MIM and RAIL. MIM and RAIL will work with these groups on mutually acceptable projects, in keeping with existing MIM policy on united-front building. While working on these events MIM will not undertake atheist propaganda unless our allies use the event to carry out religious propaganda.

Notes:

1. See, for example, (A) J. M. Sison, "Sophism of the Christian Social Movement," in: *Struggle for National Democracy*, Quezon City: Progressive Publishers, 1995, pp. 191-202, or (B) Gonzalo, *Interview with Chairman Gonzalo*, Berkeley: CSRP, 1991, pp. 10-12, or (C) K. Marx and F. Engels, "The Manifesto of the Communist Party," in: R. Tucker, ed., *The Marx-Engels Reader*, New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1978, p. 492.
2. See, for example, the essay "The Materialist Method" in the pamphlet *What is MIM?* The speeches and writings of Malcolm X, who was both a Muslim and an anti-imperialist, are filled with arguments against "turn the other cheekism."
3. K. Marx, "The German Ideology," in: R. Tucker, pp. 154-155.
4. K. Marx, "Introduction to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right," in: H. Selsam and H. Martel, eds., *Reader in Marxist Philosophy*, New York: International Publishers, 1984, p. 227.
5. F. Engels, "Anti-Duhring," Peking: Foreign Language Press, 1976, p. 410.
6. V. I. Lenin, *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, in: H. Selsam and H. Martel, p. 157.
7. F. Engels, *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*, in: H. Selsam and H. Martel, p. 63.
8. V. I. Lenin, "The Attitude of Workers' Party towards Religion," in: *Selected Works*, v. 11, New York: International Publishers, 1943, p. 666.
9. F. Engels, "Anti-Duhring," pp. 411-412.
10. K. Marx, "Introduction..." p. 227.
11. V. I. Lenin, "Socialism and Religion," in: *Selected Works*, p. 660.

How not to unite with religious-minded anti-imperialists

As we pointed out in the article "Religion and the anti-imperialist movement," MIM and RAIL must unite politically with religious-minded anti-imperialists. But we must do so in a principled manner. We should unite with religious anti-imperialists around a common political understanding, that is, we should unite in the secular sphere. MIM should not attempt to woo religious minded people into working with us by dropping aspects of our materialist line. Indeed, it is our materialist analysis and practice which will draw the best of the religious-minded anti-imperialists to work with us.

Two examples of how not to unite with religious-minded people follow.

The All-African People's Revolutionary Party's pamphlet "African Liberation Day '94: Revolution and Religion are acts of Culture and must be used as Weapons for Liberation" contains a lengthy article defending the A-APRP's belief in the "absolute harmony between revolution and religion." The A-APRP writes:

"Religion is an organized way of way of life which includes a belief system and practice which regulates the behavior and conduct of its followers... The religious principle stems from a universal understanding that human beings should live in peace, harmony, and justice; the purpose of Revolution is to restore peace, harmony, and justice. There is no practical difference between a true servant of God and the People, and the revolutionary who may not believe in God at all."(1)

This is ahistorical sophism which only serves to cloud the masses' minds. The A-APRP essentially defines away the material reality of religion and its development - according to the first sentence quoted above, MIM is a religious organization! Instead of pushing people with religious sentiments who are sympathetic to the plight of the masses towards anti-imperialist politics or scientific socialism (which the A-APRP claims to uphold), this stance flatters them and equates all sorts of religious baggage - from non-violence to outright colonialism - with revolutionary science.

The A-APRP's attempts to secularize god (or mystify revolutionary science) are similar to arguments made by A. M. Gorky, which Lenin vehemently criticized. According to

Gorky: "God is a complex of those ideas elaborated by the tribe, the nation, mankind, which arouse and organize social sentiments with the purpose of binding the individual to society and of binding animalism [compare this to 'a belief system... which regulates behavior and conduct of its followers']. "(2)

Lenin replied:

"[This] is obviously false and reactionary. Like the Christian Socialists (the worst species and worst distortion of 'socialism'), you employ a method which (despite your best intentions) repeats the hocus-pocus of the priests: all that is contained *historically and practically* in the idea of god is removed from it (filth, prejudice, the consecration of ignorance and submissiveness on the one hand and of feudalism and monarchism on the other), and in place of historical and practical reality a nice philistine phrase is inserted into the idea of god (god = 'ideas which arouse and organize social sentiments')."

"You mean to say something 'nice and sweet' by this, to point to 'Truth and Justice' and the like. But this good intention remains your own personal affair, a subjective 'pious wish' ... By gilding the idea of god, you gilded the chains with which [the reactionary clerics and ideologues] fetter the ignorant workers and muzhiks." (2)

Religion's principal role – especially now, when the revolutionary movement is at an ebb within U.S. borders – is that of an opiate, a pacifier. Christian turn-the-other-cheekism, new age mysticism, and the Nation of Islam's emphasis on individual atonement are examples of the kind religious humbug which teaches people to accept oppression as an unchangeable fact of life and/or turns them inward, away from the struggle for political power.

The sweet-sounding line that "true" religion and socialist revolution are in "absolute harmony" cannot adequately combat these reactionary manifestations of religious thinking, because it denies the truth that religion "is nothing but the fantastic reflection in men's minds of [the] external [material] forces which control their daily life." (3)

Just as this line fails to expose the reactionary politics of religion, it also fails to provide any leadership for religious-minded people who are honestly progressive or revolutionary. For example, the A-APRP praises Martin Luther King for his compassion without criticizing his pacifism and reformism. Praying, dreaming, petitioning, and "moral suasion" will not topple the largest, most brutal military empire history has ever seen. Certainly religious-minded people can contribute to the anti-imperialist movement, but lying to the masses as the A-APRP does by equating revolution with religion leads the movement down an old dead-end.

MIM made a similar mistake in a review of the A-APRP's Kwame Toure. This passage is worth quoting at length because it also contains an accurate assessment of MIM's most fundamental difference with the A-APRP.

"[Toure] believes you should not judge and ideology by its practice, but by its principles alone. He said 'you don't judge Christianity by its practice,' which he concedes has included chattel slavery, so you also should not judge socialism by its practice. Thus he can praise a wide variety of leaders from Castro to Qaddafi without defending any particular nation's socialist path. MIM is materialist and does judge both Christianity and socialism on their practice, finding that national liberation is won only with socialism. While MIM is not anti-religious and considers religion on par with other leisure activities, it does not agree that if people would read their Bible then they would act OK." (4)

The mistake here is defining religion solely as a free-time activity. As MIM Notes later pointed out, "while going to a religious service could be a leisure time activity, religion in general is line on mysticism which holds that knowledge or power can be gained from the supernatural. This runs contrary to materialism, the theory that all power and knowledge are gained from the real world." (5)

Imperialism and fascism in the oppressed nations breed spontaneous rebellion and resistance, and many religious individuals and groups take part in this resistance. MIM and RAIL must also struggle to bring these religious people who are not immediately revolutionary into the revolutionary united front. At the same time, MIM must boldly advocate the scientific world outlook, the outlook which firmly recognizes the masses as the makers of history, the only outlook which makes the transformation of this "vale of tears" into an "earthly paradise" possible.

Notes:

1. All-African People's Revolutionary Party. "African Liberation Day '94: Revolution and Religion are acts of Culture and must be used as Weapons for Liberation."
2. V.I. Lenin. "Letters from Lenin to A. M. Gorky." *Selected Works*. New York: International Publishers, 1943. Vol. 11, pp. 678-679.
3. F. Engels. *Anti-Duehring*. Peking: Foreign Language Press, 1976. p. 410.
4. MIM Notes 100, May 1995.
5. MIM Notes 103, August 1995.

Get the latest
information on MIM's
agitation work on our
world wide web site:
<http://www.text.org/Politics/MIM>

One Weekend's Movie Sales

Corporate concentration and cultural hegemony

by MC12

On a fairly typical weekend in the film industry, July 18-20, the top 60 movies in national distribution grossed \$104 million in ticket sales within U.S. borders. These top 60 movies altogether had grossed \$2.1 billion by the end of that weekend, at which point they were showing on more than 13,000 screens.(1) So, U.S. movie-goers have spent more for tickets to these 60 movies than the whole Gross Domestic Product in Eritrea for 1995.

The concentration of spending on just a few movies is significant. The top five movies on this list — *Men in Black*, *George of the Jungle*, *Contact*, *Nothing to Lose*, and *Face/Off* — grossed \$72 million that weekend, or 69% of the total. This is evidence of a mass capitalist culture of conformity.(1)

These top five movies were run by the largest culture companies in the world, also some of the largest companies period. *Men in Black* is from Sony, which had

\$46 billion in revenue last year, and also owns Columbia Pictures and TriStar Pictures, and distributes Castle Rock films, among others.(2) *George of the Jungle* is from Disney, which had revenue of \$18.7 billion and ranked 55 on the Fortune 500 list last year.(3) Disney, which also owns ABC, owns Buena Vista home video, 17 theme parks and resorts, etc., and controls Hollywood, Touchstone, Caravan, and Miramax films. *Contact* is from the Time Warner publishing empire, which owns CNN, HBO, and lots more, and had \$10 billion in revenue last year, at 141 on the Fortune 500.(3) *Nothing to Lose* is also from Touchstone (Disney). Finally, *Face/Off* is from Paramount, which is owned by Viacom, which owns MTV and its "competitor" VH1, Showtime and its "competitor" The Movie Channel, and, if you want a "choice" of movies, Blockbuster video as well.(4) Viacom is also in publishing with Simon and Shuster, and a lot more, with \$12.1 billion in revenue last year, making it 112 on the Fortune list.

Each of these companies is heavily involved in production of films, and their distribution in theaters, on TV, video stores, and so on — all up and down the entertainment food chain. That way they don't have to worry about serious competition at any level.

One feature of imperialism is its increasing concentration of capital and power. When this concentration develops in the realm of culture, one important result is the concentration of control over culture and the public expression of ideas. This leads to hegemony by the ruling class over culture. By maintaining a tight control over large-scale cultural production — in addition to news media, the education system, and so on — the ruling classes can do a lot to smooth the way for the public acceptance of their view of things.

Lots of critics of capitalism are upset about the concentration of capital in culture, but Maoists understand that this hegemony is reinforced by the massive infusion of superprofits from Third World countries — which are used to pay the people of the oppressor nations to play along — so that Amerika in particular has developed an epidemic of conformity despite the constant mantra of free will and individuality.

Notes:

1. Variety box office lists available at www.yahoo.com.

2. Sony corporate information from www.sony.com.

3. Fortune 500 at www.pathfinder.com.

4. Viacom corporate information from www.viacom.com.

Alvin Ailey in Perspective

National oppression, cultural achievement, and collapse

Alvin Ailey (1931-1989) was the founder of one of the first major Black modern dance companies in Amerika. Two of the most interesting aspects of Ailey's life are his cultural achievements viewed in the context of racism and national oppression, and his own thoughts on racism and national oppression; and what has been described as his mental breakdown, also deeply intertwined with the reality of being a Black man in a racist society.

So we review Ailey's life here not as a model of oppressed national revolutionary cultural work, but as an example of how prominent Blacks cannot ignore national oppression. The contradiction between imperialism and the oppressed nations is the principal contradiction in the world today, so understanding the Black nation's subordinate position in this contradiction is necessary for dealing with it correctly. In a remembrance of Ailey, the journalist who helped him write his autobiography said "he was aware that this world, while accepting him, believes that European music and dance are vastly superior to all other music and dance."⁽¹⁾ In a way, Ailey's greatest strength and contribution was that as much as he fought to be accepted by the Euro-chauvinists of the art world, he fought to be accepted as a Black artist doing Black culture.

As someone who did cultural work with no explicit political affiliation, Ailey is not someone with whom MIM has a lot in common. But while Ailey himself probably would not have had a lot to say to MIM, his work has a lot to say about cultural efforts and leadership in the Black nation. Here we review two books on Ailey's life - Ailey's own autobiography, *Revelations*, and a new biography of him by *New York Times* dance critic Jennifer Dunning, *Alvin Ailey: A Life in Dance*. Dunning's book is a detailed biography; it traces Ailey's life artistically, but does not deal with his motivations, political or otherwise. In *Revelations*, Ailey talks about what it meant to grow up and develop a public career as a Black man in Amerika. He does a better job of explaining his politics and their role in his work.

THE PATH OF AILEY'S CAREER

As the founder of an early major Black modern dance company in Amerika, Ailey grew up as an artist and an individual through a series of historic firsts. This position in some ways took a toll on his mental health; while working to be a leader in Black culture, he was being promoted as an example of Amerikan culture. In 1962, Ailey's company was the first Black troupe to tour Southeast Asia on U.S. State Department sponsorship and the first State Department sponsored company to tour extensively through the countries it visited.⁽²⁾

Sending a Black cultural mission to Southeast Asia on

behalf of the government must have been a calculated move to instill friendliness between Blacks and the peoples who were then becoming U.S. neocolonial subjects. Because images of racism and national oppression had also severely tarnished the U.S. image overseas, this was also an by the State Department to promote integrationism internationally. Showing Blacks on an official tour would have given credence to the idea that the oppressed and oppressor nations within Amerika were relatively equal, and helped propaganda efforts to make colonized peoples more friendly to the colonizers.

AILEY'S AND HIS COMPANY'S SELF-IMAGE

In her foreword to *Revelations*, Lena Horne said that Ailey and his dancers "inspired me to better prepare myself for the life I had to lead as a black artist in a society that too often refuses to recognize and reward fine talent and its contributions to our culture."⁽³⁾ From these two narratives of Ailey's life, it is clear that he did not turn away from the pressure that is put on Black artists to be cultural ambassadors from their nation to the world. The expectations that Black people in the public eye be representatives, and transformers of the Black public image and the Black nation's self-image, create monstrous doubts in the minds of Blacks who must live up to them. When white Amerika promotes this expectation it lays all possible pressure on these individuals. MIM does not claim that white Amerika cares overly about individual famous Black psyches, but rather that by publicly placing responsibility for the fate of the Black nation in these individuals' hands, the oppressor nation pushes responsibility for the results of national oppression away from itself and onto the oppressed.

Ailey said he was struck, at one point fairly late in his career, by the realization that "the dances my family did at our home in Texas, those social dances, were beautiful marks of our own culture."⁽⁴⁾ The same could be said of Ailey and dance as an editor said about Carlos Bulosan, the Filipino writer, and his writing: "Bulosan thus decided as a writer to identify with the Filipinos. He retold their experiences and gave voice to their aspirations."⁽⁵⁾ Ailey retold Black experiences, particularly southern Black experiences, and made his career about that telling. Of his most famous series of dances, Ailey said "my plan was to make *Revelations* the second part of an all-black evening of dance. First would be the blues in *Blues Suite*, the spirituals in *Revelations*, then a section on Kansas City jazz, then a section on contemporary music. The aim was to show the coming and growth and reach of black music."⁽⁶⁾ Ailey identified with the dances of his childhood and of the Black nation generally, and built much of his company's repertoire around showing the world the beauty of these

dances.

Ailey's ballet *Cry*, a solo which he would not allow white dancers to do, is "dedicated to Black women everywhere" and takes the performer "from oppressive drudgery to emotional anguish and finally to wrenching joy" in a mourning and celebration of Black women's lives in America.⁽⁷⁾ *Revelations*, his most famous work and likely the most famous single ballet of the twentieth century, is all about the southern Black church – its place in the community, in nurturing young Black people, and so on. *Blues Suite* is about the Dew Drop Inns and honky-tonks where Black adults spent their Saturday nights before going on to church on Sunday mornings. *For Bird with Love* was his big jazz piece, premiering very late in Ailey's life and dedicated to Charlie "Bird" Parker.

In *To Die for the People*, Huey Newton describes Melvin Van Peebles's approach to symbolism in the Black community: "Sweet Sweetback [shows the reaction of the oppressed to their oppression] by using many aspects of the community, but in symbolic terms. That is, Van Peebles is showing one thing on the screen but saying something more to the audience. In other words he is signifying, and he is signifying some very heavy things."⁽⁸⁾ Ailey's work – in the combinations of music and dance, the selections of pieces and periods of Black culture – does the same thing. He made constant efforts to universalize his work and to speak to all people with his choreography. But at the same time, Ailey was signifying to Black people first.

In his choreography, Ailey devoted his time to depicting Black life and the spirit of Black people over making dances of political protest. He planned for many years to do a piece on Malcolm X but never got to it. Around the time of Nelson Mandela's 67th birthday in 1986, Ailey choreographed the ballet *Survivors*, based on the life-stories of Nelson and Winnie Mandela,⁽⁹⁾ and he did a benefit for Martin Luther King's civil rights work. While on tour with his company in the Southern U.S. in 1963, Ailey referred to the South as "Courage Country" in reference to Black southerners' political work for civil rights.⁽¹⁰⁾ But his ability to identify with the Civil Rights Movement politically was limited, and his activism was limited to celebrating Black culture with Black audiences and popularizing it among broader audiences.

Ailey's career was representative of a section of national bourgeois culture. Even while this section can be progressive, it shows us the importance of proletarian art in the revolutionary movement. The separation of life from politics in Ailey's work is a political expression of the national bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie. The pursuit of culture over politics is an attempt to misguide the proletariat into supporting the national bourgeoisie to the exclusion of making socialist revolution.

AAADT AND ITS ASSOCIATED INSTITUTIONS

As much as he chose not to pursue politics, Ailey did structure his artistic life to fulfill his political goals. In response to the barriers he faced as a Black man trying to have a career in the dance and to his analysis of the dance world, Ailey saw it as his responsibility to bring Black culture to the stage. He wanted to bring Black culture to Black people and provide work opportunities for Black artists.

Black dancers had a very hard time finding work. For this reason, Ailey made it his business to create jobs for them: "I feel an obligation to use black dancers because there must be opportunities for them but not because I'm a black choreographer talking to black people."⁽¹¹⁾ MIM supports this type of thinking; we do encourage the idea that Black dancers (actors, teachers, politicians) should only be hired to represent or talk to Black people. This is a dangerous idea because it means that people who do not do work with explicitly Black content are released from the obligation of hiring Black people. Naturally, we also think that production of culture with specific Black content is also very important because it is the culture of an oppressed nation and an important part of the consciousness of the Black nation.

Ailey did not restrict his choreography or his presentation of other choreographers' work to Black material and with the exception of his ballet *Cry*; he also did not restrict non-Black dancers from prominent roles in the company. But being Black in America, he saw much of his work as a series of work on the Black experience.

In his weaker political moments, Ailey said things like "I am trying to show the world that color is not important ... that's what it's all about to me."⁽¹²⁾ As weak-kneed as this statement is, we have to look at it in context. What Ailey says to a *New York Times* reporter is not necessarily the measure of his politics. It is only the measure of how he wants to be seen in the dance world where he jockeys for money and for performance and rehearsal space. In his stronger moments, Ailey said that just because the culture is Black doesn't mean that all people can't relate to it, and he went on to say that racism kept white choreographers from recognizing the potential of relating to culturally disparate people through dance. "Here, in short, is the big problem with white ballet companies: Does one really want to see a black swan among thirty-two swans in *Swan Lake* ... I give no credence to that position whatsoever. ... We're in the theater, not in a history seminar. It's the same as saying that Japanese dancers can't dance the blues—well, they do in my company. ... their presence universalizes the material."⁽¹³⁾

**Black dancers
had a very
hard time
finding work,
and Ailey made
it his business
to create jobs
for them.**

Ailey talked consistently about bringing more Black people out to the theaters to see his company perform. While the company was in residence at the Brooklyn Academy of Music (BAM), Ailey was upset that the theater would send buses to Manhattan to pick up audiences, rather than go into the Black neighborhoods in Brooklyn to bring back Black audiences to a theater that was as far from them as is was from the white people in Manhattan.(14) Certainly the Ailey company performed for audiences with greater percentages of Blacks than the typical dance concert audiences. Ailey pointed out that "black folks make up roughly twenty percent of our audience, and the percentage should be greater." Ailey wanted the company to always be more for Black people: "dance should be a popular form," he said, "wrenched from the hands of the elite." (15)

But even Ailey's company, with all its efforts to bring dance to the people and to Black people in particular, is for the elite. From Ailey's comments on who in the Black nation supported his work, the individuals with whom he made connections in expanding his company's work into a dance school and summer dance camps, it seems that the overwhelming majority of Blacks in his audiences were at least petty bourgeois. This class composition makes sense given the restrictive ticket prices of concert halls where the company performs. In retrospect, we can see that Ailey used the class composition of his Black audiences the way MIM would have the Black national bourgeoisie organize itself. Although he made no conscious effort to string the two aspects of his work together, he generated a consistent stream of Black culture and popularized it among the petty bourgeoisie and bourgeoisie, emphasizing the importance of Black culture to the elite of the Black nation. He then went on and took the support he had gained from the wealthier Blacks and used that to reach out to sections of the Black proletariat through his dance school and summer dance camps.

LEADERSHIP IN THE BLACK COMMUNITY

Dance companies in the 1950s and 60s, with the exceptions of a few in New York and Lester Horton's company in Los Angeles, where Ailey received his early dance training and performing and choreography experience, did not accept Black dancers. As a young dancer, Jimmy Truitte, who would later dance with both Horton and Ailey, was told by white dance instructors that they would happily give lessons in the Black neighborhoods if Truitte could find enough interested students on his "side of town." They also offered lessons in their own studios at a separate time from their regular dance classes "because I know you people work so hard." (16)

When Ailey had the money and the organizational support,

he established dance camps — one in New York and one in Kansas City — as places where he could foster the kind of leadership and encouragement which he and his friends couldn't find as young dancers. The camps drew kids who would have been good candidates for dropping out of school and taught them about dancing and making dances. Allan Gray, a friend of Ailey's who had fostered the company's presence in Kansas City and established the Kansas City camp, described what the AileyCamp dance program did for kids. They "start seeing how their bodies react differently to different situations. They later tie that into control and learning what discipline it takes to think through a program, make strategies, and then be prepared physically to carry them out. And they tie that into how you have to be mentally prepared but also educationally prepared if your strategy is to complete school." Gray continued, "Many of these kids realize for the first time they have control of their lives. They don't have to react to the outside world or their families." (17)

Huey Newton's words on political action and understanding are a good framework for understanding the work of the AileyCamps. Newton wrote, "the essence of the ideology of the Black Panther Party is that we recognize that matter is constantly in transformation in a dialectical manner. But when we understand this and understand the forces in operation, we can control them in a manner which is beneficial for the community. Therefore what we want to do is

**But even
his company,
with all its
efforts to bring
dance to
Black people
in particular, is
for the elite.**

understand the contradictions within every aspect of the Black community and move on them by trying to increase the positive side of each contradiction until it comes to dominate the negative side. This is how we define power: the ability to define phenomena and make it act in a desired manner." (18)

In establishing the camps, Ailey and his associates recognized the contradiction between Black children trying to grow up and become something worthwhile, and the society they lived in and the schools that educated them telling them that they were worthless. In the introduction to his autobiography he said "that's one of the worst things about racism, what it does to young people. It tears down your insides so that no matter what you write or choreograph, you feel it's not quite enough." (19)

AILEY'S MENTAL BREAKDOWN

In 1980, Ailey lost track of reality and was put in a psychiatric hospital. In *Revelations*, Ailey describes a process that began when his good friend Joyce Trisler died in 1979 at age 48 (she and Ailey were the same age). His mentor Lester Horton had also died young and suddenly, and Ailey decided that he was doomed to die quickly and set out both to make

sure that happened and to live life to the fullest before his death. He drank and took a lot of drugs (principally cocaine), spent money on all sorts of luxuries while stealing from his corner grocery store when he felt like it, and several times ran through the halls of his apartment building screaming "Fire! Fire!" (20) After one of the fire episodes, Ailey was arrested and when given two options, chose to check into a mental hospital or go to jail. (21)

MIM has basic disagreements with the designation of mental illness under imperialism. We do recognize that some people have genuine and serious mental or emotional problems, and this will be true under socialism as well. But as socialists, we resist unquestioning acceptance of the bourgeoisie's definitions of mental illness as many people have been labeled mentally ill whose only illness was social – they opposed imperialism in one manifestation or another. Further, imperialist psychiatry uses the mental illness diagnosis to isolate undesirables from the rest of society. Mentally ill individuals are defined as being less than other people and there is little effort to bring them into society as productive people. Under socialism, we would deal with mental illness as the Chinese did under Mao, "in a comradely manner, as [we would deal with] all contradictions among the people, which are by definition non- antagonistic." (22)

For MIM, Ailey's breakdown is a very public example of how difficult it is to separate mental and emotional stability from political position and consciousness under imperialism. While Trisler's death was the event which set him off, Ailey describes how living in such an oppressive society had already set him on the edge. From Ailey's case we can see how the imperialist psychological and psychiatric professions are responsible for teaching people that they must fit in to an oppressive society to have happy lives. So as a Black person angered by racism treatment, Ailey was told to control his temper and learn how to function within the system.

This notion that we live in an unchangeable system and that individuals must change themselves to fit into it is an important element of capitalist superstructure. If the capitalist propagandists were to admit that capitalism is not good for everyone, they would be encouraging rebellion against capitalism. For this reason, capitalist psychological ideology is antithetical to revolutionary theory. Even in Ailey's non-revolutionary case, this bullshit ideology was impossible to reconcile with any degree of nationalism.

Almost from the beginning of Ailey's career, Amerika was aggressively pressuring him to adopt integrationism and leave the Black nation behind. The U.S.-sponsored tours were only the best documented form of this pressure. As far as MIM is concerned, feeling allegiance to the Black nation and struggling to make its collective consciousness and culture the bases for a cohesive body of work celebrating that consciousness and culture, all in the face of a country which rejects the idea that the Black nation might have anything of value to offer, is enough to make anyone go crazy.

The only extraordinary thing about Ailey's case is that when the contradictions between his national will and the pressures put on him from outside came to a head, he was hospitalized and not put in prison. Blacks who have problems with imperialist society are much more likely to be put in prison, while whites are the majority in mental institutions. (23) Ailey's institutionalization was another form of pressure put on him to soften his solidarity with the Black nation and adjust to Amerikan imperialism. When Amerika imprisons so many of the poor Black men who react violently to national oppression, putting a prominent Black cultural figure in a mental institution instead could only have been an effort to placate him into compliance with imperialism.

Ailey himself recognized the reasons for his so-called insanity, even though he did buy the mentally ill label in the end. Ailey quotes a *Village Voice* article about his hospitalization: "Alvin Ailey may be paying dues for fifty years of agony." Ailey comments on that article saying "my illness, I now understand, was the way that agony manifested itself. I never understood or faced the truth, not for many years. My way has always been to take things at face value, for what they are. The agony of being black, the agony of coming from a small-town Texas and ending up dancing on the Champs Elysees in Paris, was a heavy load to carry. The contrast, the cultural distance between those two points, certainly had something to do with my illness." (24)

Notes:

1. Alvin Ailey with A. Peter Bailey, *Revelations*. (New York: Birch Lane Press, 1995), p. 150.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 106.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 2.
4. Jennifer Dunning, *Alvin Ailey: A Life in Dance*. (New York: Addison Wesley, 1996), p. 380.
5. E. San Juan, Jr., ed., *If You Want to Know What We Are: A Carlos Bulosan Reader*. (Minneapolis: West End Press, 1983), p. 7.
6. Ailey, p. 97-8.
7. Dunning, p. 271.
8. Huey Newton, *To Die for the People*.
9. Dunning, p. 374.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 177.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 243.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 388.
13. Ailey, p. 128.
14. Dunning, p. 243.
15. Ailey, p. 101.

16. Dunning, p. 47.

17. *Ibid.*, p. 396.

18. Newton, p. 138.

19. Ailey, p. 5.

20. *Ibid.*, p. 134-42.

21. *Ibid.*, p. 143.

22. MIM Theory 9, "Psychology and Imperialism," p. 34.

23. *Ibid.*, p. 31.

24. Ailey, p. 146.

The Black Panther Party on culture

North American Maoism's First Anti-Postmodernists

by MC45

In building its own revolutionary cultural practice, MIM follows the leadership of the Black Panther Party (BPP) of 1966-1970, when it was the Maoist vanguard in the United States. The BPP formed out of Huey Newton's and Bobby Seale's split with cultural nationalists in Oakland, Cal. and so the BPP produced much early Maoist work on the position of culture in a revolutionary nationalist movement and the importance of making cultural work serve politics, rather than putting culture first.

Huey Newton, co-founder and Minister of Defense of the Black Panther Party, wrote several theoretical articles on the position and function of culture in a revolutionary struggle.

According to comrade Huey, the work of revolutionary culture was to explain the need for and instigate social change.

In *Revolutionary Suicide*, Newton wrote that: "Language, the power of the word in the philosophical sense, is not underestimated in our ideology. ...

Words are another way of defining phenomena, and the definition of any phenomenon is the first step to controlling it or being controlled by it." (1)

Huey Newton

So the BPP did not hold the postmodernist view that language can determine society, but argued that the party's role was to lead the masses in how to think through its use of language. So for example the BPP needed the Black nation's cooperation in exposing the pigs' oppressive role as an occupying force in Black nation territory. The party could not just wait for this cooperation to spontaneously appear; it needed to start by explaining how the police, being "pigs," were not worthy of the people's fear but instead deserved their scorn and hatred.

Describing the BPP's Maoist community organizing strategy in *To Die for the People*, Newton wrote:

"What we want to do is understand the contradictions within every aspect of the Black community and move on them

by trying to increase the positive side of each contradiction until it comes to dominate the negative side. This is how we define power: the ability to define phenomena and make it act in a desired manner." (3)

The Free Breakfast for Schoolchildren programs – begun in Oakland, Cal. and spread to Idaho, Illinois, New York, North Carolina and places in between – were an excellent example of defining a phenomenon for the purpose of manipulating it. The BPP recognized that Black children were going to school hungry in America and that this was the first barrier to them being able to get a good education. The party noted in its newspaper that the U.S. economy surely had the resources to make sure all children got a good breakfast and decent nutrition, and that since Black children were hungry, this was proof that America wanted them to be hungry.

The breakfast programs then demonstrated how easy it was and how few resources were needed to change this phenomenon by making sure that kids could have breakfast before going to school. If the Black Panther Party could do it with no state power, no ownership of banks and so on, making nutrition available to the poor must be a question of priorities and not potential. So the BPP used the breakfasts not only to feed people, but to demonstrate that the government's priorities were on not feeding people.

So the breakfasts, free food programs (at which the party and its supporters would hand out bags of groceries), free medical care programs, and all the other Serve the People programs were a means of spreading negative propaganda about the American government. These programs were also a means of promoting independent institutions of the oppressed, which Mao explained were a necessary part of the strategy of organizing the people to seize state power. Again from Newton: "When we created it, I had in mind some distinct philosophical goals for the community that many people did not understand. ... We wanted to give the community a wide variety of needed programs. ... All these programs were aimed at one goal: complete control of the institutions in the community." (2)

Notes:

1. *Revolutionary Suicide*, Huey P. Newton, 1974, Ballantine Books, p. 181.

2. *Revolutionary Suicide*, p. 185.

3. Huey Newton, *To Die for the People*, p. 138.

Letter

MIM's Cultural Revisionism

Have you seen the "What is MIM" box? The "Official Newsletter of the Maoist Internationalist Movement" box? The "subscribe to MIM Notes box"? The "What non-prisoners can do to support prisoners" box? The "What Prisoners can do to support MIM" Box? And the list goes on and on! ... Wait! Most importantly, have you seen MIM's "Got Culture" box? What's really going on? Point blank, MIM is either culturally "boxing" itself up or painting itself in a cultural corner. MIM claims to be the vanguard party of the oppressed nations within the United States, so unlike pseudo-communists and pheminists MIM does not look to the labor aristocracy or the gender aristocracy for revolution. On the other hand, MIM seems to be making a super-humyn effort to side-step these two line errors just to strain at the gnat to swallow the camel whole.

MIM practices cultural revisionism! MIM holds that the "revolutionary center of gravity is in the Third World" Then wouldn't it by necessity hold true that the greatest potential for revolutionary culture is in the Third World also?

For example, rap music generates millions of dollars for capitalists on a yearly basis and it also has a tremendous influence over youth world-wide. In fact, rappers have become consciously engaged in the struggle for "ownership" of their creative works. This says a lot for black youth. Not only have they successfully done what many Black leaders have failed to do - create jobs - they have actively engaged in the process of seizing the means of production in a market they have created. But what does the MIM do?

Instead of embracing hip-hop culture MIM turns to alternative rock. Instead of promoting and criticizing graffiti MIM turns to Andy Warhol! Who the hell is Ani Difranco anyway? (see MIM Notes 122, p. 7). You guys should find out the politics of "lil Kim"

One can tell by all the "boxes" in MIM Notes - not to say that some of them aren't necessary - that MIM fails to capture the imagination of Third World youth. There are so many youth trapped in the U.S. prison gulag, that the MIM should have tons of revolutionary art at its disposal!

"The correctness or otherwise of the ideological and political line decides everything. When the party's line is correct, then everything will come its way. If it has no followers, then it can have followers; if it has no guns, then it can have guns; if it has no political power, then it can have political power" — Mao Zedong.

If MIM has no revolutionary culture, then it can have revolutionary culture! "Smash cultural revisionism!" Pornography is patriarchal art directly tied to the capitalist mode of produc-

tion. Pornography will not vanish into thin air because no cultural art form arises out of thin air. Culture is tied into the mode of production. In fact culture is the expression in "images and concepts" of a given economic system. White youth culture at its best is anarchist but it is far from being even "potentially" revolutionary like Black and Latino youth culture. White youth music such as heavy metal and alternative rock probably borders more along the lines of fascist national chauvinism than revolutionary or potentially revolutionary art forms such as rap and graffiti. Somewhere along the line white youth got going "punk" confused with being revolutionary.

Most white youth want nothing more than to "shock their parents" by dying their hair blue or piercing their body. Third World youth want nothing more than to overthrow this crazy mixed-up-world! You guys should pay closer attention to the word on the streets!

The MIM seems bent upon throwing the creativity of the masses in an intellectual straight-jacket. In fact, MIM's inclination towards all this alternative rock is no alternative for the masses at all!

—South Carolina Prisoner
January 1997

MC12 RESPONDS:

We certainly agree with the writer that the "greatest potential for revolutionary culture is in the Third World."

MIM is ready to use art and reviews from prisoners and other Third World artists and revolutionaries. We do print prisoner art, poetry, and, of course, prisoner writings as our greatest single source of submissions. True, we don't have many rap music reviews. This writer as well as other readers should take this opportunity to write and submit reviews about rap and hip-hop culture, and the rap music industry, for the reasons this writer suggests.


On white youth culture, overall, it is indeed "more along the lines of fascist national chauvinism" than it is revolutionary. However, where it is progressive we think it's good to review, criticize, and occasionally even promote it - because if the international proletariat has any allies among groups within the white nation, it is among the youth. (We don't support Andy Warhol. We did review the movie *I Shot Andy Warhol* - and criticized the feminist strategy of the woman who shot him.)

White youth appear overrepresented in our culture coverage in part because most of what we want to say about white youth is related to culture, because that's where most of their potential lies; whereas with oppressed nations we report on a much wider array of political and economic issues.

Graffiti according to Robbie Conal

Robbie Conal is a Los Angeles artist generally referred to as a "guerrilla artist." In the *L.A. Weekly* (January 10, 1997) he is called a "a non-sanctioned public artist." His posters have appeared all over major cities from coast to coast. MIM has used his "Contra Cocaine" graphic, which predates the recent spate of news about CIA cocaine trafficking by many years. He said:

"Postering, graffiti and tagging are rap art, and like rap music they're forms of public expression that strike out at a hostile (or oblivious) dominant power structure – as in 'you take away all government health, education and welfare services from us and our neighborhoods, and we gonna pee all over your property so at least you see we exist.' This is the definition of pissing you off. That's why the city government and property owners hate it – it's a form of class warfare. The real crime is the veritable 'lost generation' of great artists on the streets of L.A."



CONTRA COCAINE: Art by Robbie Conal on a poster at a demonstration at the *L.A. Times* building in February.

Punk Protest Bangs a Gong for Privilege

reprinted from *MIM Notes* 68
September 1992

by MC12

At two consecutive weekends of punk political and cultural activity in Washington, D.C. at the end of July and beginning of August, the white punk movement demonstrated real revolutionary potential, but also showed how deeply it is currently mired in both reformism and anarchism. The reformism is a more advanced stage of political decadence, but it apparently represents what happens to the youthful anarchism if it is never organized for revolution. The "advanced," older leaders do a lot to retard potentially revolutionary development in this movement.

At its best, the movement trashes the whole system, at least making it possible for real revolutionaries to have some influence on people within the movement who want to go beyond just destroying the system. Many of these people enthusiastically buy MIM literature. At its worst, it is a preachy call to white self-interest, and is therefore both harmful and useless to truly oppressed people.

A flyer from Positive Force, the organizers of the Punk Percussion Protest and concert which drew about 1,000 mostly young white people near the capitol on July 25, screams, "Revolution begins with you." But then it takes off after a bunch of recent Supreme Court decisions which will make life more inconvenient for privileged white people, as if the Court itself had not been a tool for genocide and exploitation since its creation.

The flyer even says, "The Court, once a strong protector of free speech, has increasingly swung towards tolerating stricter limits on expression." This kind of statement represents the ugly, privileged side of the white youth movement. Contact with, study and understanding of the lives of oppressed people – principally oppressed Black, Latino and indigenous nations – shows the emptiness of this kind of longing for better days gone by.

The organizers eventually descended into complete Democratic Party politics, when they emphasized "unless we act now, our society will be dominated for most of the rest of our lives by a Supreme Court that resembles a Moral Majority rogues' gallery." In other words (although the

writers would likely object to this characterization), "You better vote for Clinton, gang, or white people are in trouble!"

The pamphlet did also mention rolling back affirmative action and the prison system as areas where the Supreme Court has recently caused harm. A spokesperson for the League of Indigenous Sovereign Nations also addressed the crowd, demanding a seat at the United Nations for indigenous peoples. (MIM says: one seat?! We can do better than that.)

The pamphlet listed a handful of reformist, mostly Democratic Party groups such as the National Organization for Women, Amnesty International, the American Civil Liberties Union; as well as a few more progressive groups such as the Washington Peace Center and the D.C. Student Coalition Against Apartheid & Racism. Then it said: "If you don't like any of these, then start your own!"

This appears to be the work of a jaded leadership simply mimicking the angry alienation of its youthful counterparts; the list of organizations would then represent the decrepit state of the writers themselves, while the call to "start your own!" is a hollow echo of rebellious sentiment.

One young person interviewed by MIM at the rally explained of the Supreme Court, "I just think they're wrong. Maybe this'll do something to change their views on the world."

When pressed, however, he agreed that was unlikely. What about overthrowing the whole government and building a better society altogether?

"That could work, maybe..." although "greedy people are going to keep wanting the power."

SO WHAT DO WE DO?

Eventually he conceded, "We have to organize and start a new culture."

At the concert, members of Riot Grrrl, an organization of angry young punk women, took the stage to explain its views on feminism and women's revolution. Women are oppressed the world over, one woman explained, and "that is why we must band together for a revolution that is our own."

"The revolution has started," she said, "and it is like no other ... it is a Grrrl revolution ... it is Grrrl power."

Prior to reviewing Riot Grrrl literature or conducting an interview, MIM won't yet assess Riot Grrrl as a whole. But MIM urges the militant women in this group to read and critique MIM literature and struggle over the revolutionary course for feminism, which means adopting the perspective of the world's truly oppressed.

The Riot Grrrl is also currently tailed by paternalist "pro-feminist" men, who tell men, for example, to cross the street when walking near women at night. Men who have this condescending view of women will never be able to take women seriously as warriors, political leaders, or comrades. This is a kinder, gentler chivalry for which revolutionary women have no use.

At the Riot Grrrl convention the next weekend, a pamphlet

called "Patriarchy Kills" lists "a few tips" on how men can stop rape, including: Don't laugh at sexist jokes, don't support sexist culture, support women who say they've been raped, don't blame women for rape, educate yourself and support self-defense for women, avoid being near women alone on the street at night (for fear that you might frighten them), demand that the State bust rapists harder ("Many authorities pay lip service to such concerns—it's our job to see that they do more,") don't rape anyone, join them or groups like them.

The anarchist side is epitomized by a statement from one of the band members: 'Everybody knows what to do,' she said. 'I don't need to tell you.'

The only good thing about this article was its statement that in order to not rape, men must "learn to communicate openly and honestly about your desires, and insist on that from your partner(s) ... Sex must be explicitly and mutually agreed upon, free from undue pressure, or it is rape." MIM agrees almost completely with this statement. But MIM knows that no sex under imperialist patriarchy is "free from undue pressure," and therefore it is all rape! MIM does not support the paternalistic efforts of chivalrous men to create a more acceptable form of rape, by, for example, "avoiding sex with anyone who is drunk or chemically impaired or too young or who otherwise may be vulnerable to you." It is not that simple.

The reformist side of this movement poses left and anarchist, but in reality is neither. It acts like it doesn't want to tell people what to do, but in fact it moves people toward empty reform struggles. The anarchist side is perhaps epitomized by a statement from one of the members of the band Bikini Kill, which played at the concert.

"Everybody knows what to do," she said. "I don't need to tell you."

But if "everyone knows what to do," then why is there so much groping and confusion on the "left" about how to respond to the war on women? And why have no strategies advanced by the American "women's movement" succeeded in curtailing patriarchal domination?

MIM will continue to struggle on the fringes of this and similar movements, support what can be supported and try to salvage as many white American nationals as possible. Those young people who will hold themselves to the revolutionary standard of oppressed people in Amerika's internal colonies and in the Third World should consider themselves desperately needed for the revolution, and kiss the motherland good-bye.

rage against the machine

reprinted from MIM Notes 74
March 1993

Rage against the machine is relentlessly political, and their points of reference are rooted in internationalism. The CD cover pictures a Buddhist monk burning to death in protest of south Vietnamese war policies and the liner notes are printed on a background photo of the Vietnamese masses. The band gives thanks for inspiration to, among others, the Mohawk Nation and Huey Newton. In their lyrics the Black nation, Azania, Indigenous people in North America are all "my people." They also put on a damned good show.

"Bombtrack," the first cut on the CD, lays out the band's agenda attacking "Landlords and power whores/ On my people they took turns," and calling out so-called radicals who aren't dealing the whole truth to their audiences. "Killing in the Name" corrects that error, hammering home the fact that cops and the Klan are the same folk. Which is why they do the same job.

"Take the Power Back," "Bullet in the Head," and "Know Your Enemy" stress education as the key to revolution. They point to the fundamental contradiction of imperialist teachings. On the one hand, capitalism feeds its youth on the Amerikan dreams: "compromise, conformity, assimilation, submission/ Ignorance, hypocrisy, brutality, the elite" so we can grow up to be good soldiers and tax-payers. But the reality of the system based on this ideology breeds enemies within its ranks.

In "Wake Up," the band goes after "The networks at work, keepin' people calm," who cover up the history of Black nationalism to try and justify FBI murders of Black revolutionaries. The song is a brief lesson on how none of this is any accident, and how imperialism is expedient about eliminating

individuals and organizations that threaten to make revolution. rage against the machine closes this song with their own threat: "how long? Not long/ Cause what you reap is what you sow."

"Settle for Nothing" slams reformists for leaving capitalism intact: "If we don't take action now/ We settle for nothing later/ We'll settle for nothing now/ And we'll settle for nothing later."

But in the final analysis, rage against the machine leaves listeners with no action to take, and no viable way to destroy the machine.

The closest rage against the machine gets to offering a practice is in "Take the Power Back." They call on their audience to "get it together then/ Like the mother fuckin' weathermen," but they make no accounting for the ultimate demise of the Weather Underground or even their failure to make any significant dents in imperialism when they were around. MIM wonders if rage against the machine consciously shares the weather brand of internationalism: solidarity with the international proletariat in words but a practice that leaves Amerikan imperialism intact. From the final cut on the CD, "Freedom:" "What does the billboard say/ Come and play, come and play/ Forget about/ the movement/ Anger is a gift."

The flip side of revolutionary internationalist consciousness is the strategic confidence to plan to take on the imperialists eventually. MIM invites all people who are turned on to rage against the machine's music and lyrics to struggle through the anger and pain of imperialism to a revolutionary practice.

Why is MIM Underground?

Read *Agents of Repression: The FBI's Secret Wars Against the Black Panther Party and the American Indian Movement*, by Ward Churchill & Jim Vander Wall. This history of the birth of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and a detailed account of the FBI's work infiltrating and splitting and wrecking revolutionary organizations, including murders and frame-ups, helps answer the question. The book demonstrates the extent of the threat to anti-imperialist movements, and the long-term futility of the FBI's work.

Send \$17 to "MIM Distributors,"
PO Box 3576, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-3576.



FBI hit: Fred Hampton.



MIM on Revolutionary Language

In MIM Theory 11 we explained briefly our use of the terms Black, Amerika, United States or Snakes, and womyn/wimmin. Here we review what Stalin, Mao and the Black Panther Party said about the importance of language and revolution, and explain where MIM can apply those theories at this historical stage. We know that the proletariat cannot control the language without state power, but MIM can control the language we use and the revolutionary culture we help to build through that language.

MIM has been accused of complicating our language with weird terms and unusual definitions. Here we explain ourselves. We know that the masses will read and understand even complicated words that MIM creates or uses as long as the language is relevant and the content important. Irrelevant and incorrect words have no place in the task of building public opinion for communist revolution and in creating independent institutions of the oppressed, which are MIM's principal tasks at this time. In building public opinion and institutions, we also build a revolutionary culture, in which language plays an important role.

At this early stage of the revolution, it is appropriate for MIM to make our language more complicated when necessary in order to effectively and correctly transmit our line. It is not MIM's intention to make things confusing, but rather to reject some words that have meanings the international proletariat must reject, and create new words or deploy old words in new ways to get across the people's voice.

We also choose to use the simplest words possible without compromising revolutionary content. We have to use words like *superexploitation*, because its meaning is important for communists in the era of imperialism. But we also try to say use instead of utilize, for example, where nothing is gained by a more complicated word.

STALIN'S CONTRIBUTIONS

In 1950, Stalin answered questions about Marxism and linguistics, and the role of language in class struggle. In response to one question, Stalin noted that language is not simply part of the superstructure that is supported by the economic base, because over centuries the Russian language had stayed essentially the same. While of course there are new words created to reflect a new society after revolution, it is a serious error to confuse language and superstructure.

"Language radically differs from superstructure. Take, for example, Russian society and the Russian language. During the past thirty years the old, capitalist base was eliminated in Russia and a new, socialist base was built. Correspondingly, the superstructure on the capitalist base was eliminated and a new superstructure created corresponding to the socialist base. The old political, legal and other institutions were consequently supplanted by new, socialist institutions. But in spite of this the Russian language has remained essentially what it was before the October Revolution."(1)

MIM disagrees with Stalin's view that the entire superstructure of the previous society was replaced so quickly with a new socialist superstructure, but we agree with his judgment that language had changed much less than the superstructure had in general.

In Stalin's view, language is to serve the society as a whole, as a means of communication between people, and it is to serve members of society equally "irrespective of their class status.

"A language has only to depart from this position of being the common language of the people and to give preference and support to any one social group to the detriment of

other social groups of that society, and it loses its virtue, ceases to be a means of intercourse between the people of that society, and becomes the jargon of some social group, degenerates, and is doomed to disappear.”(2)

Not only is such language doomed to disappear – it also causes harm to those it helps oppress. It is this tendency that MIM often opposes when we make changes to our use of language.

Stalin emphasized the connection between language and productive activity, noting that “without a language understood by a society and common to all its members, that society must cease to produce, must disintegrate and cease to exist. ... In this sense ... while it is a medium of intercourse, it is at the same time an instrument of struggle and development of society.”(3)

In upholding the need for one language common to all society, and in explaining that language is not simply superstructure, Stalin asked:

“What necessity is there, after every revolution, for the existing structure of the language, its grammatical construction and basic vocabulary to be destroyed and supplanted by new ones, as is usually the case with superstructure? Who would benefit if ‘water,’ ‘earth,’ ‘mountain’ ... were not called water, earth mountain, etc. but something else? ... What would be the use to the revolution of such an upheaval in language?”(4)

MIM agrees with Stalin; when communists have state power, we do not intend to replace existing words simply because there has been a revolution. The changes must be meaningful when they are implemented. However, MIM does not yet have state power, and we are not yet in the position of consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat after a protracted people's war. The need or usefulness of complicating or simplifying language depends largely upon the stage of the revolution.

Especially interesting is Stalin's warning not to confuse language with culture.

“Culture may be either bourgeois or socialist, but language, as a means of intercourse, is always a common national language and can serve both bourgeois and socialist culture. Is it not a fact that the Russian, Ukrainian, and Uzbek languages are now serving the socialist culture of these nations just as well as they served their bourgeois cultures before the October Revolution?”(5)

We see from this also that Stalin respected the national minority languages in the Soviet Union, as Mao respected the national minority languages in China. In fact, opposing classes (or nations or genders) use the same language in different and opposing ways; sometimes by using different words that are nonetheless understandable to all groups, and less often even by hiding meanings that some people cannot understand.

Mao looked to Stalin as a theoretical leader in the area of language. “Stalin's position on the nature of language, on standard languages and on historical change, and on the relationship between language and thought represents the accepted theory of linguistics in the [People's Republic of China].”(6)

SIMPLER CHINESE

MIM often notes that Mao simplified the Chinese alphabet to make it more accessible to the masses, and here we explain how and why that happened, as well as other changes in language and education under Mao's leadership.

From October to November 1974 the “American Linguistics Delegation” visited China to meet with representatives on language and linguistics in the People's Republic of China. This trip was part of a larger organized exchange between linguists from China and the United States, where the idea was to focus on the study and teaching of the host country's language.(7) This delegation, which was supportive of the Chinese revolution, published its findings in *Language and Linguistics in the People's Republic of China*. Since the delegation was in China during the height of the Cultural Revolution, it had the opportunity to learn about the major changes going on in China at that time.

Along with changes in language, the goals of education changed under Mao. Under Mao, and especially during the Cultural Revolution, there was an education revolution, the focus of which included changing the goals of education; the enrollment system of the universities; teaching methods and materials; examinations; and methods of running the schools.(8)

The American delegation upheld its “colleagues in China for remarkable achievements in the standardization of Putonghua, in the development of a simplified writing system, and in the effective teaching of foreign languages, as well as Putonghua.”(9)

The delegation learned that the majority of people in China speak the Han language, within which there are two major sub-categories: (a) the common or standard language, Putonghua; and (b) all others, referred to as dialects.(10) Putonghua was named the common language of the PRC in 1955.(11)

There are many different dialects in China, and under Mao one important change was to phoneticize Putonghua and simplify the written language. The written language was simplified in different ways, including reducing the number of

The need or usefulness of complicating or simplifying language depends largely upon the stage of the revolution.

strokes required to make certain characters. But the American delegation also noted that so many different dialects and different pronunciations of the same written language could lead to real confusion.

In response to their questions about language and the larger background of the Chinese revolution, the delegation learned that, "when the new social system was established in 1949, the Chinese language was at first unaffected. In the view of dialectical materialism, language is a product of the whole society and serves all social classes; it is not a part of the ideological superstructure erected by the ruling class." (12) This is in agreement with what Stalin said; it is the dialectical materialist view of language.

In "Oppose Stereotyped Party Writing," Mao said, "first, let us learn language from the masses. The people's vocabulary is rich, vigorous, vivid and expressive of real life. ... Second, let us absorb what we need from foreign languages. We should not import foreign expressions mechanically or use them indiscriminately, but should absorb what is good and what suits our needs. ... Third, let us also learn whatever is alive in the classical Chinese language." (13)

During the Cultural Revolution it was difficult for the Chinese to predict what would happen with the various dialects given that the Han language was being simplified. The general belief was that dialects would not die out for a long time. Cadres away from their home areas were expected to learn local dialects to develop closer contacts with the masses. (14)

Besides many different dialects of the same Han language, there are at several minority nations with their own languages within China, and Mao's consistent policy was to respect those nations and their languages.

"As early as 1931, the Communist Party of China established its policies towards national minorities: to encourage the development of all aspects of national minorities' language and culture. ... Later, the 1938 session of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party discussed the problem of national minority languages in detail. It was decided at that time that the Party should actively help the national minorities develop their cultures and languages, both spoken and written. In December 1947 Chairman Mao gave a speech in which he urged that both spoken and written languages of the national minorities be respected. These expressions of support for the rights of the national minorities by the Chinese Communist Party were based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism." (15)

Of course, language changed in other ways as well. For example, Mao was famous for saying that wimmin hold up half the sky, and after Liberation, "half the sky" became a synonym for womyn. Also, "beloved spouse" replaced the sexist terms "outside person - husband" and "inside person - wife". (16)

The Black Panther Party, which advanced further than MIM

has so far in terms of creating public opinion and building independent institutions of the oppressed, also created some new words that became part of the revolutionary culture of the times. In *Revolutionary Suicide*, Huey Newton wrote:

"The Black Panthers have always emphasized action over rhetoric. But language, the power of the word in the philosophical sense, is not underestimated in our ideology. We recognize the significance of words in the struggle for liberation, not only in the media and in conversations with people on the block, but in the important area of raising consciousness. Words are another way of defining phenomena, and the definition of any phenomenon is the first step to controlling it or being controlled by it." (17)

For example, the Panthers introduced the word "pig" into revolutionary vocabulary as a way to define police officers as vile instead of as upstanding protectors of the citizenry. Newton saw this as one of the Panthers' "prime needs" in terms of developing language that the people could use and relate to, and that would raise the consciousness of white people and the police.

In comparing what MIM is doing with our language (and what the Black Panthers did) with what Mao undertook in China, one must remember that Mao had state power. MIM is not yet at the level where we influence the language of the state, but we can control the language that we use and the revolutionary culture that we help to build through use of that language and our various publications.

Notes:

1. *The Essential Stalin; Major Theoretical Writings, 1905-1952*, ed. Bruce Franklin, 1972, Anchor Books, p. 408.
2. *Essential Stalin*, p. 409-10.
3. *Language and Linguistics in the People's Republic of China*, ed. Winfred P. Lehmann, 1975, University of Texas Press, p. 130.
4. *Essential Stalin*, p. 411.
5. *Essential Stalin*, p. 419.
6. *Language*, p. 128.
7. *Language*, p. 3.
8. *Language*, p. 5-6.
9. *Language*, p. 135.
10. *Language*, p. 11.
11. *Language*, p. 14.
12. *Language*, p. 15.
13. *Language*, p. 16-17.
14. *Language*, p. 113.
15. *Language*, p. 29.
16. *Revolutionary Suicide*, Huey P. Newton, 1974, Ballantine Books, p. 181.
17. *Revolutionary Suicide*, p. 185.

On Language

Some of MIM's Terms & Usage

These are terms that MIM uses in ways that may not be obvious. In some cases we invented the usage, in other cases we build on a previous tradition, or modify meanings that other people use.

Black – instead of “black” (uncapitalized: it’s a people, not a color), or “African American,” etc. We don’t use a variant of “American” because Blacks are their own nation. And we don’t use African because the Black nation here is a new nation, not an African nation. “New Afrikan” is also a good term, however, which we choose not use mostly because of its association with *cultural nationalism*, or nationalism dependent on cultural distinction instead of communist-led revolution.

First Nations – not MIM’s term, this is what we often call the peoples who were in the Americas in particular before Europeans got here; one of those terms that explains itself.

gender aristocracy – like the *labor aristocracy*, the gender aristocracy are underlings in the patriarchal imperialist system – including Amerikan wimmin – who nevertheless benefit overall from the system.

Liberalism – that’s with a capital L, and it means the philosophy that focuses on individual desires and freedoms. Not to be confused with the so-called difference between Democrats and Republicans. Generally reactionary, it’s sometimes useful to the people, as when the ACLU argues against the Amerikan death penalty.

materialist method – not the kind of materialism the tells people to buy buy buy, this is about the rational process of making concrete judgments based on realistic comparisons. This means, for example, comparing one real political practice (say, Maoism) to another (pacifism), and judging the results of their actions – instead of just comparing the two ideas and deciding what to do based on which one sounds better (which would be *idealism*).

pseudofeminist – this is how we describe those feminists who don’t extend their would-be feminism to the eradication of gender oppression overall, most often by ignoring the gender oppression of the world’s majority (and often making it worse in the process).

rape – coerced sex. Since wimmin had no choice about being born into a patriarchal system of gender oppression, all sex under patriarchy takes place under nonconsensual conditions and is therefore rape. When the police and courts get involved in what sex is rape and what is not, their main job is to make sure the system wins in the end – not to stop rape, which requires proletarian feminist revolution.

sectarianism – putting one’s own organizational leadership ahead of the interests of the international proletariat, or party-building for its own sake. Contrary to many critics, we do not agree that having a vanguard party is itself a sectarian practice. Maoists reject sectarianism but support vanguard leadership as the only proven way to get the job done.

superexploitation – paying workers less than the value of their labor power, which is the minimum necessary to live and reproduce. This is how imperialists make enough profits in Third World countries to pay the *labor aristocracy* in the rich countries more than the value of their labor power.

womyn – substituted for *woman* because we want to show that *wimmin* are not a subset of *men*, the way that the words *woman* and *women* imply. We got these words from pseudofeminists with whom we mostly disagree on questions of feminism, but on this point we choose to seize their idea and turn it to revolutionary feminist usage.

Prisoner supports 'Black'

This is an excerpt from a prisoner's letter to MIM, and our response, which appeared in MIM Notes 134 (March 15, 1997), followed by a reply from A New York Prisoner. —ed.

In the August issue I have [MN119, August 1, 1996] you present a subject of words, and their association with what they mean as to gender and race because of society and what slavery depicted as to thing or believe. In this August issue you seem to try to explain the reason that Black is less than perfect for its people title. We need to understand first what is "Black." It is a substance in this universe that's always was here and will continue to be here. Just like its people they have always been here and always will be here, so don't go saying that it not a perfect title for "Black" people because it is what it is - us!!! the original people and since that all thing arrive from that which was and is first there is no other name under the sun to call us!!! the originals, only Black, Black because we are strong, Black because we are potent, and Black because we are from everlasting to everlasting, no by help of no other force but us!!! the originals, Black man. Also Black people with knowledge of self do not think of their skin color, it is only the purest form of existence.

MIM RESPONDS:

In the article you mention, we said, "The term 'Black' is less than perfect because it implies that we are talking about a group because of its skin color, but it is the best definition of the nation within Amerika. The capital 'B' helps to contrast this legitimate nation with the 'white' fascist settler nation."

We disagree when you say that Black people have always been here, and that "Black" is an essential part of their existence, because we know that social identities are social in origin: they come out of social conditions and events, and they develop in social ways. Africans were the Homo sapiens, but it was not important that they had dark or black skin color until they had contact with people who didn't. The importance of "Blackness" was largely imposed by Arabs from northern Africa and Europeans, who seized on Blackness as the difference between themselves and sub-Saharan Africans. You correctly say that skin color is not the most important thing in Black identity, but if it were not for skin color, "Black" would not be part of that identity. That is why we stress "Black" as a national identity, but we don't pretend that it doesn't have a problematic origin in racial thinking.

When you say Black is "a substance in this universe that's always was here and will continue to be here," we agree. But as long as there has been light there has also been whiteness as well, and there "always" will be. Rather than those few constants in time, dialectical materialists such as Maoists pay most attention to that which is changing: the meaning of Black and white in society, the developing oppression and liberation of nations,

classes, and genders, etc.

For us what matters about "Black" is the nation, its oppression, its conscious expression, and its liberation as part of the struggle for a world without oppression: a communist world. For that reason, we know that the Black nation does not now include all Africans and the whole African Diaspora, because in time separate nations have developed as different groups formed economic, cultural, linguistic and territorial bonds. We must understand the real life of social groups if we are to develop the best way forward to national and human liberation.

So, our disagreement with you is philosophical: we consider your view to be cultural nationalism, which has a religious or idealistic aspect in its description of Blackness as permanent, original, and unchanging.

Black Panther Party founder Huey Newton warned that cultural nationalism can lead to mistakes such as supporting Black comprador dictators such as the Duvaliers in Haiti. Malcolm X also warned us that Black leaders may be wrong despite their Blackness. When we treat Blackness as an essential part of people, it is hard to have such a materialist analysis.

How does this affect our work together? There is no reason why cultural nationalists cannot work together with Maoists - revolutionary communists attempting to develop revolutionary nationalist struggles - in many ways at this point. We agree on the national oppression of the Black nation and other nations. We agree on the need for anti-imperialist struggle for national liberation. We may even agree on the goal of a communist world with no oppression of groups by other groups. In the course of our movement in that direction, we all need all the allies we can get without undermining our cause. Specifically, Maoists argue for the formation of United Fronts, uniting people of various classes and nations against imperialism under the leadership of a vanguard party. This is the best way for the oppressed to combine forces against common enemies under imperialism.

So we hope you will take our disagreement with your position as part of a progressive process of struggle leading to higher unity. As we said in the article you mention, we want to hear from progressive people who agree and disagree with us on language issues and all other important questions (our use of "Black" itself came out of correspondence and debate with revolutionary nationalists). Let's keep struggling as we work toward the best way out of the cesspool of imperialism.

**For MIM,
what
matters
about
'Black'
is the
nation.**

A NEW YORK PRISONER COMMENTS ON 'THE AMBIGUITY OF BLACKNESS':

MIM wrote, "When you say Black is 'a substance in this universe that always was here and will continue to be here', we agree. But as long as there has been light there has also been whiteness as well, and there 'always' will be."

Allow me to correct this: First of all while it's true that blackness (darkness) is an "element" that has no beginning nor ending, it is not true that "as long as there has been light there has also been whiteness as well, and there always will be." Light developed from darkness. What we call visible or white light is actually an array of non-white colors known as a continuous spectrum that correspond to a particular wavelength within the electromagnetic spectrum.

All radiation transmits energy through a vacuum at 186,000 miles per second regardless if it's visible or not. White light (a continuous spectrum) is produced by an incandescent solid, liquid or gas under high pressure which in turn produces a white glow to the human eye. All objects at whatever temperature emit radiant energy. The hotter the radiating body the shorter the wavelength of maximum radiation. For example, an extremely hot steel rod will emit a white glow, visible radiation. As it cools it will emit more of its energy in longer wavelengths and produce a reddish glow. Eventually no light will be given off but if you place your hand close to the rod you will feel heat, i.e. infrared radiation which is invisible.

As a dialectical materialist I would have to conclude that visible light is produced when certain elements interact with each other under certain conditions that causes pressure to become so intense that a white glow is emitted from said element or compound, thus visible white light does have a beginning and will have an end. I also support this due to the fact that the stars in the natural universe produce the largest source of white light known and all stars have a birth and death and so does the "whiteness" that develops from them.

Blackness (darkness) is something that simply is throughout the universe, it has no birth nor death. Light exists within darkness and not vice versa. All light is not white, so there could be light without whiteness.

Secondly, I'd like to add that there is no such thing as a black skinned people and ditto for white skinned. Humans range from a deep dark brown to a light pale pink. When we speak of Blackness pertaining to people we are talking about a socio-historical relationship between humans and when we speak of blackness or rather darkness pertaining to the universe we are speaking of a natural phenomena independent of the human will. In no way can the "Black Nation" be made to coincide with the blackness of the universe for the former is transient and artificial (i.e. man made) and while the latter is eternal and natural.

We mustn't become confused when speaking of Blackness for it is an ambiguous word.

Pigs vs. cops language

Dear MIM Notes editor,

Our local RAIL chapter has done a lot of work on police brutality and very related issues for over a year now. In fact, that takes up most of our time. It is with this experience in mind as well as feedback from the masses that I strongly urge you not to use the word pig, even though the BPP used it. (Speaking of the BPP, it is relevant here to say – and we'll be writing you about this in another context also – that we must *build* on the legacy of the BPP, not *mimic* it.) And I especially urge you not to use the word "pig" on the front page of MIM Notes. I am beginning to think that it hinders our work, not help it. I strongly recommend the word "kop" or "the boys in blue"; (I like both; the latter I like because of 1) the patriarchal implication and 2) these police do not act like adults, they act like irresponsible children.) But let me develop further my arguments below as to why the term "pig" is detrimental.

First, as one of our RAIL recruits who does a lot of work with us and who is also a direct victim of police brutality says: "It's an insult to the animal to call the police pigs." Secondly, the term "pig" allows the enemy a diversionary criticism of us. That is, they can say we are mud-slinging, insulting them. Our best weapon right now is to expose the kops for the criminal and morally disgusting behavior and institution that they are. People are really nervous right now because there are so many police attacks. But they are also really angry about kop terror. I know what Huey Newton said but I think conditions are different today than when he said it. We need to continue to expose their crimes. And MIM is doing a great job of that. Really, to repeat, when I think about all the direct experience I've had over the last year (and I directly and successfully prevented a kop today from stopping us for using out freedom of speech at a demo.) I don't want to pass out a paper that has "pig" on the front page; they can use that as an excuse to be assholes, saying we're insulting them, mud-slinging.

In unity-struggle-unity,

— A Very Person

RC RAIL COORDINATOR RESPONDS:

The BPP initially used pig to refer to a disgusting creature that ate shit and liked it, parallel to how the police take all the nationally oppressive rhetoric of Amerikkka, eat it up and turn it into acts of brutality. "Pig" is useful because people can relate to the word and image, like the BPP initially also said. The point was to unite around a term to expose the system. Your argument gives no material examples of how using pig

would be any more detrimental than the hammer and sickle or feminist symbol mastheads. It looks like you are proposing more "acceptable" language rather than an exposure of the nature of pig brutality through name choice. Should we stop calling big capitalists pigs? They still eat up all the superprofits like a hungry pig which proves a very useful image in exposing the system.

Also "boys in blue" has limitations. Comparing pigs to "irresponsible children" is even more unfair to youth. Adult ties to imperialism prove to create the most irresponsible practice. Youth are left with close to zero social value in Amerikkkan society and are taught they can have no responsibility. Conversely adults exercise power to starve and murder huge numbers of oppressed people—a responsibility Amerikkkans chose to forget. The patriarchal tie is correct, but still leads back to a youth and gender issue, where boys are youth and gendered powerless in a patriarchal society.

The use of "kops" is a good alternative to "pigs", but loses its meaning when spoken. Written it drives right to the connection of national oppression and the overall Amerikkkan society, but still tends toward pandering to people who don't like to hear "offensive" words.

We do have unity on the need to expose police brutality to the fullest, and the need to do so successfully. When language forms concrete barriers to progressive success, then it should be changed.

Order these essential texts from MIM

- Mavrikis, Kostas. *On Trotskyism*. \$10. The best historical polemic against Trotsky.
- Franklin, Bruce, ed. *The Essential Stalin*. \$7. Major theoretical writings 1905-1952.
- V.I. Lenin. *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism*. \$3. The classic analysis of imperialism.
- Edwards, H.W. *Labor Aristocracy: Mass Base for Social Democracy*. \$10. Why there's no proletarian revolution in the First World, especially the U.S.
- J. Sakai, *Settlers, the Mythology of the White Proletariat*. \$10. This shocking history of the United States from the viewpoint of the international proletariat argues that most Americans are bought-off allies of imperialism.
- Richard Krooth, *Arms and Empire*. \$8. Economic history on the roots of WWI and WWII — key to understanding the present WWII.

Send cash, check or m.o. to

MIM • PO Box 3576 • Ann Arbor MI 48106-3576

Shine has lessons for revolutionaries

SHINE, 1996

Review by MC12

On one simple level *Shine* is another individualist story of the triumph of the "human spirit." But with a Maoist perspective it is possible to draw revolutionary lessons from it, on: nature versus nurture in the making of child prodigies, parenting, art and mental illness. The movie tells the supposedly-true story of David Helfgott, an Australian-born son of a Jewish survivor of the Nazi concentration camps. His father is an obsessive man tortured by the fact of his own survival when so many others, including his whole family, died. In the late 1950s, he turns young David into a child prodigy piano player through constant emotional pressure and cruel parental authority. He tells David that he is lucky to be able to play music while his father had his violin destroyed as a child. He tells David that he will be a great piano player by winning many competitions. Basically, the only thing David can do to keep his father from completely losing it is to become a great piano player. Through endless practice and complete emotional investment, David succeeds — but eventually he loses his mental stability in the process.

The father's obsession threatens to derail David's success, when he decides that David going off to the Royal College of Music in London will destroy the family like the Nazis destroyed his old family. It takes the intervention of an underdeveloped character — a pro-Soviet communist woman author — to convince David to escape his father and go off to school. One implication of this is that his father was so rotten partly because he was a communist or friends with one. On the other hand, the "communist" woman is a hero in getting the child to escape his cruel father. On a third hand, she is presumably a revisionist anyway, so the whole thing is a wash.

Once at school, David gradually starts slipping even further out of "normalcy." He forgets to put on pants, doesn't cut his hair, eats erratically, and so on, all the while becoming a great pianist. He finally breaks down completely at the end of a dramatic performance of an immensely difficult piece. From then on it's the story of his virtual escape from the mental health establishment in Australia and his eventual return to performing in the 1980s.

The first good part about the movie is in the depiction of the

making of a prodigy. Many people will continue to assume that children with great abilities in narrow areas get their talents from genetics, but from cases such as this it is much more sound to conclude that the conditions of David's upbringing led him to this "greatness" – just as the conditions of his father's upbringing (WWII) led to his mental problems. David was the pawn of first his father, and then his aging mentor at school, both of whom saw David as expressions of their own greatness, furthering the alienation of his position.

Second, and this requires an analysis from beyond the movie, it is a good example of the social folly and cruelty of individual parenting. David's father is simply unfit to parent. He not only has no idea what is best for children, but his own past also prevents him from seeing beyond himself. He is a rotten parent, and his kids' lives are jeopardized. In socialist society it is possible to have collective parenting, preventing children from falling victim to the whims of their parents and allowing all children to have an equal chance at pursuing what they like.

Third, the movie – and the beautiful music performed – are good examples of why art by emotionally tortured people can be so compelling. From classical artists like Mozart to nineteenth century artists like Van Gogh, sixties figures like Janis Joplin, and rap artists like Tupac Shakur, some of the best artists have been the ones able to turn their difficult lives into artistic expressions that engage people because of their emotional intensity and the prowess that comes from pouring emotion into practice and effort. Some of this is from the oppressed, and some is from non-oppressed people with other problems (some of them self-imposed). In the case of the oppressed, this can be a model of fighting back against oppression; in the case of the oppressors, this can be a voyeuristic attraction to suffering by the parasitic classes. In all these cases, though, the pain of the artist is part of what makes the art speak to so many people.

In socialist or communist society, will we want that to be a

model of great art? Yes and no. On the one hand, as long as there is pain and suffering, it will be the fuel for a lot of great art, and that is going to be for a long time. On the other hand, we want people to be able to express emotional intensity and virtuosity without having messed-up lives. From the movie it appears that David could not have been such a virtuoso without losing his grip and falling apart.

For Helfgott, the beauty of the music is in the pain it expresses – and partly because it appears to be his escape from that pain. Maybe in a communist society there would be no David Helfgotts because children will have more balanced lives. It's not healthy for a young child to focus so intensely on one area of study and ability, to the exclusion of others, and out of a coerced sense of obligation. So we would give up some blind virtuosity in exchange for an artistic aesthetic that reflects a society in which people have more control over the course of their lives. Rather than expressing an escape from a life of torture imposed by others, art can represent the advances that society makes collectively in the direction of liberation and self-realization.

MIM received this letter in response to the MIM Notes version of this review, which appeared in MIM Notes in February 1997 –ed.

I have a comment on an article "Looking for Lessons in Shine: Art & Suffering." I found the article to be smashing, as well as very truthful because art by emotionally tortured people can be very compelling. And I think I'm living proof of that, because I am a music writer and poetry writer. And I found my work to be way before my time, sometimes. I must say under the circumstances that I compose some of the most extraordinary arts that an ear can ever receive.

But nothing hurts more than a shattered dream by the hands of the oppressors. Thus, the article was a smash.

–A New York Prisoner

MIM Theory Needs Help

***What are you doing
to unmask imperialism?***

- Write • Create art
- Contribute • Subscribe
- Distribute

Contact MIM to get involved.

You're out of uniform!



Jiang Qing, Great Revolutionary Leader

For our issue on culture in revolution, MIM decided to reprint this article which appeared in MIM Notes immediately following the death of Jiang Qing in June 1991; it was edited slightly for publication in MIM Theory 2/3, and several minor changes were made here as well. —ed.

by MCS

Revolutionary communists from Peru to Amerika to China mourn the death of Jiang Qing, the world's foremost communist leader since the death of Mao Zedong in 1976.

Jiang Qing committed suicide on May 14 according to the social-fascist (socialist in words, fascist in deeds) Deng Xiaoping regime in China. She was serving a life sentence at her daughter's house according to the regime.

BEIJING SPRING 1989 CONNECTION

The regime reported the death on the night of June 4, the anniversary of the Beijing massacre in 1989.(1) At this point, MIM is not aware of any details in the supposed suicide.

As the people that carried out a *coup d'etat* against Jiang Qing to take power, the Deng Xiaoping regime cannot be trusted to report what actually happened. The *New York Times* speculated that the regime waited as long as possible to announce the death in order not to give students another reason to demonstrate in the crucial May and early June period. This would also be an attempt by the regime to link student "turmoil" to Jiang Qing.

On June 5, 1989, after the massacre, the Central Committee of the social-fascist regime said the people it massacred were "political rogues, remnants of the Gang of Four, and other scoundrels." The "Gang of Four" — Jiang Qing, Wang Hungwen, Yao Wenyuan and Zhang Chunqiao — led the Cultural Revolution in China and represented the generation of Mao's successors.

A reading of documents by leaders of the Beijing Spring shows that the bulk of the movement leadership was not in the hands of "Gang of Four" supporters.(2) Even though the movement in 1989 used many of the same techniques — political posters, which were outlawed by Deng after the Cultural Revolution, gaining free train transport from sympathetic train workers, getting free food wherever they traveled and going into the countryside, other cities and middle schools in order to drum up support beyond the students. Even some of the slogans — "Down with Deng Xiaoping!" for example — were also used during the Cultural Revolution.

LIFE DEDICATED TO STRUGGLE

Born in 1914, Jiang Qing joined active political circles as a teenage actor. She joined the Chinese Communist Party in 1931 when it faced savage repression from a landlord and imperialist-backed party called the Guomindang (also known as KMT or Kuomintang). She enjoyed a successful progressive and then revolutionary career in theater.

In 1934, she served three months in prison, where guards beat her, by their own testimony.(3)

Enduring several sicknesses that left her hospitalized for months at a time before and after 1949, Jiang Qing received radiation treatment for cervical cancer that nearly killed her in 1956; however, she eventually recovered to continue the struggle.(4)

After success in the Cultural Revolution, Jiang ended up in prison again in 1976 — with some possible breaks for hospitalization, but she never relented in agitating against the social-fascists.

MARRIAGE AND POLITICAL RESTRICTIONS

Despite spending 60 years making revolution and spending a quarter of that time in prison as a result, throughout her life Jiang had difficulties being taken seriously simply because she was a woman.

In 1938, she married the chairperson of the Communist Party of China, Mao Zedong. The party required Jiang Qing to give up politics for 30 years.

Thanks to Communist Party leadership, China's wimmin saw their conditions advance by leaps and bounds compared with pre-Liberation days. Even compared with American wimmin, China's wimmin enjoyed greater equality — in their access to top jobs and more equal pay for instance.

Despite rapid progress in the area of wimmin's equality with men, China still had some old thinking that the Communist Party could not wish away. The reasons for relegating Jiang Qing outside politics were mostly incorrect. First, the party apparently held that Jiang Qing would receive great political scrutiny as the wife of Mao Zedong. Hence, any political mistakes she made would reflect on the party and the party believed that she was relatively inexperienced to be in such a position.

Jiang Qing was not yet a ranking political leader despite her years of dedication up to that point. There was no good reason Jiang Qing could not make mistakes and then correct them.

A second implicit reason the party had was that it wanted stability from Mao and Jiang, since Jiang had an actor's repu-

tation for having had several lovers and because Mao himself had already had two wives. Still, the two could have guaranteed stability without sacrificing Jiang Qing's political career.

A third reason given was that the party wanted to make Mao more productive and have Jiang Qing take care of him for 30 years as an important political task. Head-of-state Liu Shaoqi continued with this approach to keep Jiang out of politics after Liberation in 1949.(5)

Despite the many incorrect attitudes toward women both inside and outside the party, from the beginning of the marriage, Jiang served as Mao's political secretary. She was so close to Mao that she retreated with him as part of the last group to leave Yanan under enemy fire in 1947. She was also appointed a political assistant in the revolutionary army in the last and greatest military campaigns of the civil war.(6)

In the early 1950s, despite opposition from the party and Mao, she participated in the land reform movement that distributed land to the peasants and then collectivized agriculture. She did so anonymously so as not to attract attention.(7)

Without so much as a personal enemy of hers as a phony gossip source or circumstantial evidence, male chauvinist pig Ross Terrill speculates that she arranged her work in the countryside land reform movement, just so she could meet with ex-boyfriends.(8) This kind of questioning of her individual motivations is typical of her critics.

By the early 1960s, Jiang was pushing Mao to criticize reactionary cultural and educational practices. Having returned to cultural work in the early 1950s, she was in full swing by the 1960s authoring criticisms and then directing revolutionary ballets and theater.

Jiang criticized art for not changing after the revolution. Art continued to have bourgeois and feudal heroes, ghosts and other superstitions, and avoided the life of the common people: "Do you eat?" she cried to the theater people. "That food came from the farmers! So serve the farmers in your plays and operas!"(9)

Throughout the Cultural Revolution, Mao gave his ideological support and theoretical aid, while Jiang Qing did the hands-on work. A strong portrait of her leadership role in the Cultural Revolution (1966-1976) emerges in a biography called *Chiang Ch'ing*.(10)

JIANG QING WAS RIGHT

Of all the analysts and critics looking at China after Mao, Jiang Qing saw most clearly what various individuals in the party would do after Mao died. She made the shrewdest political judgments in some cases where Mao Zedong may have proved wrong.

This is not to say that such judgments are the most important aspect of building a movement toward communism. All individuals are the product of historical forces and situations. However, too often, Jiang Qing does not receive credit for what she has done.

Nicholas Kristoff claims for instance that "One of her grave

miscalculations, in retrospect, was to make an enemy of Deng Xiaoping, now China's senior leader, and denounce him as an 'international capitalist agent.'"(1)

In the next paragraph of his hack-job, Kristoff goes on to talk about Jiang Qing as "using beauty and sex to win power."(1) Kristoff makes Jiang out to be someone who never understood politics, but Jiang was profoundly opposed to Deng Xiaoping for years. Kristoff's portrayal pretends that Jiang was not a revolutionary veteran in her fifties and sixties when she attacked Deng Xiaoping.

Jiang Qing has proved quite correct about Deng Xiaoping as an "international capitalist agent" as MIM Notes has shown repeatedly in past issues [See also MIM Theory 4 -ed.].

One of Jiang's merits was her attempt to get Mao to purge Deng Xiaoping from the party much earlier than his third disgrace in 1976. She also led the attack on Zhou Enlai in the later years, again for consistent reasons of program despite Zhou Enlai's obvious popularity and declining health. Zhou Enlai was Deng Xiaoping's direct political boss and patron.

From the beginning she also saw through Yang Shangkun, reportedly having violent disagreements with him as early as the early 1950s. Yang responded to her radical activism after 1949 by continuing to advocate her retirement from politics.(11) While the bourgeois hacks and revisionists describe this as a personal conflict, Yang's line was obviously sexist across the board.

It was Yang Shangkun, along with his relatives, who commanded troops to massacre the people of Beijing in 1989. Yang is now one of the top handful of leaders in the social-fascist regime.

Jiang Qing also reportedly never trusted Hua Guofeng to assume leadership of a province as early as 1967.(12) Despite her low estimation of Hua, Mao appointed him to the top government and party posts just before he died. When Mao died, Hua Guofeng arrested the "Gang of Four" and helped Deng Xiaoping to power.

In concluding his biography on Jiang, *The White-Boned Demon*, a whole book of psychological National Enquirer-style gossip criticizing Jiang's sex life, Terrill has this to say about Jiang's challenge to Deng from prison:

"Jiang added, 'he's a coward and a revisionist. Only if he debates me [at the 12th Congress of the Communist Party] will he show himself a true Communist.' It was the same Lan Ping [Jiang's name from younger days] who had told Tang Na: 'Unless you correct your faults, you will not be worthy to say you once were my lover.'"(13)

With Jiang Qing in prison because she never gave up the class struggle, all the bourgeois male-chauvinist pigs can talk about is her sex life. The handful of China "experts" who dominate the U.S. media and academic circles are too caught up in sex, not to mention intelligence-gathering, anti-communism and cultural bias, to give the U.S. public any deep understanding of what Jiang was really saying.

Unfortunately, Terrill's book is one of two well-known

English-language biographies of Jiang Qing, and hence very influential. Among Terrill's promoters who put recommendations for his book on the back cover are Richard Solomon, head of the Political Science Department of the Air Force intelligence company called the Rand Corporation; Joseph Kraft, a syndicated columnist; and Professor Michel Oksenberg of the University of Michigan, Jimmy Carter's number one China intelligence agent and one of Richard Nixon's buddies. Oksenberg in particular distinguished himself by going to China with Nixon in the first group of Americans to pay respects to the regime after the Beijing massacre in 1989.

JIANG DURING THE CULTURAL REVOLUTION

Thanks to the China-watching-academic-intelligence-media-elite, a number of myths have arisen with regard to Jiang Qing in the Cultural Revolution. Jiang is blamed for anything wrong that happened in the Cultural Revolution, even more so than Mao because of her hands-on role.

According to the *New York Times*, "During the Cultural Revolution, Ms. Jiang oversaw mass rallies in which her enemies were humiliated and physically abused. She also is said to have sought out and killed those who spurned her in earlier years." (1)

The latter accusation is not substantiated in the article, but instead, like half of the *New York Times* and *Los Angeles Times* obituaries, plagiarizes Terrill's book. These bourgeois male chauvinists cannot imagine Jiang having a political line. They cannot imagine that she was engaged in class struggle her whole life, in some cases for decades against the very same people.

Every time she proved exactly right in her accusation regarding a "despotic landlord" (Yang) or "international capitalist agent" (Deng), the bourgeois hacks preferred to fantasize about her sex life or label her crazy as in the case of one state capitalist paper in China: "She 'twists her lips, snorts and even says some nonsense like 'This is not the Chairman's revolutionary line.''" (1)

When revisionists arrested Jiang Qing in 1976, Hua Guofeng's press criticized Jiang Qing as a "modern witch," "woman devil," and "procuress." For good measure the press added in that "from time immemorial women have been the source of all evil." (14)

Two of Jiang's female associates, at the time of the anti-"Gang of Four" campaign, were tarred with the charges of "she had never had a boy friend" and "unable to succeed with men at either a high or low level and never able to find a suitable husband." (14)

Even one of Jiang's more sympathetic bourgeois biographers – a woman named Roxanne Witke, who at least tried to deal with serious political issues befitting state leaders – accused Jiang Qing of distorting the goals of the class enemy she attacked. Jiang Qing led the Cultural Revolution, saying the Liu Shaoqi headquarters wanted to break down collective

agriculture, assign plots of land to families, set quotas for farmers for sales to the state, put the rest of the product on a "free" market and open China to superexploitation by Western imperialists. (15) And when Deng Xiaoping took power, he and the rest of his class did every single thing Jiang Qing said he would.

Jiang Qing did not have to distort the class enemy's goals. There were very large differences between the two sides, the two lines – Jiang's line and Deng's line. The new state capitalists led by Deng did indeed break collective agriculture, open free markets and allow imperialist investment with wages for Chinese workers that amounted to a few dollars a day.

The most serious charges against Jiang Qing by the bourgeoisie would amount to her repressing the masses. This charge is far from proven.

The usual Western custom is to attribute all violence during the Cultural Revolution to the "Gang of Four," a means by which it is possible to come up with figures in the hundreds of thousands or millions of casualties. By such a measure there is no question that the Cultural Revolution exacted a high price from the masses.

These figures include violence by factions opposed to the Gang of Four, personal vendettas carried out by people in the name of politics and whatever Western analysts deem a premature death. As explained in previous MIM Notes, this technique is culturally chauvinist and pro-bourgeois because these same analysts use different methods in examining Western bourgeois leaders.

According to Jiang's enemies in power, the "Gang of Four" killed 34,800 people in 10 years in a country with a billion people. (16) By contrast, the regime in one year in 1983 called for a quota of 5,000 executions and apparently surpassed the quota with 15,000 or more. (17)

Meanwhile, Deng accuses both Jiang and the 1989 movement of advocating "beating, smashing, looting and burning." Actually, Jiang Qing took a clear line against violence during the Cultural Revolution. Witke paraphrased Jiang Qing of 1972 this way:

"How can ideological aggression against revisionism be sustained without stimulating physical aggression, which might sever lines of communication between the leaders and led? More to the point, how could the violence that was no more than political enthusiasm in action be curbed without breaking off the revolutionary momentum needed to prevent society from sinking back into the status quo ante where poor people and women were excluded from responsibility for public affairs?" (18)

From the beginning of the Cultural Revolution in 1966, Jiang Qing said to a rally of teenage activists: "if you want to unite, you must be dictatorial toward the minority who persist in violent behavior." (18) This was a clear statement that people employing violence were undermining socialism.

Jiang Qing was quite right about violence. Violence among

middle school students or against intellectuals could not accomplish anything. Again and again Mao and the "Gang of Four" stressed that violence must be reserved for the tiny class enemy in the party on the capitalist road and only employed cautiously. Jiang Qing spent much time criticizing ultra-leftism and anarchism for militant posturing that diverted attacks from the capitalist-roaders.

Another little known fact is that Jiang Qing was perhaps the first major leader opposed to the theory of "hereditary redness." At the beginning of the Cultural Revolution, privileged children of capitalist-roaders in the party (applauded by Trotskyists for their class stance) used this incorrect doctrine to attack other children.(19) In the end, Jiang Qing prevailed, and 95% of the youth were allowed to participate in the Cultural Revolution.

This did not stop conservative and ultraleft Red Guards from attacking intellectuals and students in the name of defending Maoism. These Red Guards were hoodwinked by children of the capitalist-roaders trying to divert the attack from their parents onto other targets. They roused themselves to taunt Jiang Qing at Beijing University that they were going to "hang and fry" her.(20)

Much is made of the fact that Jiang Qing referred to the intellectuals as the "ninth stinking category" as a means of criticizing them. She also said, "attack with words; defend with force" once, but then took even that mild statement back. Jiang Qing never said, "use this period of freedom, political education and participation to form factions that kill each other and persecute intellectuals." That this often happened in China demonstrates the difficulties of putting proletarian democracy into practice.

The people's movement in Beijing 1989 would do well to look at the problems with attaining mass participation in politics. When central government authorities allow big character posters to go up everywhere, allow strikes, allow demonstrations and encourage workers and students to administer their own affairs, there is a price to pay in shaking off the old habits of generations.

Jiang Qing knew this but did not conclude that the masses should not start running their own life as her concerns regarding violence show. Nor did she throw out the idea of relying on the masses and encouraging them toward self-reliance in politics, as most of her critics would.

While the Maoists' efforts to rely on the masses had many adverse effects for the masses themselves, a lesser known phenomenon is the several assassination attempts on Jiang Qing.(21) Many political leaders would have imposed martial law and state-of-emergency, but Jiang Qing and the Maoists persevered through assassination attempts because they did not wish to incite the masses to further violence against each other in the name of preventing assassination attempts.

Jiang pushed this notion of relying on the masses farther than Mao did in a friendly disagreement within the ranks of Maoists. The "Gang of Four" held that Shanghai in 1967, and

by implication the rest of the country, could organize itself into Paris Commune style governments. When Mao died, the revisionists charged that the "Gang of Four" moved to have various places establish Paris Communes, which is likely true.

Their notion of proletarian democracy makes the ideas of today's movement leaders like Wuor Kaixi, Shen Tong and Yan Jiaqi look authoritarian and elitist in comparison. These leaders only want freedom of the press and an end to government corruption. They have little idea how workers and peasants could practice "democracy."

In contrast, in the Paris Commune style administration, the masses seize their government and economy and have the power to recall their officials at any time. Membership in the party and government posts as they were known would be abolished because of the participation of the masses. The class basis of commune rule would be assured by the masses' dictatorship over the small minority and the masses' continuous supervision of their leaders.

The Shanghai Commune of 1967 was short-lived because Mao reluctantly opposed the idea and adopted Zhou Enlai's idea of revolutionary committees as a compromise. Mao held that the masses still needed a vanguard party and that too many communes would complicate foreign policy and make dictatorship and defense preparations more difficult. In other words, Mao felt that the international conditions were not yet ripe for communes. For this reason, among others, Mao lightly referred to himself as center-left with the "Gang of Four" as the real left.

Jiang Qing realized perhaps more sharply than Mao that the culture and ideology of the society lagged behind the advance of the developing socialist economy. She never "rested on her laurels" as Mao would say.

As an example, in 1952 she was not satisfied with wimmin's progress, especially in the countryside, so when she got the chance, she went to a village incognito and worked behind a plow to show that wimmin could manage plowing of the fields.

In some remarks to Witke, Jiang Qing summed up the situation of wimmin in 1972: "Don't just look at the progress of today. Although women occupy highly important positions in industry, agriculture, education, and other departments, and there are even women in such critical industries as defense, still there are backward aspects that you should examine."(22) This attitude of not ignoring the realities of patriarchy and class society guided Jiang Qing in her efforts to make "continuous revolution" precisely when she was at the zenith of her power and when typical rulers would have become complacent and defensive of the status quo.

Contrary to what Westerners might expect, Jiang Qing also made a detailed criticism of the personality cult which was built up around Mao Zedong to make it easier to knock down Mao Zedong Thought.(23)

JIANG'S PLACE IN HISTORY

Comrade Gonzalo in Peru has pointed out that Maoist parties engaged in armed struggle are more advanced than those that are not. Jiang participated in armed struggle led by the Communist Party to liberate China from semi-colonialism and semi-feudalism.

She also took the struggle to the next stage – against the bourgeoisie in the party under socialism. In that struggle she was the steadiest and foremost hands-on organizer.

After Mao's death and her own arrest with the "Gang of Four," Jiang Qing demonstrated herself to be a leader of leaders. Two of the "Gang of Four" sold out to the regime under pressure in return for lenient sentences.

Zhang Chunqiao, the only other Maoist leader close to Jiang's stature, chose a strategy of silent resistance. Jiang, however, by all accounts gave fiery resistance to the revisionists at every turn and to the end of her life. In her political trial even the bourgeois critics noticed that she embarrassed the regime politically.

In all these ways, Jiang served as the leading Maoist in the world since Mao's death. Her death is a tragic loss to the proletariat, especially in the loss of her knowledge derived from practice of the twists and turns in the first historical struggle against the bourgeoisie under socialism.

Notes:

None of the sources for this article are by Jiang Qing supporters except for Rita Helling.

1. *New York Times* June 5, 1991.

2. See Mok Chiu Yu and J. Frank Harrison, eds., *Voices from Tiananmen Square*. Montréal: Black Rose Books, 1990.

3. Ross Terrill, *The White-Boned Demon*, New York: William Morrow and Company, 1984, p. 61.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 228.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 201.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 177.

7. Roxanne Witke, *Comrade Chiang Ch'ing*, Boston: Little, Brown, 1977, pp. 252-3.

8. Terrill, p. 188.

9. *Ibid.*, p. 248.

10. Dwan L. Tai, *Chiang Ch'ing: The Emergence of a Revolutionary Political Leader*, Hicksville, N.Y.: Exposition Press, 1974.

11. Witke, p. 255.

12. Roger Garside, *Coming*

Alive: China After Mao, New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 1981, p. 146.

13. Terrill, p. 393.

14. Rita Helling, "Women in China," in *China in Transition: Where to Next?* South Australia: Adelaide Anti-Imperialist Study-Action Group, 1979, p. 43.

15. Witke, p. 305.

16. *Los Angeles Times* June 5, 1991, pp. A1, A6.

17. Orville Schell, *To Get Rich Is Glorious: China in the 80's*, New York: Pantheon Books, 1984, pp. 44-6.

18. Witke, p. 331.

19. Hong Yung Lee, *The Politics of the Chinese Cultural Revolution: A Case Study*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1978, p. 75.

20. Witke, p. 297.

21. *Ibid.*, pp. 352, 362.

22. *Ibid.*, p. 230.

23. *Ibid.*, p. 361.

Jiang Timeline

Jiang Qing's post-1949 accomplishments: party posts and movement leadership

1950: "Spring. Participates incognito in land reform in East China. Is appointed director of the Cinema Department of the Propaganda Department and launches condemnation of the film *Inside Story of the Ch'ing Court*.

"Spring through summer. Leads the Wu Hsun investigation.

"Fall. Her second episode of incognito land reform, which includes marriage reform in environs of Wuhan.

1951: "Winter. Is forced to resign her post as chief of the General Office of the Party's Central Committee. Again becomes Mao's secretary and remains so through the 1950s.

1954: "Engineers Marxian debates over the novel *Dream of the Red Chamber*.

1961: "Is preoccupied with a class analysis of the performing arts.

1962: "With the mayor of Shanghai, K'o Ch'ing-shih, begins her attack against feudal and bourgeois conventions in art and literature.

"Spring. Drafts the May Sixteenth Circular. [Document to become the most important initial set of instructions to Red Guards in 1966 –MC5]

1963: "December. Seeks background for *The Red Detachment of Women* on Hainan island.

1964: "June and July. Peking Opera Festival. Makes her first public speech. Continues opera and ballet reform behind the scenes, while stimulating other arts festivals.

"December. Elected to the National People's Congress.

1965: "Organizes the critique of Wu Han's *Hai Jui Dismissed from Office*, presented in Yao Wenyan's name in November.

1966: "Directs the Forum on the Work in Literature and Art in the Armed Forces in Shanghai. Appointed cultural advisor to the army by Lin Piao.

Drafts second May Sixteenth Circular ... Cultural Revolution Group of the Central Committee is convened with Ch'en Po-ta as head, and Chiang Ch'ing and Chang Ch'un-ch'iao as his deputies. [The Cultural Revolution Group functioned as the highest body of the party at the time –MC5]

Becomes secretary of the Standing Committee of the Politburo.

1967: "Appointed adviser to a reorganized PLA Cultural Revolution Group.

"Having addressed groups and rallies for almost a year, presides over the Peking Rally commemorating the twenty-fifth anniversary of Mao's Yenan talks.

1969: "April. Is elected to the Politburo.

1971: "Winter. Among the designers of the national campaign against Lin Piao. Throughout the mid-1970's continues to revise revolutionary operas, ballets, and musical compositions introduced in the 1960's. Releases film versions of some."

[Jiang Qing was also the secretary of the group responsible for the anti-Lin Biao, anti-Confucius campaign of 1973-4 –MC5]

Source: Roxanne Witke, *Comrade Chiang Ch'ing*, (Boston: Little, Brown, 1977). MIM's italics, Witke's removed.

Ultraleft in the Cultural Revolution

MIM reprints a 1992 Internet exchange on the Cultural Revolution for this issue of MIM Theory. —ed.

by the Maoist Internationalist Movement
June 25, 1992

Recently, someone ... asked us if we thought Maoism was practiced during the Cultural Revolution, and if so by whom? We at MIM based our opinion on close readings of participants in the Cultural Revolution. We found that the people committing crimes against the people came from either the Right — Liu Shaoqi, Deng Xiaoping, etc. — or by the ultraleft. In a previous post we gave an example of Maoist resistance to the ultraleft and Right during the Cultural Revolution.

This is something you cannot generally ask Western scholars about, never mind journalists who never studied the Cultural Revolution. As far as Westerners are concerned, it is impossible to sort out Chinese shouting "Long Live Chairman Mao!" All they know is that what the participants in the Cultural Revolution were saying doesn't sound like what we have in America.

The press lumps everyone including Deng Xiaoping, Hua Guofeng, the Gang of Four and everyone else not advocating U.S. neo-colonialism openly enough — as "hardline." We at MIM find this ignorance to be dangerous. There are important lessons to learn from the Cultural Revolution, but we can't learn the lesson just by saying "China Went Mad" like *Time* magazine did in 1987.

When we raise the issue of the ultraleft, some people say that it didn't exist. Luckily, some leaders who even called themselves "ultraleft" did go to Hong Kong and wrote their views about being "ultraleft" Red Guards. Without these documents, we would not know from Western journalism that some Red Guards really opposed what Mao was advocating.

Wu Man was one such Red Guard, who escaped to Hong Kong in 1973. The date is very important to note, because it is proof that people opposed Mao very early on in the Cultural Revolution. Wu Man criticized Mao with the aid of other Red Guards and Western anarchists and Trotskyists in 1974.

I know a lot of people on this net will say, "great, they opposed Mao Zedong during the Cultural Revolution!" However, these "ultra-leftists" were the ones who believed Mao did not go far enough. "We could not accept this 'transitional period' as excuse, for if we accepted it, many problems would disappear. We deliberated on this point and felt that 'can't be helped' was only an excuse. ... You may ask what

are the solutions to this problem. Many feel it is difficult to answer." (Wu Man interviewed in Kan San, intro. *China: The Revolution is Dead — Long Live the Revolution*. Montreal: Black Rose Books, 1977. pp. 208-9.)

Wu Man was similar to many Kronstadt rebels in the Soviet Union in 1921 who wanted utopia instantly. Such utopia-seekers are always quick to use violence on anyone for the slightest imperfection. And despite this impatience for "excuses," the ultraleftists, as in Kronstadt finally admit that they don't have solutions themselves, just criticisms.

Wu Man went on to advocate "neo idealistic heroism." (p. 208) Unlike Mao who studied reality and upheld dialectical materialism, Wu Man compared all reality to the ideal of communism. If the reality did not match utopia, then violent opposition was justified.

Another ultraleftist, Yu Shuet, opposed Mao's use of the military to end the Cultural Revolution. (p. 187) Yu called Mao the "chief representative of the ruling class."

This kind of thinking was very influential amongst millions of Red Guards and even some Western Marxists. In the United States, Maoist forces split at the end of the Cultural Revolution in 1969. The previously official Maoist party in the United States denounced Mao as a state-capitalist and split the entire revolutionary movement in the United States. The name of the party was Progressive Labor Party, which teamed up with the ultraleftists, anarchists and Trotskyists in the book cited here.

It was these overread poets who felt that 90% of the party was bad and that that 90% deserved the violence against it of the Cultural Revolution. Quote:

"The January Storm told people that China would go toward a society which had no bureaucrats, and that 90 percent of the senior cadres had already formed a privileged class. The fact that 90 per cent of the senior cadres had to stand aside in the storm of the January Revolution was certainly not an error by the 'masses'" (p. 156).

This document even referred to itself as the "ultraleft," partly to distinguish itself from the Gang of Four that it saw as to its Right (p. 157). Chinese students will recall that Mao maintained that the vast majority of the party was "good" or "comparatively good." Mao and the Gang never referred to the whole party as a privileged class. The ultraleft targeted a whole strata of people as enemy that deserved violence against it. This tended to fall on lower-ranking party members and intellectuals.

RAIL Nonviolence Debate

This essay was written by a member of a RAIL study group, as was the response that follows. —ed.

"If a revolution destroys a systematic government but the systematic patterns of thought that are produced by that government are left intact, then those patterns will repeat themselves in the succeeding government."

—Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance

MIM has previously admitted that 99% of all current violence is reactionary in nature or used to support reactionary politics. I would like to take this time to challenge MIM to accept some portion of Gandhi's outlook and admit that all 100% of violent activity is reactionary. My impetus for these comments comes from the critique of Gandhi in MIM Theory 11. I am not intending to argue the success of the Indian non-violent revolution, nor do I have the ability to do so. I am also not speaking for Gandhi or representing him as my revolutionary mentor. I am merely siding with him, and seeking to clarify a few points that he raised.

The first question raised by MIM (and answered) is: "What is meant by elitist violence?" MIM concludes that Gandhi meant: "Violence is O.K. for the rich but unacceptable for the oppressed." This, indeed, sounds quite foolish. How can a movement seeking to end the violence of the state also condone it. Though I was not there, I find it laughable to even consider this as a plausible argument that Gandhi considered making. That is irrelevant. I will make my own point as to how violence is elitist. My thoughts on this stem from the above quote. The true revolution is one that shatters the current system of humyn (and sadly, admit it or not, non-humyn) interaction. The system of group over group oppression — or hierarchy. This system that we all know and love as capitalism is what the revolution must destroy. So far RAIL and MIM should be nodding their heads agreeably. MIM will also agree that the most useful means of social restructuring (and/or maintenance) is through non-repressive (that's relative) thought reform. We saw in *Prisoners of Liberation* that MIM upholds the theories that ran the Maoist prison system. Well, these practices seek to destroy the system of group over group oppression. They seek to stop the selfish and sadistic thought patterns of imperialism.

Where Gandhi and I disagree is when the revolution begins attacking not the essence of oppression, nor the mindset of the oppressors, but the actual oppressors (and by attack I am not referring to destruction of property — that is something I find necessary, eventually, to the revolution. I am discussing the taking of life.) What this leads to is not communism; a classless (i.e. non-hierarchical) society. Instead it inverts the pyramid. It maintains the same desire to oppress based on class status as the capitalist state does (did). The pacifist does not condone violence for any reason, so why would it condone state

sanctioned murder? No. That's not the idea at all. The concept is that when we take on the methodology of the oppressor, we soon become the oppressor.

Next, then, comes Gandhi's critique of socialism which I believe was incorrectly taken as a critique of communism. Again, I do not know Gandhi's thoughts on this issue, so I'll express mine. I see socialism, the so-called "revolutionary state" as the failed link in communist theory. I don't have any qualms about living in a classless society in which prisons are unnecessary etc., and group over group oppression is no more. I don't have any problem with struggling to obtain that goal. The problem I have is with how Marxist-Leninist-Maoists propose getting there. I do not see the instillation of a reverse state — one that oppresses the rich — as a step in the right direction. (Do not get me wrong, I want to completely obliterate even the thought of decadent and selfish pigs such as the ruling elite — but I don't think murder will destroy the system that bolsters that thought process).

In various other instances, we see the imperialist empire seeking revenge on those that threaten their hegemony. The Black Panther Party, for example. They blatantly attacked the ruling elite — the white bastards that were raping their communities. Thus the state was able to use their position of social-economic authority to label them as insignificant. I believe the number murdered was around 40 and the number of imprisoned panthers is still higher. What I'm getting at is, the state attacks the oppressed in the same manner that the BPP attacks them. I am weary about being too into "power struggles" and the road of revenge that may lead us all down. So many times I'd loved to bash the heads in of some fascist scum, but I have to recognize that that wouldn't be useful — not ever.

I am not critiquing the Black Panthers because they did some wonderful things. I am critiquing the general practicality of armed struggle. Since it is a major tenet of MIM line, I know this argument is a dead end but I think any Maoist fears the thought of becoming reactionary — that must be the last thing they want to do — it's the last thing I want to do. Thus, if it becomes clear that using murder to control a nation is reactionary, perhaps MIM will abandon support of such a practice.

A last point on this issue is this (and I am only raising a question): If MIM supports armed revolution in the belly of the empire (the U.S.) only after the masses have been well organized to accept a new state — then why is force necessary? That's a little silly, there will obviously be resistance from the capitalists. I suppose then a better question is: Why not keep organizing the masses, until no one supports the imperialist regime anymore and it crumbles by virtue of its own lack of support. To me, this would destroy the system of oppression — something far more useful than killing the figureheads.

TOLSHOK RESPONDS:

I would like to say that first of all, and I know that Otis isn't supporting Gandhi; Gandhi was not a materialist but a mystic idealist who was comparing his ideas with actual practices. There is a section in "What is MIM?" that explains where idealists fall short. MIM basically says that these ideas have not really furthered the struggles of the oppressed masses. I would have to say that Gandhi's nonviolent methods didn't accomplish much because he downplayed class antagonisms and national antagonisms, which in essence is liberalism. As we speak, India is still patriarchal and still bears the brunt of imperialism.

The reason that revolutionaries can't convince the entire world to change the world without violent means is because there is a material base which has to be gotten rid of. The imperialist and the oppressor nation are so used to their privileged status that in most cases they are willing to throw reason out the window to protect their vested interests and put up brutal fights at the expense of the oppressed.

This is what most anarchists and pacifists are unwilling to recognize. To change the world to a stage of no power of groups over groups one must be a materialist, one must learn to see that the exchange of ideas is not enough to change a person. If this were so than no revolutions would ever be needed. Under a system with oppression, people with oppressive thoughts are going to be produced. The only difference is that some are interested in changing it because it is a matter of life and death for them. Those who oppose this change do so not only because their ideas are wrong, they oppose this change because their material conditions have shaped them. Only through a thorough sweeping of the old traditions can people actually start to become better.

National struggles require violent means. Violence as a form is not inherently wrong, only to which ends. If people are pissed and the only way they can get rid of their chains is through violent means, then this is correct. This is a problem a lot of revolutionaries have: they tend to feel disgust at everything that capitalism has brought forth. Just because the imperialists use science, math, industry, and violence it doesn't mean that these things are incorrect, only the purposes for which they are used is what needs to be changed. If someone wants to get rid of technology just because the imperialists use it, this is wrong. It would reverse historical progress and it would be reactionary. Now if someone denies the use of violence just because the pigs use it, then there would be no use in changing the world. Some people are so engulfed in their material interests that there is no use in trying to change their minds, there is no need to. Some crimes are unforgivable and the justice of the people must be seen through. No one is forced to support their nation. Some oppressed nationals become compradors and are bought off and some oppressors commit nation suicide and fight to end oppression because they are able to grasp this concept. But it is very time-consuming to try to convince the white nation to give up its parasitic

lives while 14 million children are dying and there is simply no use in waiting. The Third World is fed up and can't wait around for their oppressors to become "enlightened" and give up their genocidal practices. Even when an oppressed national pleads for a bite to eat, they would probably get a slap in the face and be told to pull themselves up "by their bootstraps."

When there is a proletarian dictatorship, the many oppress the few, but these antagonisms are not solved through violent means, but through cultural revolutions where criticism, self-criticism and reason are put into practice.

MC12 ADDS:

MIM would differ with the responding RAIL comrade on one point. That is, in the individual case, communists always prefer to give individuals a chance to change their ways instead of using force. All soldiers in the enemy camp, for example, should know what the communists are about and if possible they should be given the chance to switch sides. In the process of taking away class power by force, many individuals choose to switch to the side of the people before it is too late.

RVS Brings Maoism to the Future

Comrade,

This is in response to your letter of 10 February 1997 engaging me in struggle over the politics of such a character as RVS. Or perhaps the potential danger that such a character could come to present to the masses in the future.

You stated, as Mao said at the talks on literature and art at Yanan, "Revolutionary literature and art are the products of the reflection of the life of the people in the brains of revolutionary writers and artists" (*Selected Readings of Mao Zedong*, p. 265). That is so correct! I am an artist however at this point in time my incarceration severely restricts my freedom of expression or rather I should say the "means by which I can express what I create." RVS as well as many songs that I've written have become "politicized" art during my struggle with MIM for the last 2 1/2 years. In fact, it is a reflection of the MIM's correct line in proving the Party's effectiveness in "radicalizing" and "revolutionizing" the thinking processes of all those who engage in unity and struggle — those who truly desire liberation. So in response to your letter I will begin by describing the development and purpose of the character RVS.


RVS is a character I created for a comic book I had in mind. Over the course of struggling with MIM it has been "altered" so that it would serve the interests of the masses instead of my individual interests.

RVS is the tale of a nineteen year old living in the year 3025 N.W.O. (New World Order)

He is captain of the resistance movement which is trying to smash the intergalactic imperial federation. Yeah, yeah, aliens and all the other good stuff is off in this "idea" for the comic. However, in the year 3025 the entire inter-galactic resistance has been suffering heavy blows dealt by the federation. RVS has been given a time-traveling device by a very concerned "master" who resides on the planet Venus. This device is called an "equator ball."

Some very technologically advanced computers with a very real "synthetic" form of human intelligence and thinking capacity. There are only three of the balls in the entire universe. Two were stolen by a bounty hunter from the federation. One of them was recovered by a resistance member a girl of 17. The mission of RVS is to travel back in time to obtain the most correct military science with which the resistance can use to smash the federation. RVS arrives in the year 1997. He travels the world evaluating the various "theories" their stated "claim" to political correctness and he weighs this information against the ability of that theory to wage a successful revolution. He has the equator ball to translate much of the "philosophies" but RVS himself can't learn just so fast or grasp the correctness of a theory too quickly for after all he is just a 19 year old inside a "shield suit." For the love of creativity! So here (1997) is where RVS finds himself sitting through all the pseudo-sciences when alas, he finds Maoism! He begins to develop a materialist analysis of the present conditions in the world, why and how the people failed to smash the imperialist machine in 2005 ad – yes a failed revolution! Anyway, RVS polemicizes with any and everyone willing to engage him in ideological struggle over Maoist military science and he does this while the entire "federation of intergalactic bounty hunters" are tracking him. Enough of it.

Adventurism? I think not. Two things I will not do 1) I will not sell the idea of RVS and 2) I will not develop it into an actual comic book until I'm free of prison because I do not have the time or resources to do so. At this time RVS as a



character will only be found sloganeering for Maoism or using quotations from Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. Oh it's a far out "idea" but the capitalists finance and create bourgeois culture. Why can't revolutionaries create revolutionary culture? In fact, RVS did not become an "action figure" in my imaginative process until about 9 months ago. This is due to my struggle with the MIM. Due to the stretch of imagination behind it you have the power (right) most certainly to reject it, however I will continue to develop this creature so that when I get out I can put it to work for the cause....

In struggle,

—A South Carolina Prisoner, 1997

Poetry from Viet Nam

The mountain is only so high, the river stops.
Our capacity is without limit.
The stars can move.
Our will is unshakable.
—Anonymous

The Liberation Girl

From a child, I have been dreaming of
becoming a fighter
Against U.S. aggression and a defender of the
land.
I'll say farewell to my dear ones and respond
To the vibrant call of the Truong Son Range.
Wrapped in the affection of the whole coun-
try,
I'll be tempered in the crucible of war,
Aware of the Truong Son hardships
Aware that it's an immense school of life.
—Dang Thi Ha (d.1972)

Inscribed in blood on her cell walls

A rosy-checked woman, here I am fighting
side by side with you men!
On my shoulders, weighs the hatred that is
common to us.
The prison is my school, its mates my
friends,
The sword is my child, the gun my husband.
—Nguyen Thi Minh Khai
Secretary of the Saigon-Cholon branch
of the Indochinese Communist Party (execut-
ed 1941)

Songs That Cannot Be Silenced

Sing! Let us sing out,
Sing out again so our hearts may burst into
flame
And our burning blood may finally melt these
chains.
So that in the depth of the blackest night
The sun shines forever.

Here they come with their sticks
In the glacial silence
In the bolted cell
Their bloodshot eyes rivet on us
They hurl threatening words,
"Who's the bitch who had the nerve to sing?"
Mute rage engulfs our hearts

Our retort:
A willful silence.

After vain threats and questionings
Blows rain down.
So much flesh is torn
Over all the body, so much pain!

Then, my sister,
You stood up so proud
Rising above the pack of killers
"Down with terror! Down with brutes!"

Hand in hand,
Shoulder to shoulder:
A human wall
Will not give way.
Scarcely have they turned on their heels
Our laughter bursts out more brightly
Our voices rise more sweetly
More harmonious together
With a stronger beat
Defying the impotent rage of the guards.

Such power in such frail bodies—
Does it come from magic?

The next day, reprisals.
Aged mothers,
Little sisters, barely thirteen years old,
Beaten with the rest
Just for having sung.
"Who led the singing?"
Answer: a willful silence.
Cornered between the wall and the hard
ground
They fell unconscious.
Awakening,
Into their ears glides the sweet lullaby of an
elder sister
Like the voice of the native village.
Suddenly, on your trembling lips
Blooms the rose of a first smile
That no chains nor shackles can imprison!
—Hien Luong

Guerilla Woman

The night is shorter than the road
its path more intricate than the tiny lanes
that curve the surface of my baby daughter's
palm.
Yet I will wound this land, our own, with
trenches,
With pits for the French when they march
this path,
beds for the French to sleep in,
groves in the land for the enemy of the land.
The ditches must go deeper than my hatred.

The work must fly faster than my tears . . .

You can drown out the calls of my children,
but you can never hush the rhythm of my
naked hands
clawing the frozen mud that will contain you.
—To Huu, national poet of the DRV

Daughter Of Viet Nam

Wake up, my sister, the nightmare is over,
You live again, sister, you really live;
The searing electric shock, the piercing point,
The brilliant knife; the consuming fire
Have not killed you; heroic girl, your heart,
my sister,
Your heart so great, with one drop of blood
It will beat again and it will not beat for you
alone.

It will beat for justice, for your native village,
for
your country,
For humanity.
From the regions of death, you have come
back to us,
resplendent
As on the day you went away when the
nation called;
You have come back, daughter of glory.
The whole country embraces you
As flesh of its flesh and blood of its blood,
You live again, for you have conquered . . .
—To Huu

Winter Monsoon

I lie here listening to the winter monsoon
Wail in the night and I think of you.
Little daughter dear,
Have you gone to sleep or lie you there
awake?
Who is looking after you my child?
Who picks up your blanket
when you drop it in your sleep,
your plump fingers exposed to the cold?
How I crave to hug you, and kiss your lips,
and put my cheek against yours
and caress your shoulders.
Oh my little daughter,
Without you how the bed looks forlorn!
Can there be in this world more grieved
mothers?
In your letter you said, "I dreamt of you,
mother."
No, my child, it won't help to dream,
Let us be back together,
By destroying the enemy.
—Anonymous Northern Vietnamese woman

MIM's Maoist Movie Reviews

MIM uses movie reviews to comment on culture: to expose decadent, patriarchal, racist, or other imperialist cultural products; to use nonrevolutionary movies as a sounding board for revolutionary ideas and interpretations; and (much more rarely!) to praise progressive and revolutionary movies, including those that MIM uses in our public events. MIM will update this list of reviews as we get or write them — so send us your blurb-reviews, for inclusion in future publications or on our world wide web site <<http://www.etext.org/Politics/MIM>>. —ed.

Addicted to Love (1997): Two yuppies are united in their obsession with stalking their ex-es. Romantic-partners-as-property — the leading cause of illegal murders — is all good fun when patriarchy is the name of the game, and love is in the air. Hey, you got your Matthew Broderick in my Meg Ryan!

Alien3 (1992): In terms of a correct assessment of friends and enemies in advanced monopoly capitalism, Alien3 is pretty much right on. The Company controls state power and all of human society's capital. Planets are exploited for their natural resources, prisoners are forced to labor for free. On the side of the people, Sigourney Weaver, strong female lead looking very androgynous with her shaved head and no sex-symbol aura in sight, we well-organized prisoners. Still, it's a Hollywood movie. There is the mandatory Hollywood emphasis on romance, chase scenes and meaningless violence. The basic contradictions of imperialism underlying the plot also undermine its triumphant ending. Weaver and the prisoners are martyrs to the cause, and the Company has been defeated in one battle, but with no organization to carry on the fight, the oppressed of this future world, like those of today, are still at risk.

Barbarian Queen (1985): Led by a vanguard of women fighters of an oppressed tribe, the peasants, slaves, gladiators and oppressed tribes rise up to overthrow a king and his slave-owning guard of men. Potentially revolutionary

content is seriously undermined by pornographic "barbarian" costumes and repeated scenes of rape and murder mixed in with the male pleasures and fantasies. Eroticizing violence, perhaps all the more convincingly because of its pseudo-feminist political veneer.

Batman Returns (1992): Batman, for all his shrouded mystery, is just a cop whose role is to protect the entrenched power structure—which not incidentally includes protecting Bruce Wayne's fortune from so-called "criminals" who might want to redistribute the wealth. When Catwoman Michelle Pfeiffer finds a woman being raped in a dark alley, she dispenses with the rapist, then looks contemptuously at the woman and says: "What were you waiting for? Batman to come along and rescue you?" Women need not appeal to cops and other men in power to rescue them from domestic violence and rape; they should seize power for themselves. And contrary to the Batman Returns message, power doesn't mean dressing up in a cat costume. It means joining a revolutionary party to overthrow the imperialist patriarchy.

The Bird Cage (1996): As criticism of the religious right, a fun parody of hypocrisy among the Amerikan family values fascists. Not revolutionary, preaching greater tolerance for different lifestyles and begging the religious right to accept queens into their families so that everyone can live happily ever after. Still, it's progressive for mainstream Amerika to see queens portrayed as real people, but the struggle to gain acceptance in imperialist society is reactionary. Queens in Amerika are oppressed as outsiders to the dominant hetero-patriarchal culture. But they can also be rich and even raise children, while the majority of queers on the planet face survival issues before sexual liberation. Progressive queers in Amerika must ally themselves with the international proletariat fighting to overthrow the patriarchy, not attempt to win acceptance from the oppressors.

Breakdown (1997): Kurt Russell is the Massachusetts yuppie accountant whose wife is kidnapped when she takes a ride from a trucker because their yuppie Jeep breaks down on a small road out west. Proving once again that middle-aged, out of shape, couch potato yuppies not only

will do anything to save their nuclear families, but that they also possess whatever superhuman abilities are required to get the job done. Sport utility vehicle sales soar.

Breaking With Old Ideas (1975): Made in China during the Cultural Revolution, dramatizing the struggle for proletarian control of education at an agricultural college during the Great Leap Forward (1958-1959). Makes it clear that leading party members can still promote bourgeois ideas and only the masses can rectify these leaders (or remove them if necessary) to ensure that education truly helps to build socialism. An excellent introduction to the politics of the Great Leap Forward and the Cultural Revolution. Full of concrete examples of how class struggle continues under socialism and how communists can wage that struggle successfully: by mobilizing the masses to criticize those in positions of authority taking the capitalist road.

Carlito's Way (1993): Al Pacino is a Puerto Rican gangster who gets out of prison and tries to go straight. Cops and district attorneys are corrupt, the prison system is not rehabilitative, and judges are unabashedly on the side of prosecutors. There are no good cops in the film. Carlito tries to lead a clean life without Christianity or psychology as saviors, which is a relief. When the police try to get him to testify against a friend who crossed him, Carlito figures out a way to get back at the friend without selling out to the pigs. The "honorable gangster" is a movie cliché, but MIM is glad to see it dragged out in today's increasingly fascist cultural climate.

Children of the Revolution (1997?): Australian film creates the bizarre story of an Australian labor leader who sleeps with Stalin just before he dies and then raises his son. The movie relies on biological determinism and individual personality traits to create bourgeois criticisms of Stalin as an evil tyrant and leader of a personality cult.

China Cry (Nora Lambe, 1990): Anti-Mao and Cultural Revolution propaganda film, supposedly from a true story. A young Christian Chinese woman faces a firing squad for her Christian beliefs is saved by an act of God. Chinese communists depicted without the slightest attention to historical accuracy. The film concludes that some day China will be "free," and blames Mao for Deng Xiaoping-era atrocities. Chinese prisons were a model compared with U.S. prisons. Countless bourgeois and communist reports alike find that the Chinese prisons actually rehabilitated prisoners (ask for the MIM literature list). And if the point is to portray China as a police state, then the Christians should also do a movie explaining how it is that the United States has the highest impris-

onment rate in the world.

The Cook, the Thief, his Wife and her Lover (1990): In a restaurant microcosm of capitalist society, a feminist-worker alliance forms to smash the boss-patriarch. The thief is the boss, the cook is the main anti-capitalist organizer. Set in contemporary England under a French Revolution-era motif, the movie boils society down to the two extreme classes, eliminating the complication of the so-called middle class. The movie is literally hard to stomach; some reactionary violence-ridden movies anesthetize people to violence and oppression—dampening criticism of the violent capitalist status quo. While these movies show violence of the excessive, impersonal, shoot 'em up variety, *The Cook* has numerous personal, designed for the situation, humiliating torture scenes. The upshot is that the movie correctly presents violent oppression as ugly as it really is. It *should* be difficult to stomach, not fun to watch.

The Crying Game (1992): The real "secret" of this film portraying the struggles of the Irish Republican Army, is its reactionary picture of gender and national conflict—despite pithy metaphors on the meaning of life and human "nature." By this theory, there are two kinds of people, oppressors and complicit dupes of oppressors, and both the IRA and the British army are hierarchies that have both kinds. The movie makes betraying the IRA the only humane decision for the hero. It is simply not in Fergus's "nature" to kill and be a revolutionary, so he bags his commitment to the IRA for love and sex. Dedicated IRA comrades are depicted as unthinking terrorist robots.

Daughters of the Dust (Julie Dash, 1992): The film is the story of a Gullah family, descendants of Africans who slaved on the South Carolina island's indigo plantations for two centuries. As capitalism consolidated the textile industries on the mainland, the Gullahs were basically left alone to subsist and create their own society. The family faces a crisis in 1902 as people begin to migrate to the mainland. The mother recounts the tale of the Igbo brought in chains to the island after the Civil War. They turned as a group and walked on the surface of the water, back across the sea to Africa. This is an idealized, liberating vision common to Black oral history. The truth of the tale, known to the Gullahs, is that the Igbo walked into the sea and drowned themselves rather than submit to the white man's forced labor.

Dead Man Walking (1996): Much-praised for its liberal "balance," the movie is based on the book that tells the true story of a Louisiana nun who befriends a man on death row. The movie portrays the death penalty as arbi-

trary and unfair. Still, it does not come out against the death penalty, and the book is a stronger testament than the movie to Sister Helen Prejean's anti-death penalty activism. The movie supports the reactionary "victim's rights" movement and preaches taking "responsibility" for criminal acts. Maoists believe people need to take responsibility for their actions and struggle with self-criticism, but we know this is not accomplished through the imperialist death-penalty machine, even with the help of progressive nuns.

Dragon: The Bruce Lee Story (1993): Based on the biography of Bruce Lee by his wife. Emigrating to the United States from Hong Kong in his early 20s, Lee set out to disprove the cliché of "a Chinaman's chance" at success. He figures out that non-Americans get consistently screwed by the entertainment industry, and develops a healthy disdain for the American Dream. Maoists respect Bruce Lee in part because we support martial arts. Training for a high level of physical and spiritual discipline is essential, and helps teach the lesson that small size overcome greater size and numbers with correct planning, honest assessment of an enemy and one's own resources. What looks like a strategic disadvantage can be transformed into many tactical victories—and long-term triumph.

Face/Off (1997): World's leading terrorist (Nicholas Cage) and anti-terrorist FBI man (John Travolta) switch places and faces (notice it's always the wimmin who are idiot enough not to notice that another man is impersonating their husbands or boyfriends). Proving once again that no matter what the stakes (in this case a huge chemical bomb in the middle of L.A.), what really matters is saving the hero's yuppie family. Sorry to give away the ending: the good guys win.

Falling Down (1993): D FENS is every white working husband who has been laid off by corporate Amerika in the last decade: a middle-aged white-collar worker laid off from a missile plant and named after his license plate. D FENS attempts to shoot his way back to a mythical 1965 when life was better and white men were on top (as if they aren't any more). The lesson for Americans is to continue arming and wait patiently for Amerika to legalize domestic mass murder—as it has already legalized international genocide. Trotskyists need look no further for the vanguard leadership of the American white working class.

Famine Within, The (Catherine Gilday, 1993): The harm caused to American wimmin by the beauty myth. The majority of wimmin fear being fat more than they fear dying, for example. Its shortcomings mirror are the same

as the white feminist movement's: no analysis of class and nation differences among wimmin. It universalizes the experience of privileged white American wimmin to all women. Also doesn't recognize that a situation of economic abundance is a precondition for problems such as anorexia, and ignores the larger context of imperialist plunder of the Third World which generates the relative abundance that creates problems such as anorexia for American wimmin.

Farewell My Concubine (1993): Anti-communist director Chen Kaige's portrayal of the lives of two actors in China. Initially banned in capitalist China in part because of its depiction of gay love, the film has some interesting gender commentary and politics. As the line between opera character and real life is blurred, one man is at the same time a woman (the concubine) in love with a man (the king). Includes typical revisionist history depicting the Cultural Revolution as anarchic and destructive, — neglecting especially to show the breakdown between "high" and "low" culture that was so important in that struggle.

Framed: The Story of Geronimo Pratt (Dennis Mueller and Masimo Pillow, 1993): Short film that does a great job showing FBI repression of the Black Panther Party and Pratt's frame-up in the particular case of the California Panthers. Unfortunately, it doesn't give enough information on the true political potential of the BPP, instead focusing on their struggles over the right to bear arms. That misleads viewers into thinking the U.S. saw the BPP principally as a military threat, which is not true. The government cared so much about the BPP because of their power and dedication to organize the Black community, and especially the Survival Programs, which were used to educate the people as well as supply their immediate needs.

The Good Woman of Bangkok (Dennis O'Rourke, 1992): "Documentary-fiction" (undefined) on the meaning of "love," rather than on the exploitation of Third World prostitutes who work to service First World sexual decadence. O'Rourke allows a Thai prostitute to speak about being a prostitute with no economic alternative, but turns the movie into reactionary romantic mush. When Aoi says she hates all men and wishes she could make them die, O'Rourke frames this as the tragedy of prostitution destroying Aoi's ability to "love." Despite plenty of Eurochauvinism, the movie manages to expose the substantial gender oppression which is imperialism.

Gross Pointe Blank (1997): The Hollywood celebration of amorality goes on. A Generation-X hit man enjoys his high school reunion. Fortunately for the bourgeois moral-

ity crowd, he's willing to give up his career for love. Hip cynicism covers (weakly) for couch-potato support of the status quo.

Groundhog Day (1993): How to get laid by a partner who can say no? Phil, a cynical television weatherman suddenly doomed to live one day in his politically incorrect life over and over again, gets an infinite number of chances to change his patriarchal strategy and hit a lucky number. He uses his 24 hours of god-hood to rape his politically correct producer into "consent." When normal lies and threats fail to produce the required surrender, Phil constructs an elaborate plot in which he enlists the unwitting help of the entire town. By the end of the movie everyone, even Phil, is convinced that he has lost his sexism and transformed himself into the nicest father-figure around.

Handmaid's Tale, The (1990): Doesn't live up to Atwood's book, but the basic structure survives, so it's still got a lot more going for it than most. Fascist fundamentalist Christian takeover in a society where women have been stripped of all power, in the name of protecting them from pornography, and are openly ruled and controlled by men. Major disappointments include the dramatizing of the Handmaid's "love" affairs, the glorification of her maternal "instincts," and her dependence on men in the revolutionary movement.

Harlem Nights (1989): Eddie Murphy, Richard Pryor and Redd Foxx make a perfect fictional representation of the interests of the Black national bourgeoisie. Upstart Black national bourgeoisie fights established white bourgeoisie of organized crime and wins decisively. The Black national bourgeoisie distinguishes itself from the comprador bourgeoisie by its independence. That is the strength of the movie, which shows both the restrictions that the Black national bourgeoisie chafes under and its independence. As with any national bourgeois leadership, though, the proletariat here ultimately gets short shrift.

Hoffa (1992): Doesn't tell the true story of Teamsters leader Jimmy Hoffa, but interesting for reflecting on the how the "labor movement" in the U.S. has succeeded in uniting white people, across class lines, to better trample on and exploit the oppressed. This has rendered the white working class a parasitic and non-revolutionary labor aristocracy, aligned with American-apple-pie-imperialism against the interests of the majority of the world's peoples. "I have led the Teamsters, and the Teamsters have led the American working man right into the middle class!" says this Hoffa, to cheers from the white working class audience.

I Shot Andy Warhol (1996): The story of the would-be rad-

ical feminist who founded (and was the sole member of) the Society for Cutting Up Men (SCUM). She thinks men are biologically inferior, which is incorrect, but her anger is righteous and her advocacy of asexuality and destruction of Amerika are right on. She shoots Andy Warhol - not because he is a man, but because she thinks he is cashing in on her work, a man-hating play she hoped he would produce. The "alternative" scene is no safe haven from patriarchy; it's just as decadent and meaningless as the mainstream. It is funny that a womyn who opposed patriarchy thought Warhol could be worth anything.

Incident at Oglala (1992): Traces the events at Pine Ridge Reservation between 1973 and 1975, when the American Indian Movement was at war with the feds and corrupt would-be neo-colonial rulers. After two FBI agents were killed, AIM activist Leonard Peltier was framed and is still serving two life sentences. Robert Redford and the others behind the movie would have liberals walk away saying, "Peltier should be freed, because he didn't kill those agents." MIM says: "So what if he did?" There was a war on: those killings were justified in the name of self-defense and national liberation. The Peltier-is-innocent defense just means another revolutionary should be in jail instead. Some good evidence and some bad choices in the production. MIM prefers *Agents of Repression: The FBI's Secret Wars Against the Black Panther Party and the American Indian Movement*.

Independence Day (1996): What should the international proletariat do when space aliens attacking earth with the intent of killing all humans? ID4, doesn't say, but once the principal contradiction shifts from imperialism-vs.-oppressed nations to Humanity-vs.-Space Aliens, a lot of old enemies work together against the new enemy. Of course, Hollywood makes the Americans the smart ones who have to lead the fight. After the aliens are defeated, the oppressed may have a revolutionary opportunity amid all the destruction. Still, MIM asks, "who wrote this?" For now, aliens are cultural creations, and therefore class creations. If this was a movie written with proletarian politics, advanced aliens would more likely be communists, not evil imperialists. Or in a different as yet unwritten revolutionary alien movie, the proletariat unites with the space aliens behind the bourgeoisie's back. Then, at the crucial moment, the bourgeoisie realize they have been outflanked by the combined forces of the space aliens and the proletariat. Then, the aliens and what's left of humanity peacefully coexist.

Indian Summer (1993): In the tradition of *Return of the Secaucus Seven*, *The Big Chill*, and *Grand Canyon*, *Indian Summer* is another film about the reunion of thir-

tysomething yuppies who spend a concentrated amount of time reminiscing about a cliché. These movies get more and more meaningless: *The Big Chill* portrayed ex-politicos who had sold out, gathered for a friend's funeral to remember their college days. *Indian Summer* is about remembering summer camp.

Liar Liar (1997): Well, lawyers for the rich have to lie a lot. The big lie of this movie is that what they really need to do to save their souls — or at least their families — is tell the truth. One thing about the legal system — it protects the rich even when people do play by the rules and don't lie. The Big Lie case in the movie is a woman's divorce case against her millionaire husband, passing up the chance to even pick on corporate polluters or other real villains.

The Little Thief: Raised in poverty by her aunt and uncle, a 16-year-old woman is a thief first order. She ends up at a women's prison run by nuns. The harsh prison is the best part of the movie; she escapes with another woman. The movie does a good job painting a picture of a woman who has a positive outlook in spite of having nothing. But the political content ends there and for the most part the movie is a boring romance.

Little Vera: A Russian woman just out of high school, whose drunk father represents traditional Russian society in crisis, mounts an escape. Worth seeing for its detailed view of the family and relationships in Russian society. As fiction, the main message is obtuse, but the treatment of woman and general alienation of the family show the failings following the world's first existing socialism.

The Lost World: Jurassic Park (1997): The main message is a pseudo-environmentalist, preserve nature theme. One of the main characters is an ineffective Earth First! activist. The environmentalist message is confusing because the island of dinosaurs was created by humans. With little justification given for the importance of preserving the dinosaur island, the environmentalism is mystical. Human-made resources may be worth preserving because of their value for life, but this is not the case with human-made dinosaurs causing death and destruction of humans.

Longtime Companion (1990): Intending to illuminate the collective experience of a community — "the" gay community — dealing with AIDS. The subject alone is the political statement for Hollywood: a positive movie about gay people is political even without political content. Still, that means a psychological approach to a political subject, so on that score it fails. Plus, it's about rich white men, and the empty characters' dialogue is flat to boot. The poignant death of a rich man with his paid servant is

touching, but it's the the AIDS story (even in 1990). Even the narrow activists who serve these men are ignored in the movie.

Manufacturing Consent: Noam Chomsky and the Media (Mark Achbar & Peter Wintonick, 1992): Three hour film with talks, interviews, and debates with Noam Chomsky. A good film to see if you are interested in learning about Chomsky. Showing the media is biased and some critics are idiots who never even read Chomsky's writing (easily demonstrated and pretty entertaining). But not a substitute for the facts and research of his books. Reveals one of his persistent problems: blandly equating socialist and imperialist power without regard to their contents. As an anarchist, he believes that anyone holding power is evil. For Chomsky there are no relative advances. He is an idealist and so everything is either perfect or it is wrong; no workable solutions, but good exposure of the imperialists, and especially their media.

Medics of the People: A video documentary put out by the New People's Army (NPA) — led by the Communist Party of the Philippines — chronicles the activities of NPA Medical Units as they serve the people in the rural areas of the Philippines. They help communities fight common diseases, provide dental care, emergency surgery and health and sanitation education. Their work is an important part of the survival of the Filipino people as they struggle against an oppressive regime which keeps them in poverty. The most important thing they do is make it possible for people to run their own health clinics. The health clinics they set up provide many treatments, including acupuncture, surgery and herbal medicine. The medics inventory health problems, record medical histories and design strategies to treat the people. People only pay to replace used medicine stocks. In this way the NPA is serving the people as well as building independent power of the oppressed. *Medics of the People* is available for \$25 from Philippine Information Network Services, PO Box 55666, Hayward CA 94545.

Menace II Society (1993): Marketed as a film by and about "real" Black people, it does not show how Black people can make it out of the ghetto, nor does it turn the ghetto into a less oppressive place. There is a lot of violence in the film, but the point is not to show exaggerated or exotic brutality. The point is to show that it happens. Short on solutions except for one naïve Muslim character, it's still a lot better than the mindless action-adventure junk. Worth seeing as an unapologetic picture of Black national life.

Mermaids (1991): Set in the groovy 60s, back when sex liberated women (Cher) and gave them personal power.

Yeah right. Contrast between the Church in its purity and unreal beauty and the reality of the oppression it perpetuates. Did the directors intend to portray such misogyny or does it take a communist to decipher that through what was supposed to be Winona Ryder being cute? Mermaids ultimately deals with religion as just another way for a teenager to rebel against her mother. Women who are single and sexually active are feminists by definition, in control. The fantasy is that these women find wonderful sensitive men who want to make monogamous commitments but turn them down to continue having sex on their terms. We are supposed to feel sorry for these women, incapable of loving like "normal" folks, and thus what was phony feminism in the first place is shot down in the last few scenes.

Mo' Better Blues (1990): Spike Lee says that because of white oppression and domination, Black men are in such a state of moral crisis that they don't deserve Black women. One woman uses sex to get the attention her career deserves. But the woman recognizes and challenges their oppression, and the man with the misogynous practice meets a fable-like, poetic justice. In retribution for his selfish, sexist lifestyle, the man (a trumpet player) gets dumped by both women and then has his mouth broken in a fight. His precious career is ruined. In the end one of the women saves his life by marrying him. MIM sides with the movie's (imperfect) advocacy of monogamy. This movie added anti-semitism to sexism in the list of Spike Lee's alleged crimes, because of the slimy portrayal of Jewish small capitalists who run the jazz club. If such extreme sensitivity were applied with regard to racism and sexism, many fewer movies would be made.

On Deadly Ground (Steven Segal, 1994): Segal is a mercenary for an oil company paid to set fire to evidence of the company's negligence in maintaining its rigs. He turns against the company and decides to destroy its newest facility so that they will have to evacuate the First Nation land. A step forward since Segal doesn't just play a cop, but actually serves a progressive political purpose. Also shows Segal fighting reactionary white chauvinist labor aristocrat workers who benefit from the colonization of First Nations. A good movie for the relationship between capitalism and indigenous exploitation, and the importance of self-defense and martial arts, despite bad gender politics and fascist implications.

The Paper (1994): Movie about a New York city tabloid misses the true story entirely. A story newspaper about two young Black men framed for the murder of some rich white guys. The hero is a news editor who doesn't want to run the bogus story because it will cause race riots. He

makes great personal sacrifices for this, and in the end the story they get is just as much of a scoop anyway, so everyone is happy. The reality is the mainstream media who really want to be honest aren't made into heroes: they're broke.

Patriot Games (1992): Our least favorite movie of 1992's summer. A former CIA agent kills a member of a (supposedly Maoist) splinter group of the Irish Republican Army. In this fictitious portrayal the IRA and its supposed splinter group are both clearly off the deep end. The killing spurs an irrational revenge plot of the group, and a chance to glorify the perfect family-man CIA agent played by Harrison Ford. In the post-Cold War, one of the leading spy movies about personal vendettas and family, as if imperialism didn't need murderous agents of the old school anymore.

The Pelican Brief (1994): John Grisham action movie sort of portrays the government as corrupt, with a puppet-fool president. Plus, big corporations conspire with the government to make a profit at the expense of the environment. But the FBI and CIA, along with the mainstream press, turn out to help the people and environment. Big on individualism, the movie asks people to walk away thinking the government is stupid and can be defeated by smart individuals.

Perfect World, A (1995): The hero is Kevin Costner, ostensibly driven to petty crime because of his abusive father and neglectful mother. After his escape from prison he takes a young boy hostage and tries to be the father he never had. In one pornographic scene, Kevin Costner terrorizes a Black family because the father slaps his son. How many do we have to sit through long close-ups of a Black man's eyes before he is lynched? And then, why is it always another white person who saves the day? Why is NOT killing a Black man viewed as such an act of kindness and good character? The film pretends to grapple with the contradictions of the so-called justice system, but ends up painting the problems as a matter of personnel and not structures.

The Player (1992): An only slightly annoying movie with minor political value as a satire on Hollywood's ruling elite. The hero is a power-mongering jerk; the film tries to condemn the decadence and grotesque wealth associated with the movie industry. Unfortunately it is co-opted by the industry itself, showing its liberalism and support of free speech by letting a bunch of its stars make cameo appearances and allowing such criticism of itself to be produced and distributed. The best scene is where the producer and his girlfriend lie in a bathtub covered with caked black mud, looking very dead. Not a bad commen-

tary on their meaningless, vapid lives.

Reversal of Fortune (1990): A liberal movie from hell, unabashedly cheerleads for the legal system and proudly upholds the letter of the law as more sacred than human life. Klaus Van Bulow, a zillionaire who was sentenced to 30 years for attempting to murder his wife, is defended by a famous lawyer who regrettably has to ditch a case in which he is trying to keep two innocent Black kids from getting executed. Klaus, who is probably guilty, walks free and the kids are still on death row. And the bourgeois lives happily ever after.

Romy and Michele's High School Reunion (1997): Generation-X do-nothings go back to their high school reunion, and find out that being popular (back then) isn't everything — because being popular now is everything. As if 20-somethings now are more reasonable than they were in high school, they are now able to judge the true character of our heroes, instead of just judging them by their supposed geekiness like they did in high school. Right. Maoists don't agree with this "just be who you are" stuff, because these people are worthless parasites in their current roles - finding social acceptance among their peers doesn't change that.

Rumble in the Bronx (1996): Hong Kong actor and director Jackie Chan edited "Rumble in the Bronx" for an American audience, and it shows. "Rumble" caters to Hollywood's vapid and reactionary standards. Some of his earlier films—like *Drunken Master II*—were marked by political themes of revolutionary anti-imperialist nationalism. Sometimes accurate renditions of historical struggles, these films were also significant for the strong non-romantic roles played by women. But this is pure American tripe: gratuitous sex, violence, racial stereotyping and a politically meaningless plot. Jackie Chan is an excellent martial artist and a great entertainer. Too bad he has now sold his skills to the disgusting bourgeois Hollywood movie industry.

Schindler's List (1993): Amidst enthusiasm for the Nazi Party and its genocide, there was one Nazi businessman who helped 1,100 Jewish merchants and intellectuals-turned-factory-workers from the ovens. Oskar Schindler's was a heroic act. It stands out not for its absolute heroism, however, but because of how most Germans didn't help. For the masses of Americans who know nothing of the Holocaust, Schindler's List may be educational. But those same masses participate in a system of violent, global subjugation, including genocide. Americans supported the mass slaughter of Vietnamese citizens, Iraqis, and many others, while hypocritically gasping at Nazi atrocities. And all the Jews on Schindler's List would have died

anyway if millions of people (principally from the Soviet Red Army) had not died stopping Hitler's Eastern conquest. A fitting American eulogy to one benevolent capitalist who saved people by putting them to work in his factory.

Sleepers (1996): Four American boys go to juvenile prison after a prank goes awry. They suffer savage abuse during their incarceration and execute the most sadistic guard years later in revenge. It's an exposure of the oppression of both children and prisoners in a system that has nothing to do with stopping "crime" and everything to do with power over youth and the oppressed. The guards live in a sadistic sexual dreamworld of terror-rape at will. The movie also doesn't judge two of the boys who become hit-men when they get out; the prison made them killers. The Catholic church is upset because in the movie the neighborhood priest lies for them on the stand to get them off for a murder they did commit. The lying priest is a hero, which suits MIM fine. Finally, the nuclear family is not saved, the court system is not vindicated, and no one lives happily ever after. The characters do find a way to redeem their humanity within an oppressive system, and in that the movie is positive without raising false hopes of reformist solutions.

Sliver (1993): Sliver's parasitical yuppies become addicted to voyeurism as they might to narcotics, after a young millionaire installs a \$6 million surveillance system in the apartment building he owns so he can view and tape every room in every apartment. Watching people bathe, fuck, fight, rape or kill eases the bland emptiness of their bourgeois existence. In the end the movie is supposed to on one hand preach against the postmodern worship of surface existence, symbolized by the video voyeurism, while of course selling that very sex-voyeurism that Americans crave. The Big Brother element just adds to the power-erotic images, offering the added fun of imagining being the object of pornography even alone at home, masturbating in the tub.

Sneakers (1992): Now that the Cold War is over, America's surveillance capacities supposedly serve only to invade Americans' "privacy rights." One of this movie's catchphrases is that there are "too many secrets." With Big Chill-like activist backgrounds, the hacker heroes demonstrate the individualism of both the hacker world and the settler-left. The SNEAKERS collective shows that technology can be defeated by people if they are properly organized. After using their collective skills to steal a microchip for what they presume to be the NSA, they test the chip and find that "It's the codebreaker. No more secrets." The hacker's dream. They take money from the

Republican Party and give it to liberal organizations. Whatever.

Starship (video, 1986): A low budget sci-fi film centered on a resistance movement made up of youth, fighting evil robots controlled by a few ruling humans on a mining planet. The rulers exploit youth labor, labor that will soon be replaced with better robots, making the youth dispensable. With Vietnam-era overtones, the movie does a good demonstrating planned armed resistance by the people and their power to overcome difficult odds. Predictable dialogue and difficult plot, but an inspiration to revolutionary youth.

Strictly Ballroom (1993): Australian spoof on mainstream conformist culture, focusing on a small Australian town where everyone dances. Potential Pan-Pacific Ballroom champion gets bored with ballroom dancing and starts doing his own thing. In the end everyone unites behind the individualist dancer and his equally non-conformist and heroic partner to overthrow the corrupt chairman of the dance committee and live happily ever after—dancing as they want to dance. Devoid of revolutionary content, *Strictly Ballroom* still makes a good statement about how silly mainstream culture and values can be. But stripped to its bones, this movie is an individualist dream.

Swept Away (1979): A male Southern European follower of the Communist Party and a Northern European wife of a bourgeois are shipwrecked. At first she insults working class people, but then she becomes a slave to the sailor. Finally he assaults her sexually, yelling political statements. She discovers that rape is what she wants; she likes being “mastered” with reference to “primitive” impulse. The enslavement scenario is typical eroticizing of violent domination and other power. The movie makes the audience accomplices to the enjoyment of sexual violence. Unfortunately realistic: love of power is conflated with “natural” love under capitalist patriarchy, and movies like this one help perpetuate the problem.

Three of Hearts (1993): For those people who spend their political energy clamoring for “positive images” of gay men and lesbians, this is a double-edged sword. One on hand, it portrays a lesbian relationship consumed with everyday gender oppression and power plays. The women are sympathetic characters, basically, played by conventionally beautiful actress/models. On the other hand, one of the women hires a gender oppressed (relatively) male escort to rape her ex-girlfriend, which is extreme, even for Hollywood patriarchy. So tell us, was the film portraying lesbian relationships as dysfunctional or hopelessly regular? Was this a “positive” image? Save the price of renting this post-Crying Game neo-patriarchy and buy a

copy of MIM Theory 2/3: Gender and Revolutionary Feminism.

Total Recall (1990): Fun dabbling both in political commentary and psychological fantasy. On Mars, air is monopolized and rationed to control the proletariat. Even though to Schwarzenegger it's a heroic tale of individualist leadership, we think of the plot as representative of U.S. imperialism, with the oppressed colonies now on oppressed planets. While the proletariat on Mars suffocates, even humble white construction workers on Earth have TVs 50 feet wide.

Unforgiven (1992): Clint Eastwood is eminently qualified to criticize the individualist-macho-male-senseless-gun-shooting-violence ideology of the Western genre. Americans have long romanticized The Cowboy and The West, part of their imperialist heritage that they made about a million movies of just to make sure they completely distorted the history of their conquest over the land's First Nations. This movie debunks some of that romance; but ultimately replaces it with retro-self-reflective romance.

USA on Trial, Parts I and II (1994): Video documentary about the International Tribunal of Indigenous Peoples and Oppressed Nations in the USA. Produced for Deep Dish Television Network by Carla Leshne and Alejandro L. Molina, it covers a tribunal which found the U.S. government guilty of genocide, colonialism and many other crimes against the oppressed nations of the world. A good overview of the historical and ongoing crimes of the American government. Contact Mission Creek Video, P.O. Box 411271, San Francisco, CA, 94141-1271, and ask for a catalog.

Wild At Heart (1990): Director David Lynch's mix of violence and eroticism look critical but on closer examination they eroticize violence, to turn the audience on — with a touch of titillating horror at itself — at the sight of wimmin's sexuality being molded and dominated by violence. Wimmin are socialized to enjoy their subordination. What better an example of the twisted capitalist patriarchal construction of gender than a woman who, despite struggling against it, orgasms as she is raped? No matter how real, the bottom line is to glorify sexual power.

MIM Statements & Resolutions

On the PCP-Generated Organisms Abroad

This resolution was unanimously approved at MIM's February 1997 Congress. —ed.

The MIM Congress condemns the difficulties of those would-be supporters of the People's War in Peru in keeping their chauvinist paws off the PCP generated organizations abroad.

Most notable in this regard is the number of Yankees and other imperialist country lackeys who flocked to Agent Quispe of the "MPP-USA." The imperialist country chauvinists didn't like the existing leadership of the PCP-generated organisms abroad, so they invented their own of their own choosing in the worst traditions of colonialism. When the police arrested Gonzalo in Peru and handed the revolution a setback, instead of rallying around the existing leadership that had been in place under Gonzalo, imperialist country chauvinists used the arrest as an excuse to name anything that walked in the door the new leadership of the movement to support the People's War in Peru.

In the case of Quispe, this meant propping up someone who was not active before the arrest of Comrade Gonzalo. One

"middle force" person went so far as to say he could not work with the previous leadership and hence threw support to Quispe, because the existing leadership "is hard to work with."

The main choice in the imperialist countries is between two leaderships—that of Esparza in France/Sweden and that of L.A. Borja in Belgium. It is an important principle of internationalism that the imperialist country communists not interfere in the organizations of the oppressed nations so directly as to set up legitimate leaders of their own choosing.

The leadership of the PCP-generated organisms in the imperialist countries is not for the imperialist country chauvinists to choose. Even if they don't like the leaders, they have no right to proclaim their own choice of leaders as the true representatives of the PCP-generated organisms.

Unlike Agent Quispe, Luis Arce Borja had an established and acknowledged role in leading the movement to support the People's War in Peru before the arrest of Gonzalo. Those rushing to Quispe are wrong not just because Quispe is a cop, but as a matter of principle opposing Yankee/other imperialist country interference.

On the May 18, 1997 RCP-USA Statement on Peru

The phony Maoists of the Revolutionary Communist Party-USA (RCP-USA) continue to speak for the Communist Party of Peru (PCP), evermore shamelessly as time goes on. In the May 18, 1997 *Revolutionary Worker*, despite MIM's criticism, the RCP-USA continues the line that the authors of the Canto Grande capitulationist document are merely examples of "right opportunist" politics within the PCP and not outright counterrevolution. The RCP-USA is seeking to straddle those who would continue the People's War and those who would lay down their arms and dissolve the base areas, but there is no straddling revolution and counterrevolution.

After the arrest of Comrade Gonzalo, the leader of the Peruvian Revolution, some comrades in the Canto Grande prison of Peru wrote a document called "Outline for a Basic

Document." This poisonous weed said,

"Ending the people's war represents neither surrender nor abandoning the revolution, but rather continuing the struggle under new conditions." In addition, the document continues,

"II. Basic Approach

1. Sign a peace agreement whose application would lead to the ending of the war the country is experiencing.
2. End the people's war begun 17 May 1980, in all its four forms of guerrilla actions. Disband the People's Guerrilla Army, destroying its arms and combat material; likewise, dissolve the People's Committees and the revolutionary base areas of the People's New Democratic Republic."

Going back as far as statements released in 1994, MIM said

it would never be permissible to advocate laying down arms as a matter of principle until the day of communism globally. "Outline for a Basic Document" advocates laying down arms now, but the RIM calls it "written in the latter part of 1993 by leaders of the Right Opportunist Line" (*A World to Win*, 1995, p. 64). By this the RIM means that these Canto Grande authors are still members of the PCP, just guilty of being off the correct course.

In contrast, we at MIM believe that the PCP-CC is in favor of developing the People's War and distinguishes between counter-revolutionaries and right opportunists. Those who brazenly advocate laying down arms and dissolving base areas are taking a counterrevolutionary line. It is not permissible within the party. Those who hesitated, to consider the idea of a peace accord or to evaluate the evidence that Comrade Gonzalo wants the peace accord or to evaluate the mood of the masses toward peace, these are right opportunists since the PCP-CC wants to continue the People's War without negotiations. The RCP-USA is now going beyond right opportunism and hardening its counterrevolutionary stance with regard to the Canto Grande weed. MIM did not know how bad the Canto Grande weed was till 1996 when we obtained the *A World To Win* magazine with the weed in it. Those officially tied to the PCP have no excuse for not acting quickly on the Canto Grande weed as soon as they had it.

MIM has great sympathy for all people in Fujimori's prisons. We do not wish to second-guess their tactics for dealing with torture and repeated prison massacres. Nonetheless, it is a different matter for the RCP-USA to be saying that the "Basic Outline" is merely "Right Opportunist." The authors of the Canto Grande weed are no longer members of a real Maoist party. They purged themselves from it.

The RCP-USA points to documents it says are from the PCP; however, the RCP has never shown that the PCP-CC believes that the Canto Grande weed is an example of the "Right Opportunist Line." The RCP-USA simply made that up out of thin air. Numerous other statements from the PCP-CC show that the PCP-CC considers the peace accords idea a "hoax" of the Peruvian police.

Should the RCP-USA ever prove that the PCP-CC says that the Canto Grande document is merely "Right Opportunism," then our criticism will extend to the PCP-CC as well. This is a question of the universals of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

The fact that the RCP-USA may be correct about what the PCP-CC's position is, but cannot prove it in detail or in any interactive way is just further proof how the whole rehashing of the COMINTERN idea is not going to work—especially outside the narrow confines of Europe where the participating parties used to be close together. The RCP is basing its RW article on documents more than one-half year old. When we add the consideration that document fraud has occurred inside and outside Peru with regard to PCP documents, the case against the RIM concoction used by the RCP-USA to boost its own politics gets all the worse. Inevitably the RCP-USA

inserts its own opinions where details from the PCP are lacking. Objectively-speaking this means imperialist country domination of the RIM—even on absolutely fundamental questions like where to draw the line between counterrevolution and the party.

The RCP-USA has also made another new and important admission in its own backhanded way. "Over the last two years, supporters of the Right Opportunist Line that arose from within the PCP, calling for negotiations with the government and an end to the people's war, have put out a paper under the *El Diario* name. The Central Committee of the PCP has condemned and repudiated its line."

MIM has not seen the copies of *El Diario* that the RCP-USA is referring to, but MIM does know that the ones calling for negotiations removed Luis Arce Borja's name from the masthead and thus attacked him. At precisely the same time, the RCP-USA launched an attack on Luis Arce Borja internationally, with individual supporters ranging from Detroit to Malmö, Sweden. Now the RCP-USA has basically admitted it was acting in concordance with what it calls the "Right Opportunist Line" in 1995 and 1996. MIM charged this at the time, but the RCP-USA had nothing to say in its defense with regard to the pro-peace accords *El Diario*. Through the RIM publication *A World to Win* the RCP-USA has continued its coordinated attacks against Luis Arce Borja into 1997.

Just as patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel, dialectics is the last refuge of revisionist mystics like the RCP-USA. For years the RCP-USA has been criticizing metaphysics in the name of dialectics in the context of Peru. It turns out that all this criticism of metaphysics is just a cover to smuggle counterrevolution into the vanguard party. MIM too has always criticized as metaphysics any line that said that consideration of peace accords is counterrevolutionary. However, the Canto Grande authors went far beyond considering the sentiments of the people for peace. The Canto Grande authors advocated laying down arms and dissolving the base areas. Communists do not lay down their arms during peace accords; although they may cease-fire as long as they protect themselves.

The RCP-USA's abuse of dialectics does not surprise MIM, because dialectics apart from materialism is Hegelian idealism. Such is useful stuff for personality cults seeking to obtain a new deal for the labor aristocracy tying itself to imperialism. Whenever we talk about how the oppressor nation workers are parasites, the RCP-USA objects and calls them proletarians and does so in the name of dialectics. However, just because crises can and do happen and parasites do return to the proletariat on occasion and just because even counterrevolutionaries and members of the bourgeoisie join the revolution in some minority percentage of cases, we do not have to be two-faced and fork-tongued like the RCP-USA.

MIM Responds to CoRIM

June 8, 1997

MIM recently encountered the article "Anti-RIM Critics from the Cyberswamp: 'Virtual Maoism' and Real Opportunism," by R. Voina, in *A World To Win* (#22, December 1996), the unofficial organ of the crypto-Trotskyist Revolutionary Communist Party-USA-led Committee of the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement (CoRIM). It is in part a response to MIM polemics, and is CoRIM's first public acknowledgment of MIM's existence, let alone CoRIM's stance towards MIM.

The article appeared in *A World To Win* magazine, and was posted in English and Spanish on Revolutionary Worker Online at: <http://www.mcs.net/~rwor>. Copies of the magazine may be obtained from: Box 3486, Merchandise Mart, Chicago, IL 60654; Phone: 773-227-4066 Fax: 773-227-4497. —ed.

1. CAPITULATIONISM IS COUNTERREVOLUTIONARY, NOT MERELY RIGHT-OPPORTUNIST

R. Voina repeatedly asserts that MIM and others have "opposed the struggle against the Right Opportunist Line" and have in fact engaged in "denunciation of the fight against the Right Opportunist Line (ROL)..." In fact, the Right Opportunist Line that the CoRIM/*A World to Win*/R. Voina is talking about is not the same one the PCP is talking about. The CoRIM is referring to counterrevolution as mere Right Opportunism and then saying MIM opposes the struggle against Right Opportunism! However, MIM is attacking the counterrevolutionary line.

The RCP-USA and company, in contrast, are in metaphysical denial of the fact that the line in question is counterrevolutionary and not merely right opportunist. AWTW 21 made it clear that CoRIM considers outright capitulationist documents to be "documents from the Right Opportunist Line." The current *A World to Win* (which, though dated Dec 1996, was released in North America in April 1997) contains the following from CoRIM: "We have noted that some tendencies still exist to underestimate the importance of the two-line struggle in the PCP, to see it as something of the past, or to believe that it is enough to passively support the position of the CoRIM. Comrades, this is dangerous thinking!" (p. 35). In sum, the CoRIM insists, even in the face of criticism, that the counterrevolutionary line of capitulation is currently to be found within the ranks of the PCP. This is quite an accusation for the CoRIM to be making of its supposed comrades, and is quite an accusation to be making without proof.

As another example, in footnote 9, Voina refers to a "pro-Right Opportunist Line edition of *El Diario* (Lima)." To MIM's knowledge, the "*El Diario* (Lima)" that Voina is speak-

ing of calls for peace negotiations quite blatantly and changes the format including credits to comrade Luis Arce Borja that used to exist in that paper. Now CoRIM is calling that work merely "right opportunist"? The revisionist swindlers of the CoRIM seek to use discussion of the "right opportunist line" to smuggle any counterrevolutionary into the ranks of the PCP and the movement abroad by extension.

Voina presents the line that "RIM supports the line of peace negotiations" as evidence of CoRIM critics' dishonesty. But to the extent that RIM has said that the Canto Grande weed is mere right opportunism, it can be said that the RIM supports the peace negotiations. It uses a cover like all revisionists do. RIM claims to be Maoist while it seeks to admit counterrevolutionaries into the ranks to dilute the party and the international communist movement.

Not all line struggle is a police plot. However, Voina and CoRIM go on and on about this subject without getting specific. In fact, CoRIM nowhere defends its decision to call the Canto Grande weed merely "right opportunist." But that is the concrete situation; there is no general philosophy about two-line struggle worth debating. We should be talking about the Canto Grande weed specifically as MIM already has, but the CoRIM needs to dodge this subject and turn it into one of philosophy detached from the realities of struggle, the realities of what the rest of us are talking about.

It is true that MIM has done its best to unleash "vicious attacks against the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement (RIM) and especially the Committee of RIM (CoRIM)." MIM verbally attacks CoRIM not, as Voina suggests, because CoRIM represents Marxism-Leninism-Maoism (MLM) and the struggle against capitulation in Peru. Quite the contrary. The CoRIM represents crypto-Trotskyism (MLM in words, Trotskyism in deeds) and takes the center-right position of criticizing counterrevolutionary documents as merely "right opportunist." This is what Voina's and CoRIM's response to MIM's criticisms should be about. What Voina *doesn't* say in his or her article is more important than what s/he does say. For instance, Voina refers to MIM's argument in his/her footnote 16, but does not address it.

2. LIBERALS PROVIDE COVER FOR POLICE PLOTS

Voina aims his or her single article at Luis Arce Borja, Adolfo Olaechea, the "MPP-USA" New Flag magazine, MIM, and others. By doing so, Voina attempts to make his or her criticisms stick to all of these forces, even when they at best apply only to one. MIM takes full responsibility for its own actions. Some of our differences with comrades Arce Borja and Olaechea are a matter of public record. So, too, are our

points of unity with these two comrades, whom we respect as the leaders of the support movement for the Communist Party of Peru outside of Peruvian borders. We can take a limited responsibility for their actions, which is to say that we are fully responsible for the alliances we choose.

According to Voina, comrade Adolfo Olaechea said that the capture of Chairperson Gonzalo "...is more of a problem for Fujimori's regime than for us, really. They have relieved the Party of the responsibility of looking after the Chairman." MIM won't defend this statement from comrade Adolfo Olaechea if he made it. Everything is relative. Adolfo Olaechea has his faults, but amongst people abroad from Peru, he is absolutely one of the top fighters for the proletarian revolution in Peru. As for Olaechea's comments on comrade Jiang Qing (Chiang Ching), Olaechea is merely repeating dogmas he learned from Avakian about Jiang. See what Avakian said in Revolution and Counterrevolution.

As for Agent Quispe's "MPP-USA" and New Flag, we take no responsibility for the actions of this cop outfit. In articles cited by Voina, MIM has detailed the evidence of New Flag's role as a cop outfit. As MIM has documented, the New Flag editor has engaged in splitting and wrecking, intelligence-gathering, forgery, double-dealing, snitch work, political inconsistencies, defense of capitulation, and defense of the CoRIM. When pieced together, these facts constitute proof that Agent Quispe is a police provocateur.

Some of the evidence against the New Flag can be found in Voina's article. For instance, Voina wrote, "New Flag gave attendance figures of a demonstration in Berlin it wanted to associate itself with *when the demonstration was actually cancelled and never took place* - no clarification appeared in subsequent issues." We credit Voina for showing some integrity by including this, because the New Flag was referring to the demonstration in order to boost its claim that the RIM is important and why RCP-USA is vanguard within U.S. borders and not MIM.

Voina continued, "They [the New Flag] also quoted from a personal letter written by Herbierto Ocasio, the spokesman for the US Committee to Support the Revolution in Peru, falsifying the contents of the letter and then claiming it was a document of the RCP, USA. They ignored a public demand for retraction." Again, this is cop behavior. The New Flag's handling of the letter from Ocasio raised the cop question before MIM ever did. The document fraud perpetrated by the New Flag is just one reason MIM says New Flag is cops. The incident cited by Voina is far from the only document fraud perpetrated by Agent Quispe. The AWTW is extremely Liberal in not drawing the line against all these frauds.

Indeed, Voina attacks MIM for hitting too hard at Operation Quispe: "...[F]or these forces, labeling opponents 'police agents' has become a casual, almost everyday affair. The Maoist Internationalist Movement (MIM), for instance, shows

how casually it takes the struggle against the political police when it uses the following logic: '[The New Flag editor] argues that because someone is someone else's brother, he must be a revolutionary. This thoroughly reactionary line was crushed during the Cultural Revolution of Mao Tsetung. The prestige of one revolutionary does not convert to the family members. *The fact that [the New Flag editor] argues this way shows that he is a cop...*' (Maoist Sojourner, June 96) Just as these forces reduce the two-line struggle in Peru to a 'police plot', now they want to reduce virtually *all* political struggle to struggle against cops. With this approach, they see cops everywhere, while at the same time they have trivialized the struggle against the political police into a children's game of name-calling. This makes it impossible to carry out this most serious battle which, as Lenin never tired of explaining, is an area where revolutionaries must exert themselves to the utmost to break with amateurism and develop professional methods..."

The quote from MIM reads much differently in context. The first note about context is that this is three and a half sentences out of a 12-page tabloid-size newspaper. The majority of these twelve pages were devoted to detailing evidence that Agent Quispe is a police provocateur. The three and a half sentences quoted certainly are not the sum total of MIM's argument against Agent Quispe, as Voina well knows, assuming he or she has read the MIM writings s/he cited. The second note about context is that the quote comes from an article which exhibits and exterminates not one, but six of Agent Quispe's poisonous weeds. The quote does not even represent the basic argument against the single weed it discusses.

The main part of the rebuttal of the weed MIM labeled "exhibit B" reads, "Exhibit B shows that Quispe is willing to reveal information about the identity of people in Peru on the Internet. He also takes up the tactic of assuming that communists only care about their self-serving family ties. Hence, he argues that because someone is someone else's brother, he must be a revolutionary. This thoroughly reactionary line was crushed during the Cultural Revolution of Mao Zedong. The prestige of one revolutionary does not convert to the family members. The fact that Quispe argues this way shows that he is a cop with an impression that what really drives communists is family prestige. He has no idea that the revolution is not about narrow self-serving family interests like that."

Another article in that issue of Maoist Sojourner was called "Political clues to the 'MPP-USA' fraud." Anybody who actually read that issue of Maoist Sojourner could see that in isolation, each of Agent Quispe's actions was only a "clue" as to Agent Quispe's nature. When combined, however, the clues against Agent Quispe add up to proof that he is a police provocateur.

Because the RCP-USA is so Menshevik that one hand does not know what the other is doing, it does not surprise us to see Voina's use of kid gloves on Agent Quispe in print. In actuali-

ty, the RCP-USA was the first to raise that "MPP"-USA is a police plot. As is typical of opportunists who seek to avoid accountability, the RCP-USA did not do so in a public forum, so whether Voina knows that the RCP-USA did this or not is a different matter from the fact that it did. Thanks to the RCP-USA's unprincipled stance regarding polemics, it is always a case of one hand not knowing what the other is doing in its own organization. For this reason it is always a great victory for MIM when the RCP-USA or the CoRIM commits itself to a position in print.

In practice, both in writing and the spoken word, the RCP-USA came to a conclusion on "MPP"-USA before MIM did. When that did not suit the RCP-USA anymore, it changed its position.

3. LINE IS DECISIVE

Voina's first mention of MIM describes MIM as "a small group in the US ... which, despite its name, has nothing to do with RIM." In fact, the RCP-USA stole our name in 1984 after working with us in 1983 and gave the name to its new Comintern called the RIM. (MIM distributes other documents which discuss why Mao opposed having a Comintern.) By describing MIM as "small" without pointing out that this is unimportant, Voina caters to bourgeois democratic prejudice and puts his or her own Menshevism on display. Comrade Mao Zedong said, "The correctness or otherwise of the ideological and political line decides everything. When the Party's line is correct, then everything will come its way. If it has no followers, then it can have followers; if it has no guns, then it can have guns; if it has no political power, then it can have political power."

Combining his or her size-obsessed Menshevism with its sister, Liberalism, Voina dismisses the struggle against the "MPP-USA" police plot because the "MPP-USA" New Flag is "a small journal."

Voina writes, "MIM, New Flag and the rest of these 'virtual revolutionaries' oppose basic tenets of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, but rather than reveal their own line and risk actual line struggle, they try to hide their opposition beneath unprincipled attacks on a few Maoist leaders." New Flag doesn't have a line. It's a cop operation which is why it has jumped all over the place, including to the line that merely Avakian is revisionist. It has never been MIM's line to focus on Avakian. We hold that the RCP-USA is revisionist and we have published detailed and lengthy articles on the problems in the RCP-USA line. In contrast, the RCP-USA has written a footnote in its newspaper on the class structure of the United States as its full reply to us prior to this Voina article. It is the RCP-USA with the most to lose by revealing line and initiating line struggle, especially since it is so far from a united organization ideologically except perhaps as a personality cult. This point is illustrated by Voina's description of MIM's attacks on CoRIM

as "shallow" and "personal." If MIM's criticisms are so shallow, why doesn't CoRIM address them and be done with it? Voina accuses MIM of concealing its own line, but in fact it is Voina, CoRIM, and the RCP-USA which seek to keep MIM line out of public view.

4. WHO'S SECTARIAN?

Voina writes that MIM and others "have a long history of standing aloof from RIM and from the PCP itself, with each of them jealously guarding their independence." Voina is arguing that it is sectarian for groups upholding MLM to remain independent of the RIM. MIM disagrees. Stalin dissolved the Comintern. Neither Stalin nor Mao reconstituted it. The Comintern approach of building a world Party is an approach which discourages self-reliance among its member Parties and encourages hegemonism in its place. CoRIM's resurrection of the world Party idea is one manifestation of the CoRIM's underlying Trotskyism. The Avakianist (crypto-Trotskyist) line leading the CoRIM and the RCP-USA is in fact the sectarian position, as it attempts to smuggle the line of the labor aristocracy—including social-democratic demands and between-the-lines attacks on comrades Lenin, Stalin and Mao—into the proletarian movement. Whoever breaks with principles generates splits.

5. FILTH SUPPORTS THE CoRIM

Voina asserts that MIM and others "liquidat[e] the struggle against revisionism ... generally ... [T]hese forces ... regularly welcome into their ranks almost anyone who denies the two-line struggle and is opposed to CoRIM, including pro-Chinese revisionists, old-style pro-Soviet revisionists and the like." But, if Voina's method of argument is turned around and aimed at the CoRIM, it is quite clear from the "Marxism List" archives (available on the Internet by pointing one's browser to the "Marxism Space") that if we count everyone who supports the RCP/CoRIM position then CoRIM would have to say that individual psychiatrists (Chris Burford) supporting peace talks sided with the CoRIM against us as well as several hardcore Trotskyists. In comparison, the people R. Voina is referring to are people in the decaying revisionist parties willing to support the People's War. A minority of the people in the decaying revisionist circles have left them completely and now work with MIM. While these people certainly have much self-criticism and transformation work to do, they cannot be compared with the above-mentioned filth that supports the CoRIM.

Godenas of the Khrushchevite revisionist CPUSA, for example, is a fragrant flower supporting the People's War compared with the outright pro-capitulation people that defended the RIM like Chris Burford and various open Trotskyists did. As MIM understands it, Godenas was ready to leave the CPUSA if the revolution in Peru demanded it. In contrast, one stout RIM defender on the Internet was the same one who thought

the PCP was guilty of the MRTA's crimes.

The CPUSA did not support the People's War or issue a statement of willingness to learn Maoism or accept forthright criticism from Adolfo Olaechea. The CPUSA women whose article attacking cops MIM printed did.

Voina's criticisms of the Workers Party of Belgium (PTB) are correct, but Luis Arce Borja and Adolfo Olaechea are right to work with open revisionists supporting the People's War as opposed to those like the CoRIM falsely claiming Maoism. If Luis Arce Borja and Adolfo Olaechea jump from the frying pan of RCP-USA revisionism into the fire of other revisionisms, then that is the fault of the RCP-USA. Secondly it will be MIM's fault for not organizing an undeniable force in the imperialist countries. And let's be frank: we talk about the RCP-USA and not RIM, because Gonzalo himself credited it for forming the RIM and because reaching the other organizations of the RIM is difficult and they do not partake in the daily struggles that we are talking about here.

Given the RCP-USA's line, it would not be surprising to see Adolfo Olaechea switch from alliance with crypto-Trotskyist revisionism to alliance with Khrushchevite revisionism. Both kinds of revisionism deny that the oppressor nations are parasites and that parasites are not proletarians. However, again we must remember the context: it is challenge enough to understand Peru correctly as Adolfo Olaechea does. If he flails his arms about like a drowning man in the imperialist countries — well, we can say he never trained to swim in such waters. In fact, the life preservers that the RCP-USA threw him leaked like a sieve.

6. CoRIM EXPOSES THE NATURE OF ITS MEDDLING

Voina's statement that "There are in fact no PCP representatives abroad at this time" is actually a stunning admission. If there are no PCP representatives abroad, then that only serves to underscore how the RCP/CoRIM have sought to take advantage of the arrest of Gonzalo to put new organizations in place in Europe to replace those sanctioned while Gonzalo was still free, namely the El Diario of Luis Arce Borja. We instead choose to rally around what was already in place before the arrest of Gonzalo. The RCP/CoRIM's attempts to do otherwise are a continuation of the split-and-wreck activities that the Peruvian police initiated.

7. IS HUMAN RIGHTS WORK THE "PRINCIPAL TASK" FOR COMMUNISTS?

Voina is correct that we must make special efforts with regard to the life of comrade Gonzalo, but as s/he is aware, the issue of the International Emergency Committee to Save the Life of Dr. Abimael Guzman (IEC) goes well beyond that. The IEC propaganda is only an extension of the CoRIM literature which literally said that saving Gonzalo's life was the principal task of the international communist movement! This is how

the CoRIM and IEC slapped at the armed struggle. According to the CoRIM the international communist movement was to transform itself into a human-rights campaign:

"For the 100th Anniversary of Chairman Mao: Document of the RIM". ... The RIM needs information on the activities carried through for the celebration. But we must not forget that the principal task is to 'move heaven and earth to save the life of Chairman Gonzalo'" ("Reproduced April 1994 by MPP USA," in "El Diario," p. 9). In other words, people everywhere should lay down their weapons, leave their countries and join the International Emergency Committee to "make propaganda, make a poster" and that would be a contribution to fulfilling the "principal task."

While pretending to struggle against the peace accords idea, the CoRIM has yet to retract the above! Instead it dodges the issue without mentioning the substance of MIM's dispute with the IEC. For its part, MIM attempted to work with the IEC for years, but we were not allowed, particularly by RCP-USA members in the IEC. Only in the months leading to our public split with the "MPP"-USA did the IEC attempt to work with MIM, apparently in a change of heart. By that time, these differences between MIM and the IEC had crystallized considerably.

8. WORLD WHITE WEB

Voina's criticism of those RIM critics who want CoRIM to reveal its internal functioning is correct. So is the thrust of his or her comments on the Internet. No one objected to anything Voina said about cyberspace. His or her long tirade about cyberspace should be read as self-justification for CoRIM's failure to defend itself politically in principled polemic. In actuality, it is the CoRIM that is obsessed with cyberspace, because it only responded to the polemics once they were put there. The polemics against them all appeared in print and spoken words first. The RCP-USA newspaper also has a web page on the Internet—which includes Voina's article—so what R. Voina is complaining about is hard to see.

9. COMINTERNISM = HEGEMONISM

Voina writes, "The virtual revolutionaries also repeatedly assert that 'Avakian is running RIM', that 'RIM is nothing but an Avakian front', and the like... One variant of this attack is that 'Avakian's domination of the RIM' mirrors US imperialism's domination of the oppressed countries. This particular slander reeks of imperialist chauvinism and disrespect for the RIM parties and organizations in the oppressed countries, including the PCP itself." We certainly do respect the PCP and all Parties which genuinely uphold Marxism-Leninism-Maoism or Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought. This does not mean that we agree with all these Parties on all matters. We have already stated that we see the Communist Party of the Philippines, not the PCP, as the model when it comes to international relations.

The Cardinals, Veteran Revisionists, Liquidationism, & Youth

OUR ATTITUDE TOWARD THE CARDINAL QUESTIONS, VETERAN REVISIONISTS, LIQUIDATIONISM, YOUTH AND BUILDING MIM AND THE REST OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT IN THE IMPERIALIST COUNTRIES IN 1997

This is MIM's position on how long to wait for unity depending on the context in the international communist movement.
—ed.

It has been over 40 years since the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union. Likewise, it has been over 20 years since the restoration of capitalism in China, and still some people are referring to China as "socialist." In 1991, the Soviet Union gave up the pretense of being socialist, and yet MIM still encounters those claiming Marxism-Leninism who cannot spit out a simple fact on the class structure: Khrushchev, Deng Xiaoping, Hua Guofeng, Gorbachev, Alia—these are the bourgeoisie in the party. It is a universal truth of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism that without Mao's contribution on the theory of the formation of the bourgeoisie in the party, there is no way to struggle against capitalist restoration. The imperialists and landlord classes can be beaten, but if we fail to see the access to the means of production in the vanguard party holding state power, we will be returning to capitalism anyway. Likewise, in Vietnam, there is nothing Deng Xiaoping has done that Vietnam hasn't done. North Korea can be said to be in its new democratic stage still, but it incorrectly did not take sides between Mao and the Soviet Union, and it is thus not upholding the universal aspects of the science of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and is instead engaged in capitalist construction. Of particular note in this regard are Kim Il Sung's attempts to take a position between Mao and the Soviet revisionists on the question of the operation of the law of value.

What we mean by a universal aspect of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism is an aspect true in every country. While there is still imperialism, there will be a bourgeoisie in the communist parties in power dogging our efforts to build socialism.

Likewise, in every party there will be right opportunists. They must be fought, and some will transform into outright counterrevolutionaries. We are seeing this happen now in Peru, but it is true everywhere, so this is something we say is part of the universals of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

With the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, many have come over to the proletarian camp when previously they had been throwing rocks at it. These forces must be welcomed and engaged in struggle—and these forces will necessarily have to

raise the types of questions that led them to throw rocks at us in the past. Many are now making excellent contributions to the struggle in their work with MIM.

On the other hand, the question of leadership and organization must be handled differently. In 1997, we should not be patiently trying to reform the organizations and leaders throwing rocks. The organizations need to dissolve and the leaders need to be dethroned.

There are even some leaders and organizations who believe they are not throwing rocks anymore. Rather they have come to the proletarian camp and drop most of the rocks they are carrying on their own feet and the feet of the rest of the proletarian camp. Organizations defending Gorbachev and Hua Guofeng come to mind as belonging to this ilk. They are oh-so polite in talking to us and others in the proletarian camp, but they are still dropping rocks.

There are at least two questions in the application of the cardinals. One is the substance of the question and two is the quality of the leadership.

In all the English-speaking imperialist countries there is no reason to be reforming leaders who may not have read any newspapers in decades. They may be going through the motions of revolution, but they are akin to Catholics who believe in the rituals without having any ideas about their religion. Likewise, there is MIM's Spanish-language publication for those seeking struggle in that language, in addition to many other publications from the PCP, so there is no reason on that account to lag either.

There is a MIM, CPP, PCP, TKP/ML and many other oppressed nation Maoist parties with influence in more than one country and there is no reason to be propping up leadership so lazy it cannot see the light on the Soviet Union and China yet. Even if these leaders do come to see the light on the cardinal questions, can we say we want leadership that takes that long? World War I was over in terms of the political opportunities it presented in four years. If Lenin had not been on top of things over a space of months in 1917, there would have been no revolution, so how can we accept leaders in the English-speaking imperialist countries who still can't draw conclusions from how Hua Guofeng handed China over to Deng Xiaoping?

Mail travels quickly amongst imperialist countries. That is not to mention the Internet. There is simply no reason to put up with revisionism. MIM is prepared to dedicate regular pages of its publications to any comrades working in the imperialist countries who needs to get copies out every two weeks.

We must go over the schism between Maoism and revisionism historically with the youth, but we must also tell the youth the factual truth that many of the larger labor aristocracy supporting organizations that they see claiming Marxism-Leninism as their banner are throwing rocks at the proletarian camp or dropping them on our feet.

No one can avoid dropping rocks on his or her own feet sometimes, but we must draw the line when it comes to the cardinal questions. The youth must be told now that they have a lot of heavy lifting to do and these larger labor aristocracy organizations are not going to see the light and take up the proletarian struggle through a miracle from above. Any other approach to the cardinal questions after all these years since the key historical events is just liquidationism. There is no

time to waste waiting around for old labor aristocracy and revisionist organizations to correct themselves in the imperialist countries.

In all the imperialist countries or internal semi-colonies speaking German, Italian, French, Spanish and English there are MIM supporters and others attacking Soviet and Chinese revisionism. There is absolutely no reason to give any legitimacy to revisionist leaders or organizations in the imperialist countries, even as we continue to speak with the rank and file in these countries' parties. We can be friendly with the left-wing social-democrats who are internationalists, but we must distinguish that carefully from any question involving building parties, particularly where the youth are concerned.

MIM in the English Speaking Countries

May 1997

MIM is a collection of parties of the English-speaking imperialist countries and their internal semi-colonies. We cover the United States, where we originated, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, England, Ireland, Israel, the Black nation, Aztlán, burgeoning Asian enclaves and the First Nations surrounded by imperialism.

This announcement by MIM is not made lightly. There are concerns that MIM is becoming a new COMINTERN, a world party. Another problem is the fact that MIM is dominated by its basis in North America and the United States in particular.

However, "freedom is the recognition of necessity." MIM's announcement has the benefit of making clear that the international communist movement is in low ebb, particularly in the imperialist countries. Too many continue to hold illusions about revisionism or social-democracy or have failed to regroup at all.

MIM's announcement that it is the vanguard in several countries simply means that MIM is the most scientific pole concretely active in those countries. It is MIM opposing Soviet revisionism and Chinese revisionism.

While some countries have no pole other than MIM opposing Soviet and Chinese revisionism, there is no organization other than MIM in the imperialist countries taking up Lenin's correct line on the labor aristocracy and parasitism generally. Organizations exist that speak of "the working class" and "the proletariat" day and night without ever defining what they are talking about or applying it concretely. For this reason, MIM exists—not to hold back the development of the understanding of concrete conditions in each imperialist country and its internal semi-colonies—but to expedite this process and to rally the

elements in need of re-grouping.

Concretely-speaking, having regular publications is a major advantage in the struggle. In What Is To Be Done? Lenin insisted on weekly publications. MIM has weekly publications and has assisted localities in establishing more than weekly publications. We see no difficulty in continuing this expansion in all the English-speaking imperialist countries.

At this time, there is also an ebb in the imperialist countries in general, not just the English-speaking ones. MIM is not yet in a position to assist concretely in all of them, though it is happy to exert influence in those countries.

We call on all individuals in the English-speaking imperialist countries to rally around MIM and stop wasting time in dejection or coaxing hopeless revisionists, social-democrats or outright liquidationists. The would-be party leaders in the imperialist countries who cannot see the truth about Soviet and Chinese revisionism by now will not be won until much later in the revolutionary process.

**Stop wasting
time in
dejection or
coaxing
hopeless
revisionists,
social-
democrats
or outright
liquidationists**

Statement on African Liberation Day


May 24, 1997

Just as they did 100 years ago, the imperialists still carve up Africa for themselves while the masses languish in poverty. The Amerikan, French, and Italian imperialists negotiate the future of Algeria. The Amerikan and French imperialists negotiate the future of the former Zaire. The governments of Africa are neo-colonial puppet regimes. They are formally independent but they are actually utterly reliant on economic and military "aid" from their imperialist masters. On behalf of the imperialists, these governments use imperialist-supplied guns to suppress the people's struggles against imperialism, feudalism, and bureaucrat capitalism. Ken Saro-Wiwa of Nigeria was hung because he dared to stand up against a multinational oil company which was raping African land and exploiting African people. French imperialism sent troops to the Central African Republic to "secure a stable investment climate." The U.S. imperialists sent troops to Somalia, not to help the people as they claimed, but to secure U.S. military and economic interests in the area.

But oppression breeds resistance, and the masses of Africa continue to struggle for liberation. And they are not alone. The masses of Asia and Latin America are also oppressed by imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism. They, too, struggle for the liberation of their nations from these evils.

Within U.S. borders, too, there is national oppression and national resistance. The masses of the Black, Latino, and First Nations within U.S. borders suffer at the hands of imperialism, and they too struggle for national liberation. Amerikkka's racist police act as a brutal, hostile occupation army in the ghettos, barrios and reservations. The CIA and ruthless profiteers flood the ghettos, barrios and reservations with crack, heroin, and malt liquor. Black, Latino and First Nations youth who could be in college are instead dragged into concentration camps called "prisons." In the 1960s and 1970s, the U.S. government crushed the Black Panther Party, the American Indian Movement, and other leaders of Amerikkka's internal semi-colonies. This opened the floodgate for increasing attacks on the masses of these oppressed nations.

The common enemy of the oppressed nations in North America and the oppressed nations of the world is imperialism, principally U.S. imperialism. The common solution is a national democratic, anti-imperialist, armed struggle for independence quickly followed by a struggle to develop self-reliant socialism.



MIM encourages revolutionaries of all nationalities and in all continents to study and apply the science of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, which is a revolutionary tool of universal value. The

oppressed peoples of the world have made Marxism-Leninism-Maoism their own by successfully applying its tenets not only in China, but also in Vietnam, India, Eritrea, Peru, Turkey, and the Philippines, to name a few. The Maoist strategies of protracted people's war and two-stage revolution—an anti-imperialist national democratic revolution, followed by the development of socialism—are essential for the liberation of African nations, almost all of which are semi-feudal and semi-colonial. Mao's teaching that class struggle continues under socialism is of great importance for all those who uphold socialism and communism. It helps us understand how capitalism was restored in the Soviet Union, China, and Albania. The world's oppressed majority needs socialism, and therefore needs to distinguish between phony socialism and genuine socialism.

Long live African Liberation Day!

Long live the anti-imperialist struggle!

Long live Marxism-Leninism-Maoism!

MIM Celebrates NPA Anniversary

March 29, 1997

The Maoist Internationalist Movement, a revolutionary communist party based in North America, enthusiastically salutes the anniversary of the New People's Army (NPA). Soon after its own re-establishment on Dec. 26, 1968, the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP) organized the NPA on March 29, 1969. The NPA started with 60 Red fighters armed with only nine automatic rifles and 26 single-shot rifles and handguns. The NPA has grown significantly since then.

The CPP established the NPA under the guidance of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought and along the general line of the new-democratic revolution. Under the absolute leadership of the Party and its Marxist-Leninist-Maoist line, the NPA wages a protracted people's war, made possible and dictated by the chronically crisis-ridden semicolonial and semifeudal conditions of the Philippines.

By waging the Protracted People's War, the NPA correctly follows the guidance of Comrade Mao Zedong, who said, "We are advocates of the abolition of war, we do not want war; but war can only be abolished through war, and in order to get rid of the gun it is necessary to take up the gun." Imperialism, feudalism, and bureaucratic capitalism ruthlessly oppress the Filipino people. The oppressors repeatedly demonstrate that they will not give up their power without a fight. The masses can only liberate themselves from oppression by organizing themselves under the leadership of a communist party to seize power through armed struggle. Only by fighting until total victory can there be a just and lasting peace.

Under the leadership of the Communist Party of the Philippines, the Commanders and fighters of the New People's Army have expanded and consolidated their mass base for carrying out the national-democratic revolution through protracted people's war. With the support of the broad masses of the Filipino people, the CPP and NPA can expect to lead the intensification of guerrilla warfare and the mass movement in due time.

Comrade Mao Zedong said, "The correctness or otherwise of the ideological and political line decides everything. When the Party's line is correct, then everything will come its way. If it has no followers, then it can have followers; if it has no guns, then it can have guns; if it has no political power, then it can have political power." The NPA's history has shown this to be true. From 1987 to 1992, an incorrect political-military line dominated the NPA's work. This adventurist line called for a strategic counteroffensive. It dichotomized military work

from political work. The NPA's incorrect abandonment of mass political work led to a diminishment of the NPA's mass social base. The NPA's incorrect abandonment of political study consolidated these errors. Under the influence of the adventurist line, the NPA failed

to educate, mobilize, and arouse the masses. The NPA became isolated from the masses. Many heroic fighters were martyred as a result of these errors.

Since 1992, under the leadership of the CPP, the NPA has been undergoing a rectification campaign. The goal of this campaign is to reaffirm the Party's Marxist-Leninist-Maoist principles, rectify errors, and rebuild strength which was diminished as a result of the erroneous line. Today, the NPA studies the classics of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao, and opposes the adventurist line. This movement has been an overwhelming success, and it demonstrates the universal significance and importance of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.

The NPA's continued and growing success demonstrates the continued relevance of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism as a tool for liberating the oppressed. MIM wishes continued success to the NPA and the national democratic revolution it advances. MIM contributes to this success in the best way it can-by preparing the masses of North America to make anti-imperialist revolution.

Long live the New People's Army!
Long live the Communist Party of the Philippines!
Victory to the Filipino people's war!
Long live Marxism-Leninism-Maoism!



On the Historical Role of G. Zinoviev

This document was approved by MIM Congress in 1996. —ed.

It is an historical fact that Central Committee member G. Zinoviev snatched on the Bolsheviks at the crucial moment in October 1917 and opposed the armed uprising. "Encountering a decisive rebuff at both meetings of the C.C., Kamenev and Zinoviev made a statement on October 18 in the Menshevik newspaper ... about the Bolsheviks' preparations for an armed uprising and said that they considered it to be an adventurous gamble."⁽¹⁾

Yet Lenin stressed repeatedly thereafter that this should not be held against Zinoviev. Nearing death, Lenin said on December 24, 1922, "I shall just recall that the October episode with Zinoviev and Kamenev was, of course, no accident, but neither can the blame for it be laid upon them personally."

After October, Lenin not only kept Zinoviev in the leadership, but also Lenin made him president of the Comintern. How could Lenin do that? What could outweigh splitting the party and being on the wrong side at the crucial moment of the insurrection?

In spite of these actions taken by Zinoviev, Lenin held that Zinoviev's attacks on the Second International during World War I far outweighed his weak points. Without Lenin's and Zinoviev's efforts to re-orient the international communist movement, there would have been no military battle to snatch on in October, 1917. During World War I, it was Zinoviev's job to represent the Central Committee,⁽²⁾ including at the most crucial Zimmerwald conferences.

Lenin knew very well that it was a rare comrade willing to go against the social-patriotism and militarism of the Second International which dragged workers into slaughtering each other in World War I. Not only did Zinoviev attack social-patriotism and imperialist militarism, but also he provided theoretical leadership along with Lenin on how to destroy the old revisionism and re-orient the international communist movement. Fundamentally that re-orientation hinged on distinguishing between proletarians and workers. It meant not fighting for the interests of the labor aristocracy. When the social-patriots said that the majority of workers favored the war, Zinoviev replied firmly that it was not the proletarians who favored the war. When the sizeists bragged about how much support they got for supporting World War I, Zinoviev said he'd rather have a party with one-fifth as many delegates, as long as it didn't vacillate. For this reason, and only because comrades Zinoviev and Lenin were able to hold out against World War I, the Bolsheviks were able eventually to turn an imperialist civil war into the world's first communist-led revolution.

This is something that Zinoviev brought to the Comintern as well, at Lenin's bidding. On any matter concerning the role of proletarian leadership, we will find that on the floor of the Comintern in his verbal comments or in Lenin's written *Selected Works*, Lenin always defended Zinoviev.

Who but Zinoviev would be a better choice for forming the Third International to replace the social-chauvinist Second International? According to Lenin, none other than Zinoviev was suited for this task.

Later in life, Zinoviev sold out, and even allied with Trotsky at times and ended up being shot by Stalin. Yet even so, Stalin made sure to uphold what Zinoviev said about issues of proletarian leadership, even after Zinoviev was disgraced. It is not the Marxist-Leninist method to throw out the truth just because its author was not later able to uphold it.

Just as Deng Xiaoping had to clear out the "Gang of Four" before he could carry out his sinister plans for the restoration of capitalism in China, those seeking to restore the social-patriotism of the Second International do not attack Lenin directly and instead aim their attacks at the perceived weak link of Zinoviev. We must crush the attempts of the Mensheviks to attack Zinoviev when he was correct.

When Zinoviev laughed at Trotsky's proposals for how to put the party in line with his theory of the productive forces, Lenin defended Zinoviev in "Once Again on the Trade Unions."⁽³⁾ It was Trotsky's idea to boost production to defeat imperialism by using coercive methods of government administration, including the use of military organization in industrial and agricultural production. Zinoviev Trotsky accused of using propaganda methods, and Lenin defended him.⁽⁴⁾

After Lenin died, Trotsky disgraced himself before Zinoviev did. At that time, Zinoviev managed to play a crucial role in the defeat of Trotsky. Later when Zinoviev disgraced himself, Stalin made a point of defending what Zinoviev had done in attacking the social-democracy of the Second International. Bringing down Zinoviev did not mean Stalin was going to make peace with social-patriotism.⁽⁵⁾

As time passed, Mao did not try to reverse correct verdicts on Zinoviev either. The Foreign Language Press of Peking continued to publish Lenin's works that referred to Zinoviev favorably in concrete historical conditions.⁽⁶⁾

Notes:

1. V.I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. 3. International Publishers, NY: 1967. p. 831.

2. For Lenin specifically authorizing Zinoviev as representative of the CC at that time, see "Tasks of the Proletariat in Our Revolution," Vol. 2, p. 44.

3. Ibid., Vol. 3, pp. 527-30.

4. Ibid., Vol. 3, pp. 539, 544.

5. See MIM Theory 10, p. 23.

6. See for example the Peking, 1965 edition of "The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky" preface which mentions a work called *Against the Stream* by G. Zinoviev and N. Lenin (Petrograd, 1918).

Struggle & Review

Yellow-Bellied Avakian Reveals His Colors Again

by MCS

Addressing issues more clearly and directly than usual, Bob Avakian of the Revolutionary Communist Party, USA (RCP-USA) wrote an article in *Revolutionary Worker*, January 19, 1997, about how to maintain an internationalist orientation while working in a society of parasites.

We will credit Avakian for recognizing that the whole imperialist society is parasitic and increasingly so. Doing so, Avakian cuts off his support from sectors too wishful in their thinking to confront the realities of the class structure — except that the beer-bellied sector is too lazy to read what he wrote anyway, and will side with Avakian for another statement he made that we will get to in a minute.

Pretty much acknowledging MIM's scientific analysis of the labor aristocracy (see MIM Theory 1 and 10), Avakian then gets to the bottom line of how to avoid its implications: "If we don't maintain the strategic orientation of seeking to unite the 90% — even while it may be true at a given time that we're far from having 90% of the people with us — we will lose."

To translate what Avakian is saying against MIM: We can't tell our best friends their breath stinks. Actually it's worse than that, because we have to be friendly with people who are parasites. Avakian even says, because the only way to unite 90% of a nation of parasites is by putting forward parasitic demands.

We aren't even allowed to enumerate the parasites' existence precisely in our analysis of class structure, because that might alienate them, according to Avakian, the opportunist sugar-coated

bullet manufacturer. Yet where do we ever see Lenin or Mao take this approach? Lenin did a careful statistical analysis of every class structure he wanted to talk about. So did Mao. Mao could unite the 90% because that was the class structure of his country, and even so, Mao warned against the influence of Mencius in taking percentages metaphorically.

As Mao explained, those without strategic confidence will make ultraleft and right opportunist errors, and eventually end in paralysis. This does not mean we have to capitulate to the 90% in the imperialist countries like Avakian does.

Avakian is correct. Lenin said we cannot know what portion of the labor aristocracy will go over to the revolution, as Sakai also points out in *Settlers*. Let's not stop there, because Marx and Engels believed a section of the bourgeoisie would go over at the last minute too. Using the scientific method, by denying the demands of the bourgeoisie, the communist movement would nonetheless win a section of the bourgeoisie over. The same is true of other bourgeoisified classes and we cannot know exactly how many. The actual appearance of the revolution such as its social composition and what line led to its successful conclusion are two different things, which is why Lenin said a lot more than Avakian intimates when he selects one quote and makes it the centerpiece of his own agnostic reading of Lenin: "we can't know what will happen." ("But (and this is extremely important), we cannot know for sure, in advance, where all the different social strata and forces will line up when the showdown comes — that will be deter-

mined in the actual event."

Lenin said:

"The conduct of the leaders of the German Social Democratic party, the strongest and most influential party belonging to the Second International (1889-1914), which voted for the military appropriations and which repeated the bourgeois chauvinist phrases of the Prussian Junkers and the bourgeoisie, is a direct betrayal of socialism. Under no circumstances, even assuming the absolute weakness of the party and the necessity of its submitting to the will of the bourgeois majority of the nation, can the conduct of the German Social Democratic party be justified. This party has in fact adopted a national-liberal policy."(1)

In other words, even though the communists were going to be censored and thrown in jail with the approval of the majority of the German masses — who were bourgeois — there is no reason to be so yellow-bellied as to give up internationalism. Sure, try to avoid the censors and the prisons, but do not give up internationalism by catering to the essence of these bourgeoisified class demands.

Lenin had strategic confidence, even though most of Germany was bourgeois. How is that possible? As we have shown in numerous publications, Lenin thought the imperialists would destroy their own bourgeoisified classes, and they in fact did so at a rapid pace during World War I. Lenin predicted if that did not happen, the parasitic trend would gain hold in the economy and work its way inevitably into the labor movement. That is in fact what has happened, and only dolts can deny it now.

There is nothing to be agnostic about any more. With the aid of the modern weapons of militarism, the imperialists have made whole countries consolidated parasites, and there will have to be a whole strategic stage of the dictatorship of the proletariat of the oppressed nations over the imperialist bourgeoisie and its allied bourgeois classes that takes account of this. Anything less as strategy will result in neo-colonialism and a restoration of imperialism. The consolidation of the labor aristocracy has made the national question the way to go in the imperialist countries. In contrast, Avakian's position on having to work with the enemy classes in a spirit of love and unity is not much different than Martin Luther King's – a nice idea that doesn't work. The oppressor nations are not ready for integration and that is a result of generations of the consolidation of the labor aristocracy.

Mr. Avakian, you "can't know what will happen," so we suggest you step aside and let those of us who do know something have a clear field without your vile distortions of Leninism. One of the things we know is that there has been consolidated generations of parasitism now, and its chokehold influence will not immediately disappear the day "the Revolution" a.k.a. "the showdown" happens.

It will in fact take a relatively long period of time to cleanse the bourgeoisified workers of their parasitism and prepare them for the day when they actually could be members of an integrated society, and not members of the Rodney King or Vincent Chin juries. During that phase of the dictatorship of the proletariat adapted to our present conditions, oppressor nation people will not be able to run oppressed nation people's lives, not in court and not in police patrols. Instead of saying "we can't know," we should prepare for this now to speed up the success of the dictatorship of the proletariat adapted to conditions in an advanced imperialist country. Only a party that does this deserves the support

of the oppressed nation masses now and only a party that does this will receive the support of the oppressed nation masses.

The white man threw away his chance at peaceful integration long before the assassination of MLK. He has now raised generations of people in his parasitic ways, so that now it is no longer a conscious choice to live the parasitic life at the expense of the oppressed. Doing less than telling the bitter truth of parasitism and preparing a strategic stage of internationalist dictatorship is falsely flattering the parasitic classes. Even sectors of the internal semi-colonies will have to be cleansed of parasitism before they can enter full brotherhood and sisterhood with oppressed nations.

When Avakian says we will lose if we don't unite with the 90% of the U.S., he has forgotten one thing – the world's vast majority of people oppressed by imperialism. They will not stand for imperialism even while the parasites do. Avakian constrained himself to an analysis of one country when in fact the likelihood is that North America will only go down after many other countries have gone for socialism first. These countries have no obligation to respect imperialist borders. They have the right to cut off war, starvation and environmental destruction right at the source.

Avakian's position is for the self-determination rights of oppressor nations and classes.

Playing word games, Avakian openly spits in the proletariat's face by using "proletarian" and "parasite" interchangeably in the same article. We are sorry Mr. Avakian. It is not possible to have it both ways: one is either a proletarian or a parasite, not both. One cannot have a "united front under the leadership of the proletariat" for the 90% within U.S. borders if there is no proletariat in the population we are talking about leading!

The 10% of the world will not defeat the 90%, even if 90% of the U.S. takes the wrong side. There is no excuse for capitulating to the parasitic oppressor nations like Avakian does and like the yellow-bellied Second International did before him. We say we will cater our demands to the imperialist society's 20% (oppressed nations, white youth, lumpenproletariat) most closely allied with the world's 80% of basic toiling masses, and if we bring 5% or 50% with us into battle, it will still be the toiling masses of the oppressed nations of the world who will have the last say.

Notes: 1. Excerpted in *International Communism in the Era of Lenin: A Documentary History* by Helmut Gruber. Fawcett World Library: New York, 1967. p. 59.

Review: Petty-bourgeois internationalism

ARJUN MAKHIJANI
From Global Capitalism to Economic Justice: An Inquiry into the Elimination of Systematic Poverty, Violence and Environmental Destruction in the World Economy
Apex Press: New York, 1992.

PAUL COCKSHOTT &
ALLIN COTTRELL
Towards a New Socialism
Nottingham, England, 1993.

reviewed by MCS

We review these books together, because they complement each other nicely. They are important books to MIM, because their authors agree with MIM's third cardinal principle, the scientific truth that the majority of the oppressor nation workers are not exploited.

On the one hand we have Arjun Makhijani, who according to the book jacket is "President of the Institute for

Energy and Environmental Research near Washington, has worked in India's villages, organized for nuclear disarmament in the U.S. and written widely on energy, environmental and economic issues. He has a Bachelor of Engineering degree from the University of Bombay and a Ph.D. from the University of California." Arjun Makhijani represents the most radical thinking of the Third World petty-bourgeoisie possible.

W. Paul Cockshott and Allin Cottrell are academics in computer programming and economics respectively. *Towards a New Socialism* contributes to overcoming petty-bourgeois thinking by discussing how advances in technology make centralized planning of the economy easier with every passing year. At the same time, the authors are internationalists, just not as thoroughly internationalist as Arjun Makhijani.

PETTY-BOURGEOIS INTERNATIONALISM

Arjun Makhijani does not claim to be Marxist, and for this reason he is a good friend of the people, because many people with similar views – Karl Kautsky for instance – would attempt to pass themselves off as Marxist.

Makhijani shares MIM's vision of internationalism, and we vouch for his staunch anti-imperialism and anti-militarism. He also has the factual understanding of the international class structure correct, often using phrases MIM has also used to describe it: "The well-being of the capitalist countries has been inextricably intertwined with exploitation of the Third World." (p. 74). Makhijani's program is identical to MIM's on opening borders as well (p. 104).

Pointing out that one-third of the world consumes 95% of all resources, Makhijani has a firm grip on conditions of the Third World. Makhijani also refers to "global apartheid" (p. x) and the opposition of oppressor nation workers to change. For this reason, we agree with Makhijani right down to the details of the political economy of the oppressor nation workers: "Even as Marx was

writing *Das Kapital*, the mechanisms for the transfer of poverty out of the capitalist countries were operating in full swing" (p. 63). See also his contrast of the Third World and "the majority of Whites in their own countries" (p. 43).

Grasping the nature of superexploitation, Makhijani explains transfer pricing within multinational companies as a means of hiding profits obtained from the Third World (p. 14) – something that Cockshott and Cottrell fail to do in their calculations of the exploitation of workers in the United Kingdom. Makhijani also dedicates a considerable part of the book to the political (non-market) process which impinges on exchange rates among countries, thereby cheapening Third World labor. He then suggests a program of action to reform capitalism to radically improve Third World conditions without a program of redistributing existing industrial fixed assets.

REJECTION OF LENINISM

Makhijani does not deny that the most important statistical comparisons show that Lenin's communist system defeated the capitalist system (pp. 74-75) and was only destroyed for reasons other than success or failure in terms of providing for the social good. On the other hand, Makhijani rejects "the violence of Stalinism" (p. 59), the vanguard party idea (p. 61) and the dictatorship of the proletariat (p. 136). Forced to hang his hat on the example of Kerala in India (pp. 132-137), Makhijani nonetheless correctly points out that communist-led socialism has been a less violent system than capitalism. (We leave it to our comrades in India to explain why they believe the Kerala example is a false road forward.)

Along these lines, Makhijani accepted that the communist system lost out in the race to provide consumer goods and turns it into a gender issue by saying women were the ones who had to stand in line (unpaid) in the Soviet Union. Although Makhijani never addressed how far behind Russia was in the con-

sumer goods race before the Revolution of 1917, the point will appeal to the historically ignorant or lying bourgeoisie that Makhijani is writing for.

MAKHIJANI

"Human life is lived individually, in families and in the small structures of communities. The intimate decisions of everyday life are best made at that level, if only because the knowledge of what needs to be done is greatest at that level. The love and nurture that are needed in everyday life also cannot be dispensed by macroeconomic structures, but must necessarily be in the small structures of everyday life. Whether it is husbanding the land, bringing up and educating children in homes and schools, deciding where a sign for a deaf child should be put up on a street or what parts of a house or office need fixing, or any of the myriad decisions that people make every day, considerable control over property at the local level is essential. In that respect, capitalist theory is closer to what we need than Marxist theory" (pp. 109-110).

Makhijani agrees with MIM on the international class structure and many fundamental values while disagreeing with MIM on how the world works. The petty-bourgeoisie is the class most inclined to champion the efforts of the individual overcoming the obstacles placed by larger capitalists or the discipline of proletarian movements.

According to Makhijani, Lenin and Mao's successes came because they bowed to the petty-bourgeoisie in the countryside: "There were strong demands for a plot of land that the peasant could control, no matter how small" (p. 66).

Makhijani is able to explain the economic rationale underlying the petty-bourgeois position very clearly: "It is therefore incorrect to view the property of the poor peasant or small scale property held in a manner of a farmer in the

same light as that held for profit. When earnings from such holdings are comparable to income from holding a job, it is more appropriate to view such forms of property as means for the control of one's labor and as insurance for hard times" (p. 108). MIM disagrees with this, because while the worker obtains income from a highly centralized and social process, the petty-bourgeoisie described by Makhijani can obtain the same income without an understanding of the rest of the world, and thus holds relatively parochial views incompatible with internationalism and world peace.

We must concede that there is a material basis for Makhijani's views in that studies show that in much labor-intensive agriculture, there is nothing more productive than small-scale farming. Such agriculture is not susceptible to improvement through capital investment, collective farming or centralization and a substantial section of the world's population still undertakes such farming – coffee-bean growing for instance.

Where MIM disagrees with Makhijani is that the type of farming best suited to the petty-bourgeoisie is not really typical of the global economy and is in fact becoming evermore irrelevant. We continue to support the land-to-the-tiller new democratic stage of revolution in the semi-feudal countries as Lenin and Mao did before us, but such a stage must be led by the proletariat, which is the class capable of looking toward the future. In contrast, Makhijani advocates that everyone have a small piece of property for which he or she is responsible. Makhijani does not see how tending to one's own plot of land or property or locality is blinding and leads to destructive anti-social behavior including the cut-throat economic competition that underlies the war and environmental destruction that Makhijani seeks to eliminate.

PETTY-BOURGEOIS ENVIRONMENTALISM

Like some in the First Nations and the petty-bourgeois environmentalists,

Makhijani opposes large-scale production. Speaking of Leninism, Makhijani says: "Both of these problems have been reinforced by the uncritical acceptance of large-scale industrialism as the vehicle of 'progress'" (p. 61).

MIM disagrees with the petty-bourgeoisie's idealized view of how to restore nature to a mythical time when natural people lived on individual plots or areas of land. Every little farm having its own tractor or car is a perfect example of environmental waste but it would be classic petty-bourgeois thinking. Likewise, there is nothing more centralized or "large-scale" – and industrial – than public transportation, but that is crucial to protecting the environment.

True internationalism merges with environmentalism, because no locality should have the "right" to pollute more than is necessary with the most environmentally advanced techniques of production feasible. Self-interested communities that pollute the air, water and land used by others violate the principles of internationalism where all peoples are equal. Thus, in practice, there is no true petty-bourgeois internationalism or true petty-bourgeois environmentalism.

CENTRALIZED PLANNING: COCKSHOTT & COTTRELL

Advances in computers make socialist economic planning more feasible than ever. According to Cockshott & Cottrell, socialist planning is possible using spreadsheet and database software already available in the capitalist world. There is no need for supercomputers, because even intermediate technology is plenty good enough for the task of replacing the marketplace:

"If there are one million products, then teletext should be able to broadcast revised labour values every 20 minutes. The products would be identified by their universal product codes. The personal computers listen in and update their spreadsheet model in response to any broadcast changes in labour

values.

"If for any reason the personal computer in a place of work decides that the labour value of the product produced there has changed, it dials up the central teletext computer and informs it of the change. These changes might either be due to some change in local production technology, or a broadcast change in the value of one of the inputs. The whole system would be acting as a huge distributed supercomputer continuously evaluating labour values by the method of successive approximation" (p. 59).

In this system, people would be programming the computers to know when production techniques changed. Included in the possibilities of such a system are a computer-created equivalent of a market to account for demand quickly. "It depends neither on private property in the means of production, nor on the formation of market prices for the inputs to the production process" (p. 125). Hence, the question of whether to have a computer facsimile of a market without exploitation or a system in which political leaders decide appropriations can be left for later. MIM believes that at least until we reach a more perfect stage of communism, the ex-imperialist countries will require centralized control in order to overcome past imbalances with other economies.

In the past, the petty-bourgeoisie and bourgeoisie have criticized socialism because socialist governments allegedly cannot act as quickly as a spontaneous market of millions of people. In capitalism, supposedly, if people buy Barbie dolls, the "market" wants them, and so on – which is faster than accumulating information and passing it on to a socialist planner to make a decision in an office far away. As Cockshott & Cottrell have proved, this may have been true in the distant past, but it is no longer close to being true. Today we have the technical capacity to disseminate economic information very quickly and much

more thoroughly and extensively than the market has in the past. All that is lacking is the political will.

Note that this argument is just about the information/efficiency side of the debate. Socialism has been able to better provide for people already, but just making a few big correct decisions – such as making food instead of Barbie dolls, or satisfying needs at home before exporting luxury commodities to imperialist countries, and so on.

Back to information. In the past, thanks to private property, much economic information of corporations has been labeled "confidential" and other kinds of important information affecting the composition of production can be protected by trademarks. These elements of private property block the flow of information upon which the market depends. Such distortions of economic information created by the profit motive are removed under socialism. Petty-bourgeois views of local control seek to keep in place such barriers to the flow of information and indeed the petty-bourgeois view starts with the assumption of such barriers. As Marx predicted, petty-bourgeois views become increasingly out-of-date. "To establish the free and open flow of information demanded of a rational planning system will require not only the legal abolition of commercial confidentiality, but also the redesign of most of the installed computer software currently in use" (p. 128). In a system of economic cooperation, people don't hide information from each other to damage each other. The petty-bourgeois view presumes just such behavior, whether consciously or unconsciously.

THE INTERNET

Contrary to the petty-bourgeois line, centralization often creates important opportunities for the masses to gain access to the means of production and the process of production. In addition to the examples provided by Cockshott & Cottrell, nothing makes this clearer than the Internet.

1. From its earliest days, the Internet has made clear the possibility for global dissemination of software at a rapid pace. Law enforcement against computer hackers and pirates represents only the latest capitalist clampdown holding back production. The existence of free technical advice on the Internet makes it ever clearer that private property is holding back production.

2. For the environment, the Internet provides a global mechanism for whistle-blowing with an audience larger than any newspaper's. Whereas those with their noses stuck in their own property and locality will have an incentive to pollute other communities, those with access to the Internet will have a means of shooting down such selfish endeavors.

3. For those who would otherwise be living in limited communities scientifically-speaking, the Internet provides a means of gaining the scientific and environmental know-how to understand the issues of pollution in one's own locality.

4. The Internet stimulates all the communications and scientific endeavors of the masses by making a wide variety of such practices possible quickly and easily. Just as public transport should be owned by the public and free for each rider for the good of the environment, so should the Internet be free. Having a series of smaller community networks (like that championed by BBS administrators) is actually a waste both to the environment and in terms of labor – and it promotes parochialism. The only reason the BBS is progressive at this time is that property relations contaminate the Internet, making it possible that it can be easily controlled by the capitalist class and its state; hence, we sometimes prefer variety in our computer administrators, some BBS and some Internet.

The power of something like a "search engine" which explores everything on the worldwide web to find answers is available to any user and hence is a boon to the masses' scientific level. Software that makes computer power available to

users without knowledge of computer programming is also progressive. To those who say the increasing use of computers and robots in production will obviate the labor theory of value, because it appears labor is unnecessary in production, we say the opposite: what could once only be done by science management experts is now far surpassed and available to the masses through computers.

The Internet is proof that where property relations are minimized, the gains in scientific advance and communication can be rapid. Feeble notions of "local control" pale in comparison. Already many people use the Internet as a cheap international telephone. For \$20 a month and a local phone hook-up (which most in the imperialist countries already have) people can communicate for unlimited periods of time with people overseas. Those who would glorify local economy and control over such an advance make us doubt their connection and love of the rest of civilization. Such could serve as the definition of anti-internationalist chauvinism.

The Internet has demonstrated its capacity for stimulating internationalism more than any number of cultural exchanges more limited in scope. It will be our goal to hook up every village to the Internet with access for all. If it also carries such decadent and oppressive features as pornography, that may be attributed to the class and gender character of its creators and the societies in which it emerged.

CENTRALIZED SOLUTIONS FOR IMPERIALIST SUPER-EXPLOITATION

Makhijani designed his book to have some appeal to the internationalist imperialist bourgeoisie. What Makhijani offers the internationalist bourgeoisie is no less than a plan to undercut the protectionist sectors of the ruling class and labor aristocracy, a means to stimulate the global economy and a centralized and coherent way of stabilizing "free trade." As such, Makhijani's petty-bour-

geois internationalist view picks up where the most left-wing flank of the internationalist bourgeoisie leaves off.

Makhijani's program appeals to the internationalist bourgeoisie as follows:

1. Ridding the world of superexploitation will stimulate the global economy: "What incentive is there for people who make 50 cents a day to excel and innovate?" (p. 93). We Marxists call this glorifying the "bourgeois right to distribution," something progressive at this stage of history where there is no socialism yet but reactionary once we reach socialism. Makhijani's point three below guarantees an increase in Third World purchasing power and the consequent stimulation of the global economy.

2. Offering Third World petty-bourgeois acceptance of a U.N. global army and navy, a pet concern of the long-range view of the internationalist bourgeoisie (p. 118).

3. Setting exchange rates based on a real basket of goods in each country (p. 123). This is a lynchpin of the whole reform Makhijani proposes and it contains a hugely progressive content recognizable to Marxists. No longer would political processes (military aid to U.S. puppets in most cases) hold down Third World labor costs. Currencies would exchange in such a fashion that everyday needs exchange for the same price in any two countries. Such a maneuver of international bankers could not be parried by local elites seeking to maintain their death-squad control over labor.

4. Issuing a new international currency (p. 123). This combined with point three allows for free trade integration without "readjustment," because inflation is automatically and realistically accounted for. An international bourgeoisie seeking to implement its policies with less resistance will find this idea extremely persuasive – if it can cut through its own commodity fetishism long enough to understand it.

5. Creating a stock of reserve commodities in each country ready to make up for any trade deficit (p. 123). This

idea is thrown as a bone to those retrograde thinkers longing for the gold standard to guarantee currency stability.

The ideas of Makhijani and his international finance partner Robert S. Browne are a challenge to the intelligence and especially the training of international bankers and economists. However, in the pinch, these ideas might yet prove to be the right ones at the right place and the right time for the internationalist bourgeoisie.

Stalled as it has been since Adam Smith and other economists published books in the 1700s and early 1800s advocating "free trade," the internationalist bourgeoisie is not strong enough to implement true free trade via NAFTA, GATT and the EEC or any combination of regional treaties. Hence, there is some chance that Makhijani's ideas or something like them may form the basis of an attempt at radical capitalist reform by the imperialist bourgeoisie in order to save its system from crisis.

Makhijani admits that the banking solution offered in the book seems to involve centralism of the highest level – a world bank (p. 124). We do not believe Makhijani succeeded in denying this. Instead, we believe that any solution to the world's global problems caused by a global class structure require a global understanding and action. The days when societies will live in autarky (distinctly apart from each other economically) are gone in the long-run. Those seeking to overcome the injustice of superexploitation have no choice but a globally centralized solution. We at MIM do not believe that such a system can be created within the context of private property.

THE FUTURE OF INTERNATIONALISM

There will be a choice between bourgeois globalism and proletarian internationalism. A third current of protectionism and oppressor nation fascist movements will seek to restore the past order of domination, but they cannot succeed either, because of the demands of all

peoples for equality, self-determination and respect which all peoples back with military force. This third current can lead nowhere but to the end of civilization. The bourgeois internationalist option is where the action is for the system to sustain itself, but it too will prove unstable and liable to break down into the third current. A portion of the bourgeois internationalist current will discover in the upcoming crisis of bourgeois internationalism that "free trade" as an ideal can be preserved but only through implementation under communism.

The enemy of the environment and peace is not centralization or decentralization. It is property relations which seep into both centralized and decentralized systems. Tito's Yugoslavia pursued "local control" of enterprises and encouraged parochialism economically without a view for the overall production of commodities and appropriation of labor. The result is there for everyone to see – the most virulent and petty of parochial nationalisms and war. In contrast, Mao's view was correct during the Cultural Revolution: there was no choice for the masses but to understand the whole ball of wax. They must become red politically and expert in both science and administration.

The petty-bourgeois view is doomed to the trashcan of history, because communications and transport advances will make the local view of community obsolete. Already Internet communities put internationalism increasingly into practice.

In the squeeze between communist revolution in the Southern Hemisphere and protectionism within the imperialist countries, Makhijani's ideas may come to sound very good to the internationalist bourgeoisie. The Mensheviks of the world should at least get on board with Arjun Makhijani and stop trying to whip up oppressor nation nationalism amongst the workers – and stop trying to claim Marxism.

Isaiah Berlin: Leading Liberal intellectual of imperialism

ISAIAH BERLIN
BY JOHN GRAY
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS,
N.J. (1996), 189 pp.

John Gray has written a review of Berlin's life-long work especially in its relevance for Liberalism. The book jacket describes Berlin as the "commanding presence" of British intellectual life. "Few would dispute that he is Britain's greatest living thinker." The book has received a number of positive reviews, and we will not attempt to judge it as a reflection or insight into Berlin's work. Rather we will treat the ideas that appear in the book, whatever their source may be. Berlin and Gray are virtually indistinguishable considering our degree of difference with both of them, so we will treat Gray and Berlin together as Liberal birds of a feather.

OPPOSITION TO RATIONALISM

Gray's use of the words "Enlightenment," "rationalism" and related words and phrases is similar to MIM's own (e.g. MIM Theory 2/3). This permits a fairly straightforward entry into the fray of discussion. Berlin claims to be a rationalist with a lot of "buts" added in (p. 159).

According to Gray, Berlin is an admirer of the Enlightenment, but he opposes rationalism, including Marxism, a variant of rationalism. According to Gray, Berlin does not believe there are scientific answers to questions that arise "in moral and political practice" (p. 7). As a result, Gray spends much of the book explaining how Berlin is not a relativist – someone who believes no ethical decision is better than any other, because everything is subjective.

In rationalism, including Marxism, there may be instances when two choices of action are more or less equally good, but that is not the case with most

important choices that have to be made. In theory, in fact, if we could waste time scrutinizing the issues or if we achieved our more perfect selves of the future, we could distinguish between two choices, one of which is 40.1110% correct and the other being better at 40.1111% correct – this according to rationalism.

In contrast, according to Berlin's "agonistic liberalism," the most important choices are between "incommensurables," things that can't be compared and tallied up on a common underlying scale. Apples and oranges are just too different to talk about how there is a science underlying the choice between them – according to agonistic liberalism.

The favorite example the author gives in the book is the choice of French playwright and philosopher Jean Paul Sartre. Sartre had to choose between staying at home to care for his ailing mother or going out to fight in the resistance to the Nazi occupation of France. According to Berlin and Gray, such a choice is an example of an "incommensurable" and we should simply tolerate either decision. Although Sartre believed existentialism was compatible with Marxism for most of his life, it is true that in existentialism there is no scientific basis for choice-making. Sartre and Berlin both then have had to defend themselves against charges of relativism.

Such subjectivist belief brings Gray into conflict with two other famous British thinkers of a prior century, Henry James and John Stuart Mill. John Stuart Mill was a famous Liberal, but he advocated utilitarianism, a kind of rationalism that holds that it is possible to calculate the "greatest good for the greatest number." Given the choice between agonistic Liberalism of the Gray sort and the utilitarian Liberalism of the Mill sort, MIM chooses utilitarianism. Agonistic Liberalism leads to mysticism

and relativism. According to the John Stuart Mill in "On Liberty" the facts of life would just prove that tolerance was the best policy in most everything. Liberalism was not just a choice according to Mill. (Gray would disagree and see that Mill was just contradictory and that in reality, Mill believed in the individual and Liberal freedom for their own sake and not in connection to any scientific evaluation of society (p. 61).)

Following Mill, bourgeois economists have been rather un-bothered by the question of rationalism. They decide that they can at least treat any subject matter where commodities exchange through the medium of the dollar bill. Although apples and oranges are different, if we give someone a dollar, we can see which one the person buys first and in what portion of the dollar for the apple and what portion for the orange and then know something about the comparative worth of the apple and the orange. Hence, the dollar can be seen as a vote, and this is how bourgeois rationalists have already answered Gray and Berlin about incommensurables. They cannot tell you whether what people want is good or not, but they can tell you how people would vote their money: give Sartre a million dollars and see how much he gives to care for his mother and how much to the resistance. Such a view of morality respects the individual's choices including whatever stupidities or prejudices the individual – produced by a flawed society – might come up with.

We can go a step further if we take the bourgeois rationalists' logic and set it up for a hypothetical society of communism. We need not assume the existing property and money distribution to see that it is possible to determine what the people themselves think is the greatest good for the greatest number, at least in terms of how to spend society's labor. In

a society with no oppression or exploitation, we could hand out the fair amount of money or votes and people could vote their choices and that could be tallied up and used to calculate what effort should be dedicated to making and doing what. What is important is that it is possible or conceivable that we can allocate resources to things that seem to be incommensurable. Hence, there is a possibility of at least that scientific approach to one moral question.

The greatest difficulty arises in avoiding the situation where one individual demands something that is bad for another. However, we have already presumed a situation where food, clothing, shelter and medicine are taken care of and there is no class oppression or war-type thinking conceivable. Once all these things are achieved it is possible to tally up the votes of the people for how to allocate resources in a non-antagonistic way. At this point, the reader complain that we make a lot of assumptions; however, we do so only to show that there are scientific ways *conceivable* for handling what seem to be intractable moral questions. The key is "conceivable," because Gray and Berlin say it is inherently impossible to science. We say that true knowledge is a huge challenge, but it is not impossible; hence, science is possible.

To avoid the charge of relativism, Gray says it's the truth that there are incommensurables. Gray calls Berlin's thinking a species of "objective pluralism" (p. 46). "We know that the conflicts between ultimate values are genuine" (pp. 62, 65). It doesn't surprise MIM that once again idealist pre-scientific discourse ends up in deciding what is "genuine" or not in a psychological sense instead of looking at concrete things and people. Later Gray tells us that the Enlightenment ideas cause war.

According to Berlin, people can conduct scientific anthropological investigations and what they will find is that in all societies choices amongst actions arise that cannot be decided by reason. Right

in synch with today's postmodernism, Berlin says that another central truth or truth about truth besides the fact that we don't know anything morally-speaking is that the species is diverse. Furthermore, the individual is in no sense the pawn of deterministic forces, according to Berlin. Thus there are diverse cultures everywhere and diverse individuals within those cultures and science is all that much more futile. The kicker is that science is not only futile but evil: science-minded people came up with the "illusory Enlightenment ideal of a harmonious society" that "is identified as one — perhaps the greatest — source of war and tyranny in our time." Hence it is best to acknowledge human diversity and then leave it alone.

In this regard sounding very postmodern, Berlin attacks "monism," "determinism" and the Marxist theory of "human nature." The attack on "monism" and "determinism" is the ages old rejection of science already dealt with by Lenin in *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*. While psychologizing his critics' charges away, the opposite of what Berlin contends is obviously true: there are many who resist any notion that they are not completely unconstrained individuals with freedom of choice and that in fact all individuals are a product of the environment. Asked to explain this, Berlin and Gray retreat into the clouds: "yeah, but the individual is free." They hated the saying by Marx and Engels that "freedom is the recognition of necessity."

The pre-scientific Liberals are like those who say, "if God wanted us to fly, He would have given us wings," instead of saying, "if God didn't want us to fly, s/he wouldn't have given us two hands and a brain." Others have correctly referred to the Liberal individualists' fear of science and "fear of flying" as "the escape from freedom." Conservatives and individualists run back to their previous oppressors of tradition while doing so in the name of freedom. They do so because their previ-

ous oppressors rule by tradition and do not demonstrate in full-view the science or causes of their rule and human behavior under their rule and thus give the illusion that they promote "freedom" for the individual, when in fact the old oppressors and traditions bind the individual even more than the new society possible with the use of science applied to people in broad daylight. The producers of the airplane and other scientific reveal too clearly that freedom comes from knowing how the world works, the "recognition of necessity," and not from staring up at the skies and wishing for the right to fly. Gradually this kind of fear of science will be extinguished as human culture gets more and more used to advance.

We thank Gray and Berlin for making their pre-scientific position clear and openly discussing the subject whereas today many postmodernists have taken up the cudgels for a shadowy "diversity," by which they really mean rejection of science and glorifying of individualism typical of decadent imperialism. Tell the postmodernists that the vast majority of the capitalist class believes they deserve their wealth and that the starving are lazy — and that they have proved their willingness to use force to defend their wealth at the expense of the starving or so-called democracy — and the post-modernists will find one individual capitalist who had Marxist ideas and say science is disproved. In contrast, we Marxist scientists have never denied diversity and variation. Nonetheless, the person who denies that there are statistical probabilities worth studying and cataloguing is yet pre-scientific, like Gray and Berlin. It is true that imperialism has run out of progressive steam, but that does not mean as Gray and Berlin believe — that science can tell us nothing more about human behavior, so throw up our hands with two simple truths: cultural diversity and the incommensurability of moral choices.

Gray and Berlin oppose science to such a degree that MIM is forced to

defend the concept of "human nature." Usually MIM attacks as Marx did the idea of human nature, because conservatives argue human nature is eternal and unchanging, but Gray and Berlin go so far as to say we cannot generalize what human needs there are. We cannot say that there is a need for food, shelter and clothing that will drive people, say the Liberals. That's just how absurd these Liberals are willing to get to avoid the notion that anything causes social behavior: They deny that food, shelter, clothing and other needs of life will drive people in a certain causal way (p. 14).

Even if something is true in only a given context, that is not an excuse for a retreat from science. Some day we will live in communist society if we survive at all. As in Star Trek, there may be food replicators and free or almost free energy and hence no more fighting over food. That does not mean the fight over food now is not causing patterns of human behavior.

When Gray and Berlin attack "human nature," they really mean that there is no way to understand the nature of this creature. From MIM's point of view, culture can vary as much as Gray says, but people still have to eat, sleep and avoid dangerous conditions of this earth. Contrary to the image of communists who want everyone to eat at McDonalds and live at Howard Johnson's – or in huge concrete monolithic buildings that all look alike – we Maoists never said all cultures would become the same, only that violence-causing contradictions in all cultures would be eradicated.

We at MIM are also quite sure that there will be human violence as long as there are threats to human needs. That's why we are setting about to eliminate these causes of violence one by one and without overlooking any, including the notion that violence itself begets violence. The most important causes of violence must be overcome with violence – slavery for instance, or the Nazi violence that killed five of Berlin's relatives in

1941 (p. 3) – but there will be some causes or pseudo-causes of violence that can be overcome with non-violence. Berlin and Gray believe attempts to transform the world lead to violence, but they don't mention that the largest cause of death is always the status quo and not war. The status quo of starvation is killing 14 million people a year. If the starving people's "Enlightenment" pursuit of a more "harmonious" society that doesn't have starvation results in more war deaths, we have the example of slavery to thank for showing that war can end violence and that violence does not always beget more violence if something old and rotten is about to disappear from the earth as slavery did – and as the capitalist right to exploit and starve people, and sell drugs and weapons for profit, is also about to disappear, provided the whole species doesn't disappear from the environmental catastrophes wrought by capitalism and competing imperialists going to war for each other's booty.

Where Berlin departs from many other Liberals is that he is willing to say that Liberalism itself cannot hold a privileged place and is not inevitable *a la* the end of history in capitalist fashion. Traditional lifestyles opposing tolerance and choice themselves often involve the choice of a good that is incommensurable with others, so Berlin must tolerate that choice. There are good things about completely non-Liberal ideas, and there is no way to choose Liberalism above other ideas according to Berlin and Gray. In this way, Berlin and Gray hope to be more consistent than other Liberals.

MARXISM AS METAPHYSICS OR SCIENCE OF ACTION?

MIM would complete its counterattack by meeting Berlin's attack on determinism head-on. According to Berlin, even if we could come up with a science of human behavior, there is no necessary link between that science and moral and political practice. Hence, there is no sci-

ence of politics and what he calls moral action. There is only metaphysics, and Marxism is just a bold variety of metaphysics, according to Gray.

Existentialism and Berlin's Liberalism have in common the belief that even if capitalism is doomed, inevitably there is no scientific reason to hasten its downfall. For that matter, Gray says the distinction between facts and values is not iron-clad (p. 69). As skeptics, Gray and Berlin might say even if capitalism is doomed, one only reached that conclusion based on facts that one cared about. Ultimately, Gray and Berlin wallow in the idea that one might not care at all about the whole subject.

Though this is possible to wallow as such, it has nothing to do with science. We would say that the truth about the truth is different from what these Liberals and postmodernists say:

1. The whole world is knowable, including the realm of human behavior.
2. That world is external to the human mind.
3. We do not know it all now, but we might some day.

There is a science of promoting science as well. For the bourgeoisie that science is a part of economics, the science of allocating time. For us Maoists, we understand that the science of promoting science is a part of political economy. Gray and Berlin spend pages rubbing our noses in the problem of separating 40.1110% correct from 40.1111% correct, but we say we just don't have time for their concerns when there are still so many easy gains to be made in the advance of science. Wherever we are in progress toward Absolute Truth, we are not at 99.999% and worrying about that last 0.001%. Gray does not say when a rationalist might cut off pursuit of a truth not to give up on truth, but to obtain easier gains. The reason Gray never treats this subject is that he and Berlin are the mushiest, most relativist people possible to call themselves liberal rationalists. In reality they are the precursors to post-

modernism masquerading as rationalists.

If Berlin and Gray want to say that science comes with a set of values, we will say fine. However, those values are of a peculiar kind intrinsic to the practice of science itself: we value more and better science over none, less or inferior science.

1. Being first usually has some value in science. We say the one who made some discovery first is in some sense a superior scientist. Others treating the same subject in the past had inferior science.

2. Providing empirical confirmation of the more theoretical aspects of science is also valued, although some would argue that at least some science can be conducted forever without any empirical confirmations. We would just say there are different aspects and branches of science. The science of human behavior is empirical – and like medical, biological, geological and astronomical sciences – is based on historical records – newspapers instead of fossils or rocks, for example.

Today high school students know science that was inconceivable thousands of years ago. In a society not ruled by an elite protecting its own interests it will be possible to popularize science many times more than it is now. We value this and we value those who make scientific discoveries before they are popularized.

When Gray says Marxism is metaphysics on the ideological plane, because there is no link between Marx's analysis and recommended action which can have "no empirical warrant" (p. 94), Gray reveals his pre-scientific bourgeois values. Such bourgeois values were already becoming clear when Gray explicitly denied that food and shelter were needs that would propel human behavior. That's something we would expect from the bourgeois who doesn't give a thought to his own needs that are already taken care of, but someone who does give constant attention to propagating a system of thought denying the needs of the proletariat, as Marx predict-

ed.

For someone who had already lived 72 years like Berlin, it was easy to forget the statistic of life expectancy as incredibly important to the world's majority. "For Berlin the interpretation of history in Whiggish terms of overall improvement or progress – however intermittent, interrupted, rare and subject to periods of regression – is rejected on the grounds of its incoherence, arising from the lack, in all but limiting cases, of any overarching standard whereby global progress or regress could be judged" (p. 83; for Gray contradicting himself on this point, see p. 139).

Gray and Berlin should be professors with students who deprive them of their liberty, their food and finally their life free from knives at their throats. Then we will see if there is nothing universal about human needs or life expectancy. Whether hired pens of the bourgeoisie or soldiers enforcing the existence of private property, there will be those who although fed nonetheless have predictable human actions in connection to food and other human needs.

When Gray says there is "no empirical warrant" to the call for socialism by Marx, he confuses the fact that there are value questions that arise from such a call to action and the call to action itself. A similarly stated objection arises in the work of Liberal sociologist Max Weber, who Gray cites favorably. "Science as a Vocation" by Max Weber is helpful to science in some regards but ultimately fails to understand that learning from action is in fact a part of science. Something new and never tried before as in any scientific discovery can never have "empirical warrant" other than an examination of what came before. Yet, scientists make the leap into trying out their theories again and again.

This becomes all the clearer when we translate what Gray and Weber say into medicine and other sciences. A person conceives of an organism that causes disease. S/he leaves it at that. That is science. Whether the conception of this

organism is as correct as it could be we cannot say, but it may be nonetheless a scientific endeavor to put forward a bare-bones conception. Others may produce the organism under microscope. Still others may develop a vaccine. Each step is a step of science. What will we say though when the medical scientist develops the AIDS vaccine and leaves it on the drawing board, because "I'm just a scientist and there is no link between taking the action of giving that vaccine to someone and the science I put into getting this thing on the drawing board"? Strictly speaking, we may say the medical scientist is correct that s/he put in scientific effort to put that vaccine on the drawing board. Up to this point, MIM, Weber and Gray all agree.

Nonetheless, giving the vaccine and recording its progress in fighting disease (and probably modifying the conception of the disease and the vaccine itself) is not a subject of metaphysics: it is science too. If Berlin, Gray and Weber want to call that values, that is fine, but it is only valuing science, perhaps in many forms and stages and not getting stuck only in the non-empirical theoretical aspects of science. In a society with values that champion the elite above the masses, it is not surprising that people like Gray and Berlin practically forget any science that is not one person coming up with a discovery towering over the rest of society. The implementation, modification and collection of statistics regarding the vaccine are forgotten. We say in full confidence that the scientist who goes the extra mile to get that vaccine off the drawing board and out into successful trials is superior to the scientist who never made the vaccine or who made a vaccine that failed in practice. There we differ from the pre-scientific intelligentsia that produces Liberalism and attempts to come to grips with scientific progress.

The same thing can be said of the combustion engine. The subject may start in physics and chemistry or it may start from the more applied engineering

side. Most scientific advance actually occurs from the applied side going back to the theoretical side, but either way what the Liberal elitists deny is the applied side of knowledge and Marx's theses on Feuerbach. However, if some people construct a car with an engine and then never try the ignition, we can say that we have met the Grays and Berlins of auto engineering. If you turn the key, they will say you made a metaphysical choice with no basis in science. In contrast, we would say you were carrying out a scientific activity. In that case too there are moral implications – everything from car fumes to what else could have been done with the resources allocated. That doesn't mean that turning the key in the ignition is not also an element of scientific practice.

Karl Marx comes along and studies the car called human society and says the moving parts of the engine of capitalism are too close to the fuel tank, thus causing violent explosions. He recommends you replace the engine called capitalism with socialism and you should have fewer cars blowing up like Ford Pintos. He says he doesn't know a lot about this socialism engine, because there has never been one, but he asks you to go in the car and reconstruct the engine to remove certain features and replace them with other new parts. Then go turn the ignition and try driving the car to see if it still explodes in flames.

Many people in bourgeois philosophy and social science do not understand this. They are torn by the moral questions attached, the old questions that existed before science. They cannot help inventing the notion that any action taken is morally guided and hence at the expense of science, because the pre-scientific intelligentsia is not free from its religious birthmark or its self-interested class position holding a monopoly on mental reflection but not on action or application. Yet, if we look back in history it is simply not true that where there is a moral question there is no science. Science upsets supposed factual tenets

of religion – by revealing the age of the earth or that it revolves around the sun – but that does not mean people with values cannot simultaneously produce science. History is full of monks and priests who studied astronomy, geology, physics, math and so on, who were able to put forward scientific advances, while still laboring under religious and other fallacies.

Does asking us to turn the ignition and try driving amount to metaphysics or is it the work of a good scientist? We said we value more and better science over less. Marx could have stopped at an analysis of the old engine, but there is no

doubt that the effort put into building and trying a new engine is a scientific endeavor as well as a moral one.

Complainers that they are, Gray and Berlin are free to say, "Well, yes, Marx stopped the car from blowing up, but we could choose to like the old car the old way." They can also say people were better off dying from AIDS and going to meet God all the sooner that way, but such a subject is indeed metaphysics. The vaccine-maker only claims to stop AIDS and Marx only claimed to have a solution for hunger, environmental degradation, homelessness and war.

Marilyn French Debated

THE WAR AGAINST WOMEN
BY MARILYN FRENCH
SUMMIT BOOKS
NEW YORK, 1992

Nakived has been struggling with the MIM line on gender for some months now. S/he finally said that Marilyn French has the line s/he admires, so we challenged Nakived to write this review. MIM comments come after the Nakived review. We invite readers to review their favorite books on gender, national and class oppression and contrast them with MIM line – ed.

Review by Nakived

Marilyn French goes beyond theory and cites actual, graphic, concrete deeds widely and commonly, as an aspect of their societies, perpetrated on women by men and their female accomplices, often the mothers of their own daughters, in graphic detail, detail that can bring tears to the eyes of anyone who is civil and kind or just plain human.

Such deeds are a direct result of patriarchy and are practiced in the Third World as well as the First and she shows how the Third World, when once it was not a Third World at all, practiced these deeds on women back in history. The

deeds can barely be justified as being cultural in any civil meaning of the word "culture" except in the meaning used by the alternate lifestyle crowd: "Sado-Masochistic Culture."

In this sense, some of the most primitive societies, as those found in South America in the Amazon, are civil where some of the most "civilized" peoples are and were outright barbaric. This sado-masochism, as I call it, is seen by French as an outright war against women which she rightly sees is in fact a war against humanity and a threat to humanity.

She does not incorporate dialectic, from what I can see, in her citing of facts. She doesn't theorize. She cites facts. She arrives at some conclusions and sometimes misses the "real thing" going on. For example, she'll quibble about the sexual position if the man is atop the woman. This is not a patriarchal thing and not all patriarchal societies have sex in that position anyway. She also misses what is really going on in India where she gives the facts and details of female infanticide practiced by the wretchedly enslaved women. It is clear, on reading the graphic details, that these women are living in a national concentration camp. Some of her details, accurate as they are, are so gruesome that it leads one to wonder if the entire

society where such things go on is a society of madmen, of lunatics, perhaps of would-be serial killers.

The book is powerful. As bad as Christianity was, even in the middle ages during the Inquisition, it doesn't surpass some of the things that go on in hyper-patriarchal-religious societies where such atrocities against women are "the norm." Ms. French rightly says: if such things were done on one race of people by another, the world would clearly call it a crime against humanity. Yet such things go on as normal day-to-day givens, crimes against humanity perpetrated on women by men.

Imperialists or Left-leaning Humanitarians of the First World, when giving aid to such countries, might not realize that the monies go to the men. The men are paid, but the women are slaves, even often set on fire when the men are done with them as pleasure objects. This proves that the analysis by MIM of First World Patriarchy showing the Third World men in a position higher than that of Third World women is correct (see MIM Theory 2/3, p. 85), though perhaps monumentally understated. Further, one gets the idea that Third World Women don't even exist in the consciousness of the First World people who tend to lump them into a category: "the exploited." There are degrees of exploitation. Nazis didn't exactly exploit Jews and humans don't just exploit cows. Nazis killed Jews; humans eat cows. This book is gruesome; it just cites facts without trying to pretty them up with abstract terms that tend to lessen the sheer gore being done to women for the sole purpose of "turning on" their men, madmen, deranged creatures.

Even in the Nazi sense, it would "make Nazi sense" to wipe out another race to make room for your own race, but to do this to your own mothers, sisters, daughters is sheer insanity.

The best Marxist theory with its broad-spanning dialectic tends to bury the intricate details of "the life of the women" in these countries, most of them

in the Third World. Neither does the best Marxist theory include data on such societies when they were not The Third World at all, but filthy-rich, ruling and imperialist empires when Europe was barbaric and primitive. The gore went on when these people were The Great Civilizations and it continues to go on now that they are a "Third World" exploited by the First World. No one has ever advanced the idea that, perhaps, these societies became a backward Third World due to what they've done to half of their own nation, the female half, primarily at the instigation of insane male priests of an insane religious mind-set. All the best talk in the world didn't make a dent in the protests against the Vietnam war, but it took *one photograph* of a mutilated, burned child to turn the public tide. It took naked, concrete truth to spell out what can't be seen in abstract terminology.

When you finish the book, go and read the worst anti-Stalinist propaganda on the Gulag system: you can't help but know that these poor women would be better off in such a Gulag where they'd at least be paid for very hard work. As the women in India say when they kill their female children: "Giving them to the God of Death is preferable to their having to endure being alive." Kinda makes the stupid whinings of the First World "date raped" women seem insignificant.

The book is a "must read," if you can get through it. (Nakived reports it took one acquaintance 4 months to be able to bear reading it. We suspect many would have the same problem reading Sakai's *Settlers: The Mythology of the White Proletariat*. -ed.)

MIM REPLIES:

We agree with most of what Marilyn French writes about wimmin. In particular, there is a "war against wimmin." This is a correct generalization about one fraction of the violence perpetrated by men occurring in our world. Infanticide and starvation of children are

far and away the largest patterns of violence in the world. Next in line would be deaths caused by pollution.

Nakived is also correct that much of the book is agitational exposure of facts of life that compel people toward the truth more quickly but in a different way than deliberate effort applied to theoretical work. However, we disagree with Nakived for downplaying the importance of theory and we don't support French's method, which is an example of what Mao called empiricism in much the way many philosophers think of empiricism. Here we shall criticize empiricism as a method that takes individual cases and incorrectly draws generalizations from them. The worst empiricism blithely draws conclusions from individual cases so often that previous generalizations also lightly constructed are repeatedly thrown out, often unconsciously. Not for nothing does Nakived sneer at theory while praising French. Empiricism and subjectivism are strong currents underlying so-called feminism in the imperialist countries.

In actuality, French is among the more theoretical thinkers in the West's problematic feminism, a feminist more solidly put together in opposition to capitalism and imperialism than most. At least French mentions her opposition to the Gulf War and cases where she sides with Black men against wimmin. Those are important starts and causes for MIM optimism.

French defines feminism as "any attempt to improve the lot of any group of women through female solidarity and female perspective" (p. 12). MIM disagrees with this notion from the beginning, both because we are not interested in just "any group" of wimmin and because it is not just a matter of female solidarity and perspective, but an issue of science. In contrast, according to French, Margaret Thatcher "was the most extraordinary world leader of her time!" (p. 47). Hence, French is making no bones about being a bourgeois feminist, if required as a matter of putting

wimmin first.

In many ways a typical "leftist," French trots out a common statistic used by proponents of the labor aristocracy: "But by 1987 their average wage, adjusted for inflation, was \$19,859, a 19 percent decline [since 1973]" (p. 13). What French left out was that in the same period a declining fraction of male workers were blue-collar and an increasing fraction became white collar, such that in 1980, white-collar workers exceeded 50 percent amongst whites.(1)

Those who attempted to generalize about a class based on French's statistic made severe and sentimental errors. We are not surprised to see French buy into this statistic while also putting forward the view that wimmin in the U.S. are still economically dependent on men for survival (pp. 38, 183-4). It is a case of consistent sentimentalism with regard to the middle-classes of imperialism.

Since French bought into "Marxism" as represented by the numerically-dominant imperialist country chauvinists, we are not surprised that French also has her feminism wrong and sometimes champions groups of people who are not gender oppressed, despite her having a much better overall internationalist perspective than most pseudo-feminists.

FACTOIDS

French has picked up many of the popular left "factoids," which are either complete inventions or ripped from context. The most important factoid that French does get right is that biological wimmin likely are no longer the world's majority (p. 115) thanks to female infanticide in India, China and other countries. In countries with less female infanticide, wimmin live longer than men and outnumber men, but countries with large populations are more than making up for that trend.

If there was any doubt, the capitalist restoration in China in 1976 removed it by starting a huge trend toward female infanticide. Contrary to Nakived though, the cause of this trend is capitalism and

not ancient male-oriented religions, because female infanticide was not the practice in China just prior to 1976.(2) In the case of female infanticide – which by itself is sufficient proof of the war against wimmin – gender oppression is not necessarily caused mainly by something intrinsic to gender. If institutions linked to capitalism and imperialism fell, ages-old female infanticide practices would too. Thus while we agree with Nakived about all of patriarchy's abuses that existed before modern day capitalist-imperialism, it is still the case that at this juncture in history the fastest progress for wimmin internationally comes through anti-imperialist communist-led revolution. China from 1949 to 1976 proved that more than adequately.

For the majority of the world's wimmin, First World pseudo-feminism is an obstacle to liberation much like revisionism and First World oppressor nation chauvinism. White pseudo-feminists in particular strive mightily to divert attention from the principal contradiction between oppressed nations and oppressor nations as part of their denial of a role in oppression; even though resolution of the national question is what will bring the fastest and easiest progress for wimmin globally, especially the 80% in the Third World. Whenever people rise up to change their situations, small corrupted elites of Third World countries backed up with weapons and military training from the U.S. send out the death squads.

Another important question is the distribution of property in the world by sex. Here French cites the famous 1980 United Nations conference which simply invented the figure out of thin air that wimmin receive 10 percent of the world's income and own 1 percent of the property (p. 30). The agenda of this invention is to allow First World wimmin to hide their role in international class oppression and thus bring their baggage into the feminist movement, specifically making wimmin out to be in a hopelessly weak position. See for

example how the fact that there are supposedly so few wimmin with money is used as an excuse for why *Ms.* magazine is such garbage politically speaking (p. 171).

Before MIM was aware this issue of the distribution of wealth by sex existed, Sakai refuted the pseudo-feminist position(3). In the first place, when it comes to income and personal wealth, most white wimmin live with white men. Unlike nations that live apart, the sexes live together and hence statements about the standard of living of one group versus the other tend to be misleading if abused for political agendas.

French seems vaguely aware that the U.N. figure is problematic, because she admits that wimmin own 16% of the property in the U.S. Even that is a tepid admission limited to what are known as "female heads of households" and not counting other female-owned assets. To really know the whole story, we would have to look at real estate wealth, which is half the wealth of the U.S., and who lives in it now – and what happens in divorce court – in order to know who "really owns" the real estate when both men and wimmin appear to live in it. French and pseudo-feminist authors never provide these figures, only anecdotes. The next obvious fact is that there is a huge gender imbalance in pension-holding – in favor of wimmin (primarily married wimmin) who both live much longer than men and inherit their fathers' and husbands' wealth. Those pensions are based in stock assets. For this reason, in the U.S., wimmin actually own more stock than men do. Admittedly we have no complete figures on the value of assets broken down by gender, but we are not the ones trying to pretend white wimmin are not benefiting from imperialism. These facts would be needed by the many sentimental analysts commenting on gender oppression to prove their point.

Nor is the story limited to just the ownership of children, real estate and pensions. In the prime of life, wimmin

also have a much larger role in imperialism than the pseudo-feminists of the First World admit: "28 percent of all businesses in the U.S. are now owned by women, and by the end of 1992 women-owned businesses will employ more people than the entire Fortune 500!"(4) Moreover, French would not dispute that wealth is concentrated at the top, and in 1994, data was released on the part in the U.S. owned by wimmin. The figures show the breakdown by biological sex of those holding gross assets of \$600,000 or more. They show that 1.4 million biological wimmin within U.S. borders own \$2.1 trillion in net worth. Two million biological men own \$2.7 trillion in net worth. Hence, in this elite bourgeois category that comprises less than 2% of the U.S. population, wimmin hold over 43% of the wealth.(5) The pseudo-feminists do not provide these statistics precisely because the truth would not support these First World pseudo-feminists looking to pass off the blame for class and national oppression.

French also quotes Maria Mies to the effect that the IMF, World Bank and USAID (p. 36) originated the world's oldest profession. Here there was every good intention of blaming imperialism for patriarchy, but it simply backfires, making anti-imperialists look stupid. Yes, it is interesting that the imperialists support having Third World countries develop sex tourism. No, it is not necessary to exaggerate and create historical myths like, "the sex industry was first planned and supported by the World Bank" (p. 36). There is no need to exaggerate oppression or invent things to fight it. Real knowledge goes into firing real weapons that will destroy the imperialists. Mythology is like handing someone a weapon in battle that will not only not fire, but also will blow up in the users' hands.

METHOD

Although French has many facts wrong, more often she gets them right. Her method of reasoning is very typical

in the "Left" in the U.S. and England. Here is a typical example of her approach: "Black mayor Marion Barry was prosecuted for *taking* drugs (by white men who coerced a black woman into betraying him), while important white men in the Reagan administration either escaped prosecution or were punished lightly for subverting the Constitution by selling arms and *importing* drugs" (p. 66). In this case as many others, French takes two individual and correct facts and draws a conclusion from them. In contrast, we at MIM only back this statement of hers, because it is true overall. If the figures did not show that Blacks systematically received biased treatment in the courts, we would not support what French said about Marion Barry and Oliver North. Too often, however, French generalizes about individual facts without the overall context and summation of data.

An example of generalizing from the individual to the general is the many cases of First World wimmin or wimmin heavily exposed to First World culture who come to MIM and proclaim that wimmin do feel sexual pleasure, maybe even more than men. Like many calling themselves feminist, French has bought into the idea that wimmin under patriarchy can experience sexual pleasure and hence certain aspects of the feminist movement against pornography, Hollywood and pop music are wrong. She realizes this often brings her into conflict with Third World wimmin who she perceives as not speaking of or actually experiencing sexual pleasure. In fact, according to French she has been told bluntly by Third World wimmin: "sexual pleasure is *male*" (p. 114).

Nakived has a similar position, claiming that Asian wimmin seem to see the pleasure of sex as giving pleasure to the man.

We at MIM are agnostic on the question of "natural" sexual pleasure in wimmin and men, because we are not utopians as Marx said. We have no doubt sadism runs deep in our class society,

especially imperialist societies. What people "enjoy" is highly suspect. Catharine MacKinnon refers to the "eroticization of dominance" as the gist of the whole matter. For this reason we say: Let's wait till power is abolished before we decide if there is "desire" and "sexual pleasure" of some nearly universal sort. It may turn out that what we used to find pleasurable is no longer.

For a Third World womyn to tell French that she is male reverberates profoundly for MIM. Despite her biology, French has absorbed sexual privilege to a large extent just as all imperialist country wimmin have at the expense of children, wimmin and even men of the Third World. It would not surprise us that a number of First World wimmin are running around saying, "there is sexual pleasure!" as if having discovered the word of God. It is very much parallel to what happens with the labor aristocracy. On the surface, a worker is a worker anywhere in the world, but it is not true, because some workers are "bourgeoisified," which is why Lenin distinguished between proletarians and workers. Now there are a minority of workers in the world running around saying, "yes, capitalism improves living standards," just as we have a gender aristocracy running around so sure that "wimmin experience sexual pleasure too!" In reality, capitalism raises the living standards of the bourgeoisified workers and patriarchy allows some of female biology to enjoy the same oppressive pleasures men do.

We would declare sexual desire and pleasure as completely bankrupt ideas, but the humyn species is also an animal species. What is known about mating, hormones and genetics is going to improve dramatically in the foreseeable future, especially if we can destroy imperialism before it destroys us. Hence, we take an agnostic position and await the future without trying to resolve every question now when we don't have the power to do so.

French too readily generalizes from the individual or the few to the whole. If

in fact she believes most Third World wimmin do not experience sexual pleasure, she should conclude that she is in fact male for her position and not try to foist the experience of the minority on the majority. It would appear that biology is no guarantee for sexual pleasure.

Another case in point of empiricism is in connection to court. In the First World, empiricist, sometimes ultraleft, Christian pseudo-feminists and anti-racists commit themselves to a stand on the court system and its individual results. In contrast, we look at statistics on courts in general. We are not surprised that with her method French draws the conclusion that wimmin receive longer sentences than men for the same crimes of passion – based on a court case or two (p. 127) when in fact the exact opposite is the case. “Men receive longer prison sentences. A man convicted of killing his wife receives an average of 17 years. A woman convicted of the same crime receives only six years. Women also benefit from more plea bargains than men. And we never hear that mothers commit twice as much child abuse as fathers.”(6)

National Public Radio on April 18, 1997 ran an interview with pseudo-social-scientist James Q. Wilson on crime. Angling for political influence his whole career and never evincing much interest in the truth of his profession in criminology and related fields, Wilson lends a veneer of respectability to the ruling class's prison craze.

On the radio he admitted that one quarter of Black men would face imprisonment or some such discipline from the justice system in their lifetime, and he said, “we can't be satisfied with that” while quickly adding that more resources have to be dedicated to crime prevention including pre-school development. He went on to say, “they [Blacks] really are committing crimes,” while defending Mark Fuhrman as a fair cop.

Wilson lent his credentials to the topic of expert witnesses in court and his con-

clusion was that social scientists cannot predict human behavior, so they should not be allowed in the courtroom as experts, or if they are, it should only be a few certified by the National Academy of Sciences – presumably to say they don't know anything just like Wilson says. MIM is not surprised Wilson dumped on his profession, because he has been in the orbit of conservative theology his whole life despite his academic credentials. He even came out at one point in the interview and said he did not care about the evidence concerning gun control, because it would never fly with the public politically. This confirms our image of this demagogue – someone who probably knows better but takes up opportunism almost instinctively as a matter of being “effective.” This sort of intellectual is always aiming for some Cabinet job or other kind of influence-peddling job.

Wilson especially spent his time saying that social science should not be used to rationalize crime. When confronted with the idea of causation, he simply rejected the whole idea saying that social scientists cannot predict behavior. Thus, he took everyone back into the pre-Enlightenment era when behavior was seen as essentially a religious matter.

While he was speaking on the radio, people called in to say that there should be an exception to the idea that there is no causation – wimmin. When wimmin commit crime said the callers, it was only because of their violent boyfriends and husbands – and Wilson agreed. One attorney for wimmin murderers called in to say that the two months one womyn served was too long a sentence for being convicted of shooting her lover to death in his sleep. French would have fit right in during this talk with Christopher Lydon, James Q. Wilson and the womyn attorney.

Wilson explained that he had a recent change of heart on mandatory sentences, partially because of the case of wimmin accused of murdering their batterers. He

and the attorney calling in agreed that wimmin sometimes have no other recourse.

Having already said that wimmin are economically dependent on men for life and death, French also says battered wimmin live with “almost no recourse” (p. 188). Like the typical pseudo-feminist, French says, “Many men (and women) blame the women whose husbands beat them, asking why they did not leave their abuser. But even if a woman has enough money to leave and someplace to go, there is no escape from a man obsessed. You can move, you can hide, you can change your name, but they follow” (p. 188). If this were true, there would not be many wimmin left, but this common line backed up with the additional factoid, that “75 percent of reported assaults against wives or lovers are committed *after* separation” – has more to do with Hollywood fantasies of female powerlessness than reality. What portion of that 75% of assaults occurred precisely because wimmin believed they had no recourse and could not leave even sooner?

The fact that so many assaults occur after break-up again shows that it would be impossible to predict which tiny percentage would result in murder. The pseudo-feminists never tally up the number of divorces and break-ups in a year that end successfully for the wimmin, while they are always quick to point to every murder as the trend. In actuality the 75% figure for the portion of assaults that occur after separation is a very significant back-handed admission that millions of people are involved in battering after an attempt to escape. Coupled with the fact that only 4,000 wimmin are murdered a year, we have proof that wimmin manage to separate in millions of cases at a time while a few thousand are killed.

The pseudo-feminists and their paternalist backers never lay out all the facts in a meaningful way. It is simply wrong that wimmin cannot leave their men (without shooting them while they

sleep). The same stupid pseudo-feminists and paternalists who make a loose use of the facts know that battering runs into the millions of couples a year in the U.S. Estimates run up to one half of all couples involve battering in a lifetime, and one-sixth or 9 million couples have battering in any given year. Of those, 1 or 2 million involve "kicking, biting and punching" – what is considered more serious violence.(7)

Now what does it mean when the pseudo-feminists say that wimmin cannot leave their batterers? (And some are so opportunist they just say they cannot leave their "men," not just men with history of battering, and of course that number of people is even larger than 9 million.) They are saying 9 million people cannot leave. If we count just the most serious violence, we are talking about 2 million people involved (including the majority of cases where wimmin initiated the violence) who supposedly cannot leave. If we listen to these unprincipled demagogues, wimmin should kill at least two million men a year while they sleep. That's what these wimmin in court are doing – trying to win Oscar nominations and succeeding: witness the Farrah Fawcett movie about the "burning bed" case based on real life. They are saying that because men used severe violence against them, they should shoot them when they are sleeping. In that case, a seven digit figure of men should be shot every year while sleeping. Much as men are the enemy, it would seem to MIM that people should give up the romance culture before they give themselves the right to kill millions of people a year on its account. The romance culture is not worth that much to keep. At the very least, the sexes should cut each other loose. Every person an island would be better than rationalizing mass murder for romance.

After all these centuries everyone knows that participating in the romance culture is a risk, like going to a beach with no lifeguard. Some of the same pseudo-feminists complaining about

men obsessed as French does are also complaining about men who leave wimmin for younger wimmin and treat each womyn as a sex object, only to move on to the next "conquest." It seems that romance has to walk a fine line or it is called harassment, battering, rape, obsession or conquest. Even more galling, Wilson, the attorney for wimmin murderers and French all deliver the message that romance culture is worth so much that we should take the chance that someone will have to shoot someone while sleeping – then they wonder why men are "obsessed." The people truly obsessed are the ones who don't realize that their love lives should be expendable, not people's lives.

Saying the battered can't leave is clearly a lie. Only 4,000 wimmin die from all family violence every year.(7) That is less than .05% of the total people involved in serious battering violence in a year. So when Wilson said he could not predict humyn behavior, he should not have made an exception for wimmin and battering. To guess who is going to kill out of 2 million serious battering couples, that is impossible. To know that one can escape, that is possible to know, with the vast majority successfully escaping.

And who is to say those 4,000 would not have gotten away if the pseudo-feminists, paternalists and Hollywood weren't telling them they were so powerless their whole lives? If people were more rational about their romance culture facts, and less involved in American fascist crime hysteria more people would survive. French never connects to the overall truth of battering: wimmin can and do leave. They only think they cannot because of the fear of crime hitting them disproportionately and as part of socialization. The inexorable monsters following and tracking wimmin down to kill them are more common than they should be, but they are closer to the stuff of Hollywood than the ordinary condition of wimmin. The people denying this fact are hysterically fearful

of crime and buy into a patriarchal socialization of wimmin. In cases like the intellectual leaders of French's sort, the lie is a desperate diversion from the truth of national oppression in the criminal injustice system.

Another misleading factoid is that lovers account for a higher percentage of murders of wimmin than murders of men. One government statistic showed 30% of murdered wimmin being killed by male lovers, while 6% of murdered men are killed by wimmin lovers.(7) This is a very misleading figure, simply because men are victimized by murder approximately five times more often than wimmin are. So the figure can be 6% compared with 30 percent but the number of murders can be almost the same. In fact, in some cities and demographic groups, wimmin kill more of their male lovers than vice-versa.

No pseudo-feminist ever accounted for the unsolved murder rate of men, approximately 30% of all murders of men. Because men are murdered so often compared with wimmin, if only 10% of all those unsolved murders of men were really perpetrated by wimmin lovers who were never caught or suspected, then the fact would be that wimmin lovers kill more men than vice-versa. That is an image we will never see in Hollywood or pseudo-feminism, but it is something that should be raised by anyone doing a thorough analysis of the facts, including the fact that wimmin are considered less threatening than males, often to the point of being viewed incapable of crime.

In all but one imperialist country second-hand smoke will kill more wimmin than violence by lovers who won't let their wimmin leave. If we count all family violence, 4,000 wimmin die in the U.S. each year, but, comparably, 3,000 people die each year from second-hand smoke inhalation that causes lung cancer.(8) Since the U.S. has the highest murder rate by far in the imperialist countries, in other imperialist countries, more wimmin will die from lung cancer

caused by second-hand smoke by far than from romance culture, decadent though it is. Second-hand smoke is now tied to heart disease as well. A study of 32,000 nurses showed that those most constantly exposed to second-hand smoke at home and work had a 91% higher risk of death from heart disease. That translates to 60,000 deaths a year from heart disease caused by second-hand smoke in the U.S.(9) So second-hand smoke dwarfs domestic violence as a cause of death in wimmin, even in the decadent, gun-happy United States. Should we champion the people who shoot smokers in their sleep? Escaping second-hand smoke is more difficult than escaping men in the imperialist countries.

The whole fact that this subject turns so readily to guns is part of the decadence of imperialism in its most individualist form. It is not feminism. It is conservative anti-crime mythology and the utmost in rarified romance culture. MIM says it is decadent to get involved in the first place if the result is someone shot in their sleep. No one has such an absolute right to a love life that they have the right to shoot people while sleeping. Again it is Hollywood intertwining violence and romance that way. The priority given to romance culture is the real problem for feminism.

Even when French does generalize correctly, her generalization is out of context of larger ones. She holds that male judges are treating male rapists and harassers lightly, because they throw out the cases where the wimmin knew the men. However, this is not something specific to male judges with female victims. Courts discount conflicts between people who know each other in general.(10) That includes the case where the victim is male and the perpetrator female or the case where there is simply a property dispute between men and wimmin or the case where both parties are male.

In actuality, these examples that French found are highly skewed. Patriarchy rules over wimmin in connec-

tion to the court system through paternalism, not discrimination. Despite French's anecdotes, statistically, wimmin are less likely to be arrested, charged and convicted of crimes and once convicted receive lighter sentences than men. This is thanks to the notion that wimmin are in need of protection. If anything, they should be accessible to men, not in prison, according to the patriarchy. Despite the prisons full of drug users, the imprisonment rate of wimmin for drug abuse is a tiny fraction of that of men, mainly because wimmin drug-abusers are not viewed as a threat to society at large. Since the "war on drugs" is an excuse for a crackdown on the oppressed nationalities, this is one of the many reasons there is a shortage of Black men compared with Black wimmin.

The whole problem with wimmin believing the myth that they are discriminated against in prison is that it allows the majority of wimmin within imperialist country borders – white wimmin – to focus on their "own oppression" and deny responsibility for the big picture. Rather than accept the blow to the ego that "yes, my nation oppresses others," pseudo-feminists invent mythologies to avoid responsibility: "Oh, that's just white men doing that!" Carried over into political practice these ideas result in hypocrisy and political burnout, not a sustained movement for change. That is at best, because at worst, the myths invented by pseudo-feminists on the court system prop up the state, encourage fascism and divert attention from the principal contradiction. There is plenty of gender oppression to talk about without inventing it.

The utmost indignities to logic face those who do not consistently confront theory and method. French sees a conspiracy in doctors' resisting lumpectomies to fight breast cancer. In much of the book she is consistent in that she is talking about how religious-oriented men and wimmin mutilate wimmin. On the other hand, we can just see how if

doctors preferred lumpectomy over whole breast removal, there would be some who would say doctors were risking the health of wimmin just to preserve their role as sex objects.

The ultimate indignity occurs when French claims that a study of 43 people showing that men metabolize alcohol faster is "skimpy evidence" (p. 144) when she herself draws conclusions throughout the whole book based on individual, media-grabbing court cases! In that same context, French also spreads the mythology of false egalitarianism. She asks why there is more attention to mother's influences on gestation than there are studies of men ruining their sperm with bad lifestyles and environments! (p. 146). This is the same womyn who claims that wimmin do so much more work than men, among other reasons because they emotionally bond with their babies through gestation (she favors the non-biological mother Whitehead rented as an incubator in the surrogate mother custody case, p. 150) and at the same time she holds that when it comes to biological influences on the child, men and wimmin are equal! This is just denial of scientific reality to benefit a mythology. Men and wimmin are equal in that they each provide a genetic seed, but that's where the equality ends when it comes to pregnancy. It's also selfishness to complain about the scrutiny mothers receive for gestation: people's lives and futures are at stake. This selfishness is in fact a kind of patriarchal thought, so common in discounting children, as mere property or less.

In conclusion, we do not agree with Nakived's anti-theory conclusions and his/her distaste for Third World patriarchy relative to First World patriarchy. It is a common matter of national pride for supposed feminists to believe that their society is better than others. Nothing is more obvious than the labor aristocracy which believes it has earned its higher living standard when in fact the wealth was plundered from slaves, colonies and neo-colonies. Likewise, if

Bob Black's lonerism misses the Third World

BOB BLACK
"THE ABOLITION OF WORK" AND
"FEMINISM AS FASCISM"
<<http://www.unicorn.com/lib/abolition.html>>

Bob Black is sometimes referred to as a "marginalist," an upholder of the ideology of the loner taking from nihilism and anarchism. Here we review two of his essays, "The Abolition of Work" and "Feminism as Fascism," where he correctly pinpoints what MIM refers to as the labor aristocracy and the gender bureaucracy respectively. For hitting these phenomena basically accurately, Bob Black has earned our attention. Our difference with these essays lies mostly in strategy and plausibility questions, especially in connection to the Third World.

According to Black, Marx did not go far enough in saying what the future under communism should look like, namely the abolition of work. Black points to estimates saying only 5 percent of the work done is actually necessary.

In Marxist dialectics, the struggle between workers and the bourgeoisie should result in a newly synthesized system including social groups that did not exist before, but the new system should be characterized more by the proletariat than the bourgeoisie.

For Black, the future revolves around a lifestyle attitude change. "Workers of the world, relax!" he says. He correctly targets the majority (40% when he wrote, over 50% now in the United States) of so-called workers in the imperialist countries as doing unproductive labor:

"Only a small and diminishing fraction of work serves any useful purpose independent of the defense and reproduction of the work-system and its political and legal appendages.

Twenty years ago, Paul and Percival Goodman estimated that just five percent of the work then being done — presumably the figure, if accurate, is lower now — would satisfy our minimal needs for food, clothing and shelter. Theirs was only an educated guess but the main point is quite clear: directly or indirectly, most work serves the unproductive purposes of commerce or social control. Right off the bat we can liberate tens of millions of salesmen, soldiers, managers, cops, stockbrokers, clergymen, bankers, lawyers, teachers, landlords, security guards, ad-men and everyone who works for them. There is a snowball effect since every time you idle some bigshot you liberate his flunkies and underlings also. Thus the economy implodes.

"Forty percent of the workforce are white-collar workers, most of whom have some of the most tedious and idiotic jobs ever concocted. Entire industries, insurance and banking and real estate for instance, consist of nothing but useless paper-shuffling. It is no accident that the 'tertiary sector,' the service sector, is growing while the 'secondary sector' (industry) stagnates and the 'primary sector' (agriculture) nearly disappears. Because work is unnecessary except to those whose power it secures, workers are shifted from relatively useful to relatively useless occupations as a measure to ensure public order. Anything is better than nothing. That's why you can't go home just because you finish early. They want your time, enough of it to make you theirs, even if they have no use for most of it. Otherwise why hasn't the average work week gone down by more than a few minutes in the last fifty years?

"Next we can take a meat-cleaver to production work itself. No more war production, nuclear power, junk food, feminine hygiene deodorant — and above all, no more auto industry to speak of. An occasional Stanley

patriarchy gives some people of female sex sexual privilege in the imperialist countries and turns them into men grateful for their privileges relative to the patriarchy in the Third World, we cannot be surprised. Those in the imperialist countries claiming to truly oppose the genocide against wimmin in the Third World will take responsibility for their share of the problem caused by their governments' support for death-squad regimes and the status quo generally.

Notes:

1. For a more detailed MIM rebuttal of the common factoids bandied about on the decline of Amerikan workers' conditions, see "More Accounting on the Labor Aristocracy," MIM Theory 10, p. 54-8.
2. See Henry Park's *Political Economy of Counterrevolution in China: 1976-1988* to understand this point.
3. J. Sakai, *Settlers: The Mythology of the White Proletariat*, pp. 149-150.
4. Harvey Mackay, *Sharkproof* (NY: Harper Business, 1993), p. 28.
5. *Statistical Abstract of the United States 1994*, p. 482.
6. National Center for Men, "Men Have Rights! Right?" by James Pierce Winston, *What's the Point?* September, 1996 (603)-465-3423.
7. John C. Macdonis, *Sociology* (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1993), p. 428.
8. 3,000 non-smokers die annually from second-hand smoke caused lung cancer according to the EPA, Jan., 1993 and the Center for Disease Control, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
9. Boston Globe 20 May 1997, p. a3.
10. Samuel Walker, *Sense and Nonsense about Crime* (Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 2nd ed., 1989), pp. 26-7.

MIM Theory relies on reviews and debates generated by revolutionary readers. If you've read this far, you must have something to say!

Steamer or Model T might be all right, but the auto-eroticism on which such pestholes as Detroit and Los Angeles depend is out of the question. Already, without even trying, we've virtually solved the energy crisis, the environmental crisis and assorted other insoluble social problems."

With the above, we have little to disagree with. Black has hit the nail of parasitism on the head. He does not comment on the Third World where people are struggling daily to survive, but it is true that without the soldiers, CIA agents and other unproductive parasites from the imperialist countries, the lives of the Third World would be much better.

One place we disagree with Black is that we do not think people can simply be talked into abolishing work. We must agitate as Black does against unproductive labor and its stultifying effects, but we must not kid ourselves that this will suffice. The capitalists still control the wealth and means of brainwashing the populace. They perpetuate a culture to sustain their system. Though some may choose to "drop out" of the system, there will be others who don't and still others who couldn't sustain their dropping out.

The view that capitalism is not a system and that it is possible to just "drop out" is typical of the imperialist country petty-bourgeoisie. The petty-bourgeoisie can generally afford to "drop out" for considerable lengths of time, especially with the aid of surplus labor drenching imperialist countries and extracted from the Third World. However, while this goes on without the abolition of imperialism, dropping out is simply done at the expense of the neo-colonies. The parasites work less and the Third World proletariat is repressed more.

"Dropping out" is not yet a possibility for the world's people without a systematic overhaul of the organization of the politics and economy. The imperialists would use force to resist what Black is suggesting. For this reason, Black's prescription is not realistic and reflects the

attitude of the petty-bourgeoisie. We support a lifestyle movement upholding productive labor and dumping most of what passes as necessary in the imperialist countries, but we do not think it is enough to have such a lifestyle movement.

When it comes to feminism, Black's essay is also largely on target. Thinking in terms of broad causes of social behavior like what unproductive labor does to make people into idiots, Black is able to think more consistently than the average propagandist. We agree with him in three areas with regard to the pseudo-feminism calling itself feminism in the imperialist countries today. (1) It turns wimmin into helpless victims, thus creating a newly socialized feminine role. Even the most focused of these pseudo-feminists still love men – district attorneys. (2) It is guilty of contradictory subjectivism. (3) It singles out some kinds of lifestyle oppression without seeing the system of patriarchy as a whole.

The following is Black's practical understanding of the mentally undisciplined subjectivism common in pseudo-feminist quarters:

"According to feminoid epistemology, men understand nothing of the true nature of women. One might logically suppose that the estrangement of the sexes resulting from disparate roles and discrimination would work both ways, and so most of us attending to our actual experiences reluctantly conclude. But no: men don't understand women, but women (at any rate their radical feminist vanguard) understand men. Women – feminist experts, anyway – understand pornography and its meaning for men much better than the men who write and read it – and lesbian-separatists, who avoid men and decline to have sex with them, appreciate these verities best of all. The more remote your experience is from the real life of actual men, the better you understand it. Turning this around, isn't the Pope, as he claims, the ultimate authority on women and

sexuality?"

We agree with Black that many single-issue feminists are not feminists at all. "The feminist book-burners are cowardly opportunists. If what they object to is subliminal socialization of women into subservient roles vis-a-vis men (curiously, adopting the same roles vis-a-vis butch lesbians is harmless fun), their primary, near-preemptive preoccupation would have to be *Cosmopolitan*, Barbara Courtland romances, and the vast crypto-pornographic pop literature written for and snapped up by women." We would only disagree with Black in that we would not call it "crypto-pornographic pop." It is pornography. This pornography that consumes Amerikan leisure-time is shaped by the mode of production and also its own dynamics of oppression. It is so pervasive that it is hopeless to change it by a selective lifestyle movement just as in the case of the abolition of work. It is only the petty-bourgeoisie that believes in religious devotion to certain lifestyles or abstention from certain lifestyles brings about real transformation. The petty-bourgeoisie's and gender aristocracy's fanaticism and peculiar obsessions with small bits of capitalism and patriarchy has nothing in common with ending exploitation or patriarchy.

Black ends the essay saying to defeat feminist fascism by treating wimmin equally, but Black – like many anti-feminist critics – too easily cedes feminism to pseudo-feminists. Black is closer to feminism than the prevalent pseudo-feminists he criticizes. It is important not to become frustrated with feminism just because various extensions and allies of the patriarchy posing as feminists give feminism such a bad name. We do not say that just to cheerlead for feminism and Marxism. It would be correct to give up on "feminism" if there were no powerful agent of change, but Black has missed the overwhelming power of the oppressed Third World masses including its 80 percent share of wimmin.

On the Communist Movement in the Ex-Soviet Union

NORTHSTAR COMPASS
"79th Anniversary October Revolution"

Published by the Canadian
Friends of Soviet People
(formerly Canada-USSR
Association)

Vol. 5, No. 4, Nov. 1996
280 Queen Street W.
Toronto, Ontario M5F 2A1
Tel: (416) 977-5819

reviewed by MC5

This is a publication of the labor bureaucracy of Canada seeking to bolster its Marxist credentials after looking on quietly while the Soviet Union went down the capitalist road. It is a tad to the left of the Communist Party-USA, a very similar grouping that refuses to come to grips with its diversion from the road pioneered by Stalin. The basic problem is that this organization needs to reassess the past and not just continue the phony communist politics of the 1980s.

Will Lambert combines typical phony communist thoughts of the 1980s all in a few sentences: "The working class here in Ontario, Canada, has rested far too long. The concessions granted by capital, in the face of a tangible socialist bloc, here and now are being recalled. The impact of the dissolution of the former USSR undoubtedly has led to the intensifying capitalist aggression against the Canadian people in the main" (pp. 4-5).

This is untrue. The dissolution of the Soviet social-imperialist bloc has resulted in more superprofit opportunities for the Canadian imperialists not just in Eastern Europe, but anywhere that Soviet competition or barriers are gone. The Canadian imperialists can then continue passing along a portion of superprofits to the bought-off Canadian work-

ing class - which Lenin surely referred to when he said that the entirety of an advanced imperialist country is parasitic.

We are not surprised to learn that the same people who looked on Soviet degeneration passively without speaking up are the same ancient champions of more parasitism for the Canadian working class. While the bourgeoisie in the party like Khrushchev, Gorbachev and Yeltsin took control, Northstar Compass-type revisionists had nothing to say. In fact, these revisionists made excuses for not seeing the bourgeoisie in the party even when Mao pointed it out in public.

These labor bureaucrats spoke for the bought-off workers of Canada. That is also why they defended Soviet degeneration till recently and still continue to defend Cuban "socialism" in the same blind manner. The class position of the Northstar Compass was always labor aristocracy.

Most of this issue of the magazine is dedicated to Russian politics, but there are pieces on Iraq and child prostitution in Eastern Europe which are indeed correct articles. The only objection we have is that these writers are indignant about child prostitution now, but where were they 10, 20, 30 or 40 years ago when there needed to be a big fight against the bourgeoisie in the party that brought about this completely open restoration of capitalism? They were attacking Mao instead of listening to him.

We ask the same thing of Prof. Vladimir Herasymchuk (pp. 10-11). Now he notices the huge decline in life expectancy that is going on in the ex-Soviet states. But where was he when progress started leveling off after Stalin, and where was he when infant mortality and life expectancy started going downhill before Yeltsin came to power? What

did he have to say when Gorbachev admitted there was a recession if alcohol consumption and oil exports weren't counted! We Maoists said the country was having its capitalist business cycle like any other. Dupes of the bourgeoisie in the Soviet party went on defending the bourgeoisie in the party, and now we have the open and blatant results seen here. These subjects cannot be swept under the rug in the light-hearted manner of unity that Northstar Compass puts forward. All articles on the subject of the communist movement in the ex-Soviet Union should contain references to this fact.

S. Ulanova puts forward correctly: "I remember how these elements crawled into leading positions in the CPSU, in order to make a career for themselves" (p. 12). She goes on to attack the second in command under Gorbachev, thus showing herself to be a little more left than those who think Yeltsin brought about capitalism - as if Yeltsin were not a long-time member of the CPSU before resigning, as if someone had not let this enemy into the party. By 1968 he was already Secretary of the Sverdlovsk Region Communist Party Committee. So this man who was to become the ultimate open bourgeois wrecker who left no one with any doubt about his capitalist outlook, was already in the party leadership by 1968, not 1988. Yet precisely in 1968 the Soviet Communist Party and its allies abroad like the Canada-USSR Association were saying Mao was wrong to say there was a bourgeoisie in the party. Mao was saying there were going to have to be several revolutions on the way to communism, just as two letter-writers from Moscow also correctly say: "It is sure to be passed only through several subsequent revolutions" (p. 20).

After Ulanova's letter there are other excerpts and reviews of newspapers put out by new organizations springing up in Russia. We agree with the following line:

"Until such time that we will believe the bankrupt former party-nomenklatura, no matter in which clothes they might find themselves in – democrats, patriots, communists – until such time, we shall be part of their intrigues and lies. Only when we shall cleanse ourselves off [of] 'rubbish of [the] past,' putting up new, dedicated, not tarnished leaders, dedicated to the people, to socialism, to [the] USSR, not only to rule and money – only at that time can we Soviet people improve our lives" (p. 13).

The past party leaders are discredited, we agree. They were the ones selling phony communism – but it wasn't just the nomenklatura. There were those in Russia and in Canada spouting the nomenklatura line. They too must not pretend to political leadership and instead must make open and public self-criticism to serve as an example of how Marxist-Leninist-Maoist science proceeds. That should be their main task until the international communist movement and the ex-Soviet section of it is re-oriented. Only in this way can they contribute to healing the schism in the international communist movement caused by Khrushchev.

It is wrong for the Canada-USSR friendship committee to continue on with the past. Even if an individual is well-intentioned, s/he must recognize that the movement needs as a principle not to continue with past organizations and lines, especially because these old organizations will be rife with the plots of the nomenklatura to restore Soviet social-imperialism. The greatest contribution these old organizations and individual activists can make is to admit their serious errors in regurgitating Moscow revisionism. Then they should disband and hook up with genuine

Maoist organizations like MIM. Otherwise, we will be recycling the capitalist movement in the former USSR and abroad for a long time to come.

This brings us to the point of the national question in the former USSR. We say to the Russian comrades in particular: the Russian communist movement blew it. Now it cannot simply walk straight back to a USSR. No, the various nationalities can see that the CPSU was rotten to the core. It professed one thing and did another. How can there be trust between nationalities in such a situation? How can any real communist deny that the nationalities would be right not to trust a new communist party in the ex-Soviet Union right away? For this reason, the platform of restoring the USSR can only be a long-term goal while communists everywhere, but especially in Russia – earn the trust of the masses including the various nationalities with their hard work. Part of that hard work includes launching a ferocious movement against the phonies of the past and present. Those organizations claiming that the republics can go right back to communism demonstrate their insincerity and lack of understanding of the phony communist past.

It is absolutely correct for all ex-Soviet peoples to take pride in the accomplishments under Stalin. That pride is not the same thing as the kind of nationalism seeking to be the ideology of a new strategy of imperialism. Stalin and the Bolshevik party had to do decades of work in the revolutionary movement before they could lead the society to its great accomplishments.

That is why we oppose the slogan for an immediate restoration of the USSR. Done so quickly it would surely be on a false basis. There would be another round of degeneration and the trust of the peoples including its nationalities would be lost again, and communism further tarnished.

The Russian comrades must go through a rather lengthy stage of rectification, examination of the international

communist movement and reunifying of forces. For this reason, the "Open Letter to General Lebed" (pp. 16-7) is incorrect. Yeltsin's bombardment of the Parliament and seizure of dictatorial power was wrong, but the idea that Lebed broke his oath and "see the pieces that are left of the once mighty USSR after 1991!" (p. 17) is another example of facile nationalism that has nothing in common with communism. It was that "mighty USSR" that was rotten to the core and produced Yeltsin and Gorbachev, not just as members of the party, but its leaders.

Even the best examples of line in the Northstar Compass demonstrate a lack of internationalist re-orientation in the communist movement. "Khrushchev-Brezhnev-Gorbachev policies have always been afraid of the people's movement. They always refused to believe in the Constitutional Right of Soviet people to undertake partisan warfare against the anti-Soviet regime that exists since the death of Stalin!" (p. 14). Even in this excellent statement there is no acknowledgment of socialism anywhere outside the former USSR. There is no sense of recognition – that this question has been settled: there is a bourgeoisie in the party at this stage of the revolution when people in the party have access to the means of production through state power. These people Khrushchev, Brezhnev, Gorbachev and Yeltsin are not just enemies. They are the bourgeoisie in the party who achieved capitalist power. That is the lesson that Maoism began imparting to the international communist movement more than 30 years ago.

Get two years of MIM Theory, MIM Notes, Notes Rojas, and Maoist Sojourner – all for \$100, saving yourself \$8 off regular subscription rates, and sustaining the people's publications.

Capitalism in the USSR

WILLI DICKHUT
THE RESTORATION OF CAPITALISM
IN THE SOVIET UNION
VERLAG NEUER WEG
ENG. ED., JULY, 1994, 457PP.

One task that all communists work together on is the overthrow of U.S. imperialism. Revolutionaries everywhere look forward to the day when the English-speaking world finally understands the need for Maoism. To help us with this task, the Marxist-Leninist Party of Germany (MLPD) has translated this book into English. MIM now recommends the book to our readers, especially those with any remaining doubts about revisionism in the Soviet Union. Even today after the open collapse of socialism and the Soviet Union itself, there are many struggling to rid themselves of old ideas concerning the Soviet Union, only finding themselves to lapse back into them from time to time.

Most of Willi Dickhut's book is a review of the Maoist theoretical outlook in the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao and a review of the official Soviet literature itself.

In the whole book we will mention only four small problems. One is that the reader must keep in mind that the original version came out while Mao was still alive and leading a socialist China. Hence some of the references to things of the time are no longer true.

Secondly, the book mentions North Korea and Vietnam as socialist societies in passing a few times. However, by now it is especially clear that these societies retain the signboard of socialism as the old Soviet Union did and they have yet to reject the theory that has guided their own so-called socialist construction and that of the Soviet Union.

In the case of Korea, we can say that the new democratic stage of revolution is not complete, but this would not justify the Korean comrades' failure to study and pronounce bravely on the failure of

socialism in the Soviet Union. The limited comments made by the Korean and Vietnamese comrades are very disappointing. Must they even now deny the universality of Mao's theory of the existence of a new bourgeoisie under socialism? We must condemn the continued revisionism of Korean and Vietnamese comrades and the insecure nationalism they use to justify it.

A third point we will mention is that of theory in political economy. Dickhut correctly points out that mere state ownership does not guarantee a lack of capitalism. At the same time, his critique of the Soviet discussion of the law of value is missing this understanding and how commodity relations may enter where there is state ownership. In context, Dickhut was criticizing the Soviet revisionists for making the law of value an immutable law, contrary to the Marxist-Leninist view that under socialism the sphere that the law of value operates in can be gradually restricted. This criticism was correct, but Dickhut went too far in this regard. (See for example quot-

ing Kim Il Sung, p. 81.)

Finally, it is not correct to refer to the bourgeoisie in the party as merely a petty-bourgeois stratum before the restoration of capitalism is complete (p. 24.) While the dictatorship of the proletariat is in place, there is nonetheless a group of people in the party with access to the means of production through the state. This group is not just a bureaucratic faction making it with its "own means of production" the way the petty-bourgeoisie does. The bourgeoisie in the party has access to the social means of production.

We are especially pleased that this edition done in 1988 in German correctly criticizes Hua Guofeng (p. 383). Now that revisionism is collapsing everywhere, some newer forms of revisionism will be called forth by the bourgeoisie to fill in. Dickhut's book is concrete proof that the MLPD and MIM agree on MIM's first two cardinal principles regarding China and the ex-Soviet Union.

Can You Do It Better?

MIM Theory welcomes your
contributions of articles, reviews,
art, poetry, whatever.

This journal is a tool of
struggle. Don't just criticize. Get
involved.

Contact MIM at the address
on the inside cover.



H. W. Edwards: MIM Must-Read Review

H.W. EDWARDS

*Labor Aristocracy: Mass Base
for Social Democracy*
Aurora Press, Stockholm (1978)

Available from MIM for \$10. —ed.

by a comrade

MIM first read this book in 1987. It and J. Sakai's *Settlers: The Mythology of the White Proletariat* were the two main influences leading MIM to adopt its current line that the majority of people in the imperialist countries are petit-bourgeois or labor aristocracy, not proletariat.

Our first treatment of this book appeared in 1987.(1) There, we wrote that "the only important weakness of Edwards' book" is that "[w]hile the book came out in 1978, parts of it appear to be written in 1968, and some of its statistics only reach as far as 1960. While this book is still of considerable historical and theoretical value, it cannot be the last word on the current situation without some statistical extension."

While Sakai shows the parasitic nature of the oppressor-nation working class through historical analysis, Edwards' basic approach is one of statistical analysis. While some have (wrongly) accused Sakai of relying too much on anecdotes, such a criticism would in no way fit onto Edwards, who is thorough to a fault. In addition to his 42 chapters and six appendices, Edwards provides 43 tables to leave no doubt that parasitism remains a key and growing feature of imperialism, the highest stage of capitalism. Edwards' book is a valuable read, particularly for our critics.

Since 1987, MIM's line on the labor aristocracy has developed significantly.(2) We are now in a position to deepen our criticism of Edwards. Edwards correctly sees the imperialist-country majorities as parasitic labor aristocrats

bribed by a share of superprofits stolen from the neocolonies. He nonetheless also sees this labor aristocracy as exploited (paid less than the value of its labor) and as part of the proletariat.(3) Ironically, while Edwards does a masterful job of exposing and polemicizing against dogmatism, he himself makes some serious errors of dogmatism. Edwards correctly trashes the inherited dogma that the labor aristocracy is about to fall into the ranks of the "real proletariat."(4) But when it comes to the dogma that the imperialist-country workers are exploited, Edwards loudly repeats it without subjecting it to the same scrutiny to which he subjects the other main tenets of wishful thinking on the imperialist-country working classes.(5)

As for the idea that the labor aristocracy is part of the proletariat, this too results from dogmatism. MIM considers the proletariat and the labor aristocracy to be part of the working class — both groups are forced to work for a wage, since they do not control the means of production. But the proletariat is the class of workers who have nothing to lose but their chains, while the labor aristocracy is the class of workers who are bribed and parasitic.

The problem for dogmatists — including both Edwards and the crypto-Trotskyist Revolutionary Communist Party, USA (RCP-USA) — is that Lenin's 1916 description of the labor aristocracy differentiated this "privileged upper stratum of the proletariat in the imperialistic states" from the "lower stratum of the proletariat proper."(6) Edwards and the RCP-USA take this to mean that the proletariat consists of a labor aristocracy and a "proletariat proper" ("real proletariat," in the RCP-USA's words).(6) In contrast, we do not consider the "not-really" proletarian labor aristocracy to be part of the proletariat at all.(7) Edwards' dogmatic use of

Lenin's language undermines the basic thrust of Edwards' work, whereas the same language serves the purposes of the RCP-USA, which serves the labor aristocracy by smuggling it into the heart of the proletarian movement.

Edwards appears to have written his book over a long span of time. Due either to this or to confusion on Edwards' part, some contradictory positions emerge on a key question not central to Edwards' book. In some parts, Edwards correctly calls the Soviet Union of his day "revisionist," while in other parts, he incorrectly calls it "socialist."(8) Overall, though, Edwards' orientation is correct, including his recognition that the world's most advanced Marxists in his day lived in China.(9)

Edwards saw the question of the labor aristocracy as a question of universal importance, not just of importance to the imperialist-country left. In fact, Edwards thought the contradiction between the labor aristocracy and the proletariat was the principal contradiction in the world.(10) As such, he was very critical of Comrade Mao Zedong and other Chinese comrades for their incorrect statements on the question.(11)

MIM disagrees with Edwards' analysis of the principal contradiction. In Edwards' time as in ours, the principal contradiction was between imperialism and the oppressed nations. The contradiction between the labor aristocracy (of the imperialist countries) and the proletariat (of the oppressed nations) is certainly a component of the principal contradiction, but only one component. Just as Edwards was critical of Mao's incorrect statements on the political economy of the imperialist countries,(12) we have had our disagreements on this question with the Communist Party of the Philippines (which is also still studying the question) and elements of the Communist Party of Peru. Unlike Edwards, we do not feel that this is for

the comrades in the neocolonies to decide. Edwards is hampered by hegemonic world-party assumptions. In contrast, we see this as a question of applying the science of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism to our own conditions, the conditions of the imperialist countries. We do think that as the world struggle advances, the question of the labor aristocracy's size, influence, and location will become a question of increasingly universal importance. For now, though, it is a question of cardinal importance for comrades in the imperialist countries, but not for the entire international communist movement.

In addition to being a key reading on the question of the labor aristocracy, Edwards' book is also a good scientific study of the related phenomenon of social democracy. Edwards provides detailed answers to the questions of what social democracy is, where it is and is not found and why, and how it unites with imperialism and fascism in its active support for colonialism.

Also of interest in Edwards' book are references to groups which in the late 1960s held lines similar to MIM's dividing lines. These include Denmark's Communist Working Circle (organ: *Communist Orientation*; references from 1968-1969), England's Camden Marxist-Leninist Group (organ: *Camden Newsletter*; references from 1968), and England's Finsbury Communist Association (organ: *Finsbury Communist*; references from 1968 when its basic orientation was correct, and to 1978, by which time it had changed to become an oppressor-nation-chauvinist organization). We urge readers with information about these groups, their documents, or access to such documents to help us learn more about the lines and fates of these organizations and any others like them which may exist or have existed.

Those who do not have the time or patience to read Edwards' entire thorough book will benefit from a selective reading of the historical and theoretical

material, and conclusions, even without reading the detailed economic and statistical analysis.

Notes:

1. See the Sept. 20, 1987 issue of MIM Theory (9&10, the new MIM Theory series began in 1992), in the MIM Notes/MIM Theory Bound Volume, available from MIM for \$15.
2. In particular, see MIM Theory 1 (1992, \$3) and MIM Theory 10 (1996, \$5).
3. E.g., pp. xiv, 53.
4. pp. ix-226.
5. pp. 152-153, citing two Lenin works from

December 1916.

6. On Edwards, see e.g., *Ibid.*, pp. xiv, 53. On the RCP-USA, see RCP-USA pamphlet, "Charting the Uncharted Course: Proletarian Revolution in the U.S.1," RCP Publications, Chicago, 1981.
7. On the definition of "proletariat", see MIM Theory 11, pp. 70-73.
8. E.g., Edwards, pp. 195, 217.
9. p. 302.
10. p. 362.
11. pp. 363-369.
12. pp. 297-303.

Angela Davis History & Theory Falls Short

ANGELA DAVIS
Women, Race and Class

Review by MC206

Angela Davis' *Women Race and Class* is a fine introduction to the history of the split in the feminist movement in Amerika, despite Davis' own failure to recognize the depth of this split and its material basis. As Lenin pointed out in *Imperialism and The Split in the Second International*, some nations' working classes benefit from imperialism, and the social-democratic political movement sprang into existence to defend these benefits at the expense of the nations oppressed by imperialism. Similarly, because white wimmin benefit from their membership in an oppressor nation and have some gender-privileges vis-a-vis oppressed nationals, the pseudo-feminist movement came into being to defend white wimmin's privilege. Pseudo-feminists have failed oppressed-nationality wimmin, because they do not recognize that the liberation of oppressed-nationality wimmin requires the overthrow of imperialism. Instead, pseudo-feminists have used wimmin from oppressed nationalities as bargaining chips to achieve minor reforms which serve the narrow interests of white wimmin.

For example, Davis recounts the development of the wimmin's suffrage movement in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. After the Civil War leaders such as Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton took up white supremacy "on the ground of expediency," as Anthony put it (p. 112). Both Anthony and Stanton opposed Black men's suffrage on narrow grounds, saying almost literally: "How dare you get the vote before us?" Stanton appropriated many of the racist myths used to justify lynching for her anti-Black men's suffrage campaign, saying "I would not trust [Black men] with my rights; degraded, oppressed himself, he would be more despotic ... than ever our Saxon rulers are ..." (p. 75). The organizations led by Stanton and Anthony allied themselves with the likes of Henry Blackwell, who made the following statement in favor of white wimmin's suffrage: "Your 4,000,000 of Southern white women will counterbalance your 4,000,000 of Negro men and women, and thus the political supremacy of your white race will remain unchanged" (p. 114).

Many of the false theoretical premises behind the pseudo-feminists' white-chauvinism at the turn of the century are still around today. Davis does us a favor by digging some of the old skeletons up.

One of the biggest false premise Stanton, Anthony, and other early "feminists" shared was gender reductionism. Anthony used her belief that gender oppression was "the most odious oligarchy ever established on the face of the globe" to downplay other forms of oppression and to silence any critics who advocated that wimmin should also be involved in class- and nation-related struggles. As a result, Anthony tended to believe obvious liberal lies about all men having equal chances at success: "The great distinctive advantage possessed by the working men of this republic is that the son of the humblest citizen, black or white, has equal chances with the son of the richest in the land" (p. 141). Gender reductionism remains a problem today, since it still allows pseudo-feminists to claim that class and nation oppression do not exist or are secondary.

Davis devotes a chapter each to "The Myth of the Black Rapist" and "Racism, Birth Control, and Reproductive Rights" – subjects which MIM has discussed extensively in MIM Notes and MIM Theory. For the most part, Davis' analysis on these subjects agree with MIM's:

(a) The myth that Black men are hypersexual is used to incarcerate them in disproportionate numbers (or lynch them), and white anti-rape activists have bought into this myth.

(b) For wimmin in oppressed nationalities, birth control is often a tool of imperialist genocide, since it involves forced sterilization or forced contraceptive use. Birth control and abortion rights activists who do not take this into account provide a "left" cover for forced sterilization programs.

The best thing Davis adds is historical perspective. In the case of the myth of the Black rapist, Davis explains how the myth was a post-Reconstruction fabrication. During the Civil War, "not a single Black man was publicly accused of raping a white woman" (p. 184). During Reconstruction, lynching was "undisguised counterinsurgency." But after Reconstruction, when much of the threat

of Black power had been defused, white-supremacists needed a new excuse to continue the terrorist practice of lynching. Rape provided a good cover – although the vast majority of lynchings did not involve charges of rape (pp. 183-190).

To illustrate the link between pseudo-feminist birth-control advocates and imperialist population control programs, Davis discusses the career of Margaret Sanger. Sanger – who coined the term "birth control" – worked with the Socialist Party in the early 1910s but eventually became a eugenicist. She argued that "morons, mental defectives, epileptics, illiterates, paupers, unemployables, criminals, prostitutes and dope fiends" ought to be surgically sterilized (p. 214). Again, the theoretical basis for Sanger's reactionary positions has relevance today. According to Sanger, "women were inadvertently perpetuating the exploitation of the working class by continually flooding the labor market with new workers" (p. 213). The idea that the "population explosion" is somehow the root of poverty and oppression is the ideological underpinning of the imperialists population control programs, as MIM has explained in MIM Theory 12 (available from MIM for \$6 postpaid).

Davis also does a good job of debunking by example the false idea that wimmin are powerless and therefore cannot enter the broad political struggle. She argues that the struggle for wimmin's suffrage and emancipation was in large part a by-product of the anti-slavery struggle. Male chauvinism held back the leadership of abolitionist wimmin and therefore held back the abolitionist movement. So, as part of their participation in the anti-slavery struggle, wimmin fought male-chauvinism. "The question of equality for women," as Eleanor Flexner put it, was not 'a matter of abstract justice' for the Grimkes [abolitionist activists], 'but of enabling women to join in an urgent political task'" (p. 44).

Elsewhere, Davis gives an example which shows how the wimmin-are-powerless line can be used to justify complicity with reaction – in this case the Jim Crow policies of certain railroads. Susan B. Anthony's comments at a National American Women's Suffrage Association meeting squelched a resolution suggested by a black womyn: "We women are a helpless disenfranchised class. Our hands are tied. While we are in this condition, it is not for us to go passing resolutions against railroad corporations or anybody else" (p. 118). According to Davis, "The meaning of this incident was far deeper" than the issue at hand. "This gesture definitively established the suffrage association as a potentially [no, concretely –MIM] reactionary political force which would cater to the demands of white supremacy" (p. 118).

MIM and Davis disagree on some very important points. The most glaring example being the question of the white working class: Davis considers it a revolutionary vehicle at this time while MIM does not. There are several passages in *Women Race and Class* in which Davis half-heartedly asserts that the interests of white and Black workers are united – after giving pages of anecdotes illustrating the different material conditions which led a split in "the" working class in North America.

When Davis wrote *Women Race and Class*, she was a member of the Communist Party-USA, which puts forward exactly this kind of head-in-the-sand dogmatism, as we have explained previously (see a review in MIM Theory 10, for example). A vestige of the CPUSA's earlier, correct line that Blacks within the U.S. form a distinct nation in need of national liberation shows up the chapter called "Communist Women." In fact, Davis recognizes that it was exactly this line that allowed the CPUSA to address issues affecting Blacks in the 1930s better than the Industrial Workers of the World or other organizations which clung to the idea

that nation was unimportant. But the CPUSA dropped their recognition of the Black nation in the 1950s, and by the early 1980s idealist class-reductionism was standard CPUSA line.

Readers of *Women Race and Class* should refer to J. Sakai's *Settlers: Mythology of the White Proletariat* for a correct perspective on how the split in the "American" working class developed (available from MIM for \$10).

Similarly, Davis fails to recognize the material basis for the split in the feminist movement, despite all the documentation for it she herself provides. She believes that the white-chauvinism in the white wimmin's movement is a result of misleadership, and that somehow white wimmin have acted against their own interests by "capitulating to racism." This leads her to soften her appraisal of reactionary movements. On the other hand MIM looks at 150 years of consistent white-chauvinist pseudo-feminism and says: "Where there's smoke, there's fire." The material benefits white wimmin gain from imperialism and the gender privileges they enjoy as a group over men and wimmin from oppressed nations create a real split between white wimmin and oppressed nationality wimmin. The manipulation of Black men's sexuality inherent in the myth of the Black rapist and forced sterilization programs for oppressed nationality wimmin are tactics for the preservation of imperialism – and patriarchy – and those groups that depend on imperialism for their privilege. Because Davis ignores the basis for the split in the feminist movement, she ultimately can't defeat the white-chauvinism she exposes.

Despite all its shortcomings, if we understand Davis's errors, *Women Race and Class* is a good resource for revolutionary feminists.

How prison politicizes

LORI ANDREWS
*Black Power, White Blood: The
Life and Times of Johnny Spain*
Pantheon Books, 1996

review by MC234

People who come out of prison can
build up the Country
Misfortune is a test of People's fidelity
Those who protest at injustice are
people of true merit
When the prison doors are opened, the
real dragon will fly out.

—Mao Zedong (p. 155)

This biography is a good discussion of how prison politicizes people, and on the importance of all prisoners dropping narrow nationalism in favor of uniting against their enemies – the pigs. Spain was sent to prison for a senseless murder, and while there he met George Jackson and was politicized.

Spain was a defendant in the San Quentin Six case, and as the only Black Panther on trial, he received the harshest penalty. The San Quentin Six were accused of conspiracy to escape and the murder of prison guards in the August 1971 incident in which George Jackson was killed. MIM can't take a position on the accuracy of Spain's description that for much of 1971 Jackson viewed escape as his only method of survival. According to Spain, the FBI knew from two sources that Jackson was going to escape, and how this would happen. The prison then facilitated the smuggling of a gun into the prison, giving a perfect excuse for the murder of Comrade George.

While there are still too many unanswered questions for MIM to take a position on how George Jackson ended up dead in the San Quentin prison yard, all realistic views, including that of Spain, give the government an active role in arranging for Jackson's death.

One error this book clearly makes is in its discussion of Elmer "Geronimo"



ON TRIAL: Johnny Spain in chains.

Pratt. One of the jurors in the San Quentin Six case didn't disclose to the lawyers – although she did to the jurors – that she thought the Black Panthers were violent, and she supported the conviction of Pratt for killing a close friend. While this is an important issue to raise in a legal appeal, it should not be raised in a book like this without making it clear that Pratt was framed for this murder. As of May 1997 Pratt has been granted a new trial by an appeals court on the grounds that the prosecution concealed the crucial fact that the principal witness was an FBI plant. Elsewhere the book makes it clear that the FBI's COINTELPRO operations were aimed at crushing the Panthers, but to leave out this important and destructive FBI action is incorrect.

MIM recommends this book for study group use because of the above issues and its discussion of the pro-prisoner movement of the 60s and 70s, as well as the dissolution of the Black Panther Party in the 1970s.

Review: Hitler with an eye on today

ADOLF HITLER

Mein Kampf

Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1971

Now that the Soviet social-imperialist bloc has fallen, as exemplified by the destruction of the Berlin Wall, and the Marxist-Leninist movement in the traditions of Stalin and Mao is in retreat, bourgeois historians and journalists are getting around to admitting the atrocities they have committed or covered up in the name of fighting communism. USA Today is featuring stories uncovered from the archives of the Soviet secret police, the KGB.

As the main fighters against the Nazi invasion of Europe, the former Soviet peoples and their government have the most to say about that period of history. However, for decades after World War II, the West ignored the truth, because it came from a source it could not stomach – the Soviet Union.

So it is only in the 1990s that we learn that to patch a coalition together in Italy to keep out the communists, the anti-communist West melded the mafia, Christian-Democrats and the Socialists together. Former Nazi activist Kurt Waldheim nearly became president of Austria. We learn that the French president Mitterand and “democratic socialist” was a Nazi bootlicker during World War II and now more evidence arises of the Nazi infection generally in Europe.

Gold and art works stolen from Jews have been found, not just in Switzerland, but in most of the major European countries and the United States. In Canada, we also learn of massive number of Nazis in just one SS division still receiving their war pensions.

Many younger Jews have been brainwashed with Zionist anti-communist and anti-internationalist propaganda that obliterates the real history of communism and makes it seem like the commu-

nists were as bad to Jews as the Nazis. What is good about the recent release of KGB archives is that younger Jews may re-learn the history. Likewise, the release of International Red Cross archives will contribute to targeting the proper enemy.

According to USA Today, an example of an item being investigated in newly opened U.S. government archives is an exploded shell fired by the Nazis that had written on it that it was made in Sweden; although Sweden had claimed to be a neutral country.⁽¹⁾ As we explained in the MIM Theory 6 (“The Stalin Issue,” \$6 postpaid), there were no neutral countries in Europe between the Soviet Union and Germany, because Hitler twisted arms and gained genuine sympathizers throughout Europe. Most small European nations in fact sided with Hitler and those that didn’t endured civil wars to keep the Nazis out. This is contrary to much of what bourgeois historians have written about Stalin in order to condemn him. In order to condemn Stalin, countless books have been written whitewashing the Nazi infection of Europe. The crypto-fascist attack on the communists has been that Stalin’s stern actions against the Nazis and their supporters were unnecessary. Even within the camp calling itself Marxist and defending Stalin, there are still many with illusions about why the support for Hitler was so widespread in Europe. To this day, few people understand how Hitler tapped the labor aristocracy in a rising imperialist nation – and its competitors – for war against the rest of the world.

When we read *Mein Kampf*, we see that Hitler’s first lunacy in the book is against the Jews, seemingly out of nowhere and unproved, when up to that point the book had been a discussion by a garden-variety rightist. Hitler claims that his study of Jews, including Zionists in Vienna, swayed him from internation-

alism to anti-Semitism. He mentions movie producers, art critics and prostitution business-owners as convincing him that Jews settled into unsavory businesses (pp. 56-9).

For the rest of the book, Hitler targets the Jews and what he sees as their ideology of Marxism. According to Hitler, the Jews needed egalitarian ideas like Marxism to make it possible for parliamentary democracy to rule. Without solid ruling elites and only idiots chosen by the masses, countries were more easily controlled by the Jews, according to Hitler.

As for the internationalism of Marxism, Hitler saw that as an invention of Jews, because at that time Jews had no country and they needed internationalism to survive. According to Hitler, Marxism was the method by which international finance capital would take over country by country. Politically, chaos would result from parliamentary democracy and Jewish influence would rise and economically, capitalism without borders would be the true result of internationalism.

By Hitler’s reasoning, almost every major figure of the day was hopelessly snared in Marxist thinking. In that snare he included reformists, bourgeois politicians and revolutionaries alike. Just the idea of a multinational state like Austria was a Marxist plot according to Hitler, who believed only in pure nations and races.

A close reading of Hitler shows that he hated Marxist internationalism (p. 38) before he hated Jews. In his younger days, he was rather inconvenienced by Austria’s attitude toward the German language and German culture. Like the kid who never learns to like Chinese food, Hitler was never able to get past what he was raised with. His subsequent struggles were all intentional lies and excuses to prop up German nationalism.

PARLIAMENT

Hitler found Marxism so threatening and omnipresent that he found it necessary to copy it in every way with the intention of gutting it at its weakest points. His strategy is very similar to revisionism. The difference is the revisionists claim Marxism and then lie about it to weaken it. Hitler does not claim Marxism in public but then he uses it anyway as if his anti-parliament ideas and party ideas were his own. As already mentioned, although Marxism professed hatred for parliamentary institutions, Hitler stole this idea and blamed parliament on egalitarianism led by Marxism (p. 78).

Since the same Social-Democratic Party with a tradition including Engels was now a major parliamentary force, Hitler's criticism even rang true. Some political forces with a Marxist background were now the parliamentary cretins. Thus the revisionists of Marxism (German Social-Democrats) vindicated the thieves who stole bits of Marxism (Hitler).

Hitler's defense of plebiscites and the leadership principle comes from Marxism, so we would be wrong to turn against what Hitler says on these subjects just because he was Hitler. In opposing bourgeois democracy, Hitler only emphasized the role of heroes like himself more than Marxists would. He wanted a bourgeois elite to rule again, not the masses; however, he was correct to say that rulers should be held responsible with their own money and blood; in such a way he hopes to weed out those not willing to make heroic sacrifices for the people (p. 91). Hitler is correct that plebiscites are a guarantee against opportunism of the grandstanding sort.

He was also correct that interminable meetings, voting and consensus — building on what MIM calls "deciding which side to staple the leaflet" — degrades the quality of the political leadership and leads to inevitable failure. At MIM we use our Congress to discuss matters of

line, but Hitler is also correct that it would suffice to use a congress to vote for a leader and thrash that out.

"The law of fundamental responsibility was gradually taken for granted within the movement ... since scare-cats and incompetents will of course always fight against it; to them sole responsibility for undertaking will always be unpleasant; they always felt freer and better when in every grave decision they were covered by the majority of a so-called committee. But to me it seems necessary to express myself with the greatest sharpness against such an attitude, to make no concession to cowardice in the face of responsibility, and thereby, even if it takes a long time, to achieve a conception of leader's duty and leader's ability, which will bring to leadership exclusively those who are really called and chosen for it" (p. 589).

THE LABOR ARISTOCRACY

At age 20, Hitler realized that he only hated the trade unions because they were led by internationalists. Hence, he says he transformed his own views (p. 46) and came to loathe the capitalists who put their profits ahead of bettering their nation. Hitler learned to retain his bleeding-heart liberal view toward workers, as long as they were German workers. "Our own painful struggle for existence destroys our feeling for the misery of those who have remained behind" (p. 23). Contrary to his image, Hitler also spoke of "human-rights" for workers (p. 597). He was not at all afraid to speak of human-rights and never spoke of them sarcastically or as illusory.

Seeing reform as the way to stave off communist revolution like all liberals and social-democrats do, Hitler said in italics:

"Since on innumerable occasions the bourgeoisie has in the clumsiest and most immoral way opposed demands which were justified from the universal human point of view ... even the most self-respecting

worker was driven out of the trade-union organization into political activity" (p. 45).

Further, like liberals, Hitler says:

"Whatever economic concessions are made to our working class today, they stand in no proportion to the gain for the entire nation if they help to give the broad masses back to their nation. Only pigheaded short-sightedness, such as is often unfortunately found in our employer circles, can fail to recognize that in the long run there can be no economic upswing for them and hence no economic profit, unless the inner national solidarity of our people is restored" (p. 336).

Such a view would be indistinguishable from the *New York Times* or *Boston Globe*. It boils down to seeing the imperialist alliance with the labor aristocracy as good nationalism and good profits.

Taking his cue from the British social democrats who traded support for war for pensions and a welfare state, Hitler also said: "And how trifling all economic concessions, even the greatest, would have been, compared to the immense importance of winning the War!" (p. 337). Hitler's prescription is the same as any other imperialist prescription of this century: ally with your own bought-off workers to conquer the world.

Today, we have many people who do not realize that Hitler had sugar-coated bullets to offer before he could use the real ones. Agitation against NAFTA by the social-democrats and the like of the CPUSA is similar to what Hitler did. There is nothing at all Marxist about vague agitation for imperialist-country worker demands. When that agitation takes up nationalism it is exactly the same political economy as Hitler's. If we want our work in the imperialist countries not to end up paving the way for the next Hitler, we must take care to fly high the banner of internationalism at all times.

PEASANTS

"Never forget that the most sacred right on this earth is a man's right to have earth to till with his own hands, and the most sacred sacrifice the blood that a man sheds for this earth" (p. 664). Hitler's political economy was agrarian. It caused his nationalism to be very oriented toward land-grabbing. He believed that the bourgeoisie was doomed (pp. 680-1) and the answer was to go backward to save nationalism. "What will rank Mussolini among the great men of this earth is his determination not to share Italy with the Marxists, but to destroy internationalism and save the fatherland from it" (p. 681).

Having read his Marxism and European history, Hitler believed that the peasants were the single greatest bulwark against Marxism. "A solid stock of small and middle peasants has at all times been the best defense against social ills such as we possess today" (p. 138). Not surprisingly, Hitler staked his politics on a class that was becoming extinct in Germany. Such is the definition of reactionary, someone who seeks to go back to an earlier time, in this case an agricultural life (see also p. 234, 243). The more impossible the goal, the more the reactionary thrashes about wildly to attain it — causing rivers of blood to spill in the process of the reactionary's own inevitable doom.

Hitler made a similar mistake with regard to history by claiming the battle against syphilis to be the most important one of all Germany. With no concept of dialectics, Hitler had no idea how human progress in medical science could make his whole social analysis of peasants and venereal disease irrelevant, so he proposed a whole elaborate and difficult social solution to the problem (pp. 246-51) when medical science would offer much more successful tactics just a few years later.

Today there are many issues connected up with biology that are also going to

die out. Abortion is among them, because technological advance will continue to make it easier to control reproduction, with ever more improved morning-after-pills and the like. In the meantime, we should expose hypocrite proliferators by seeing if they take up the program of sterilizing all men and using artificial insemination with sperm saved in refrigerators as the only true guarantee against abortion, including back-alley abortion.

OPPRESSOR NATION FLAWS

From our point of view today, it is key to understand what Hitler did with the subject of parasitism. In some ways Hitler understood the drawbacks of his society. He knew that oppressor nation peoples, mostly of the white race, lived a parasitic life sucking the blood and labor of colonial peoples.

Yet this message clashed with his sugar-coated nationalist message and gave the Marxist-Leninists an important card to play. Hitler took this card away with a trick: he let the oppressor nation parasites pretend they were not parasites by focusing their hatred on Jews.

"Peoples who can sneak their way into the rest of mankind like drones, to make other men work for them under all sorts of pretexts, can form states without any definitely delimited space of their own. This applies first and foremost to a people under whose parasitism the whole of honest humanity is suffering, today more than ever: the Jews" (p. 150).

In one fell swoop, Hitler transfers the blame for exploitation and parasitism from the capitalist class and oppressor nations to a tiny minority of the oppressor nations, the Jews. In this way he sought to rally the white race and blame all its weaknesses on one small group.

Like other colonialists and would-be colonialists, the German people saw that communism's message against parasitism was a strong one, a proletarian

one. Yet to participate themselves would have involved self-criticism and a movement to transform German society. Hitler offered an easier solution: the right to oppose parasitism could be purchased for the mere price of bashing the Jews. Hitler designed this ploy so that whites could claim to wash themselves clean.

Today we see many trying to sugar-coat the message against parasitism. These people are clearing the way once again for a Nazi-type of movement seeking easy answers with no grip on factual reality.

THE PARTY

"The more easily attainable posts and offices a movement has to hand out, the more inferior stuff it will attract, and in the end these political hangers-on overwhelm a successful party in such number that the honest fighter of former days no longer recognizes the old movement and the new arrivals definitely reject him as an unwelcome intruder. When this happens, the 'mission' of such a movement is done for" (p. 105).

This is almost exactly a paraphrase of Lenin who especially worried about the problem when the party seized state power. Precisely to avoid the problem of an ever-lower quality of the party, Lenin wrote "Better Fewer but Better!" toward the end of his life.

At the same time, Hitler understood the role of the masses and repeated it again and again, in Marxist fashion. He stole lines like the following: "A movement with great aims must therefore be anxiously on its guard not to lose contact with the broad masses. It must examine every question primarily from this standpoint and make its decisions accordingly" (p. 107).

On the other hand, Hitler learned well Lenin's lessons on "economism," and that combined with his lack of a leader for the trade union movement caused Hitler not to attempt to infiltrate the

trade union movement by 1925.

"The economic struggle will at once withdraw the energy from the political struggle. Once people have won the conviction that by thrift they can acquire a little house, they will dedicate themselves only to this task and will have no more time to spare for the political struggle against those who are planning to take away their saved-up pennies some day" (p. 604).

When it comes to the party, we must learn that there will be those who seek to infiltrate the Leninist principles. Even Hitler picked them up wholesale. Contrary to what the Mensheviks and bourgeois democrats say, the idea of a small disciplined party catapulting past other more mushy, undefined and unprincipled organizations was also proved by Hitler. He was nobody, but he had a disciplined organization, a clear line and an appeal to the labor aristocracy. In the short-run he had great success, because Leninism on the party is true, but in the long-run Hitler failed because he did not understand where history was going, as evidenced by his beliefs about peasants, syphilis and the world's majority of people, whom he hated. It is not enough to adopt the tactics of Marxism-Leninism: one must also be correct about political economy.

Hitler spoke for doomed classes and colonial aspirations. His movement could flare briefly and intensely for a period based on support of the dying classes, but he was always doomed.

PROPAGANDA

This brings us to the next point of how to make propaganda. Hitler goes into great detail about how he learned to make propaganda from the German communists. He even stole communist colors consciously for making posters and banners. He only changed the line and also threw in that he was willing to lie and speak from a subjective point of view when he didn't know something. In

contrast, we Marxists believe the truth is not a compromise between classes and oppressed nations with their oppressors. The truth is lopsidedly with proletarians and oppressed nations, so we have no reason to lie. Because Hitler did not have a correct political economy, we cannot be surprised that he came out for the lie. Also not surprisingly, given the weakness of his position in political economy, he said, "the organizer must primarily be a *psychologist*" (p. 580). Where lies are necessary to gloss over something in the people's thinking, psychology is also necessary.

All Hitler's other points about propaganda come from Marxism and they are valid. 1) Agitation must be simple enough for all the masses to understand. 2) It must be repetitive. 3) It must avoid the influence of professors or other petty-bourgeois seeking even-handedness of substance or tone. 4) We must separate between promotional work which is eye-catching or even simply cultural and our more organized theoretical treatises. 5) The spoken word is more important than the written word.

THE USE OF FORCE

Hitler seized on another weakness of our movement in the imperialist countries. Where there has been successful agitation to oppose imperialist war, pacifism is the likely side-effect, especially in the huge middle classes. Particularly during World War I, it was our internationalist duty to oppose the war, but this caused us to pay a price when it came to fighting the Nazis in the streets later (p. 522).

There were two problems with pacifism: 1) It allowed Hitler's tiny band of storm-troopers to win actual battles in the streets, because of the qualms the people had about squelching the Nazis. 2) In the fighting that did occur and went badly for the proletarian side, it allowed Hitler to paint the Marxist movement as effete and composed of the physically weak or otherwise degenerate peoples. By this strategy he set the stage in the

people's mind for the defeat of Marxism in the streets. What started as a tiny band of physically strong men conquered much larger numbers with less firm leadership and no commitment to violence. Hitler was a better Leninist than the average labor activist when it came to such matters.

Hitler's goal of conquering the world and harnessing all imperialist oppression was doomed from the beginning because of his incorrect political economy on both the labor aristocracy and the oppressed nations. Nonetheless, by adhering to Leninist tactics he was able to extract the highest price possible for his inevitable defeat. If the party can avoid the pacifist and parliamentary errors, it might be able to squelch the fascist movement before it arises. On the other hand, the strength of the labor aristocracy may guarantee the fascist movement a foothold that we cannot handle at this stage in history.

Notes:

1. USA Today, February 17, 1997

Historical notes on Hitler's views of inter-imperialist rivalry

Hitler wrote at length explaining his *Realpolitik* view of diplomacy to those of his followers who would no doubt want simple and straightforward principles of hating the Soviet Union or hating England or hating Jews as the basis of foreign policy. He realized that his chess game would possibly alienate his followers, but he put it forward anyway.

We will note two things. One is that Hitler opposed the German Social Democratic Party's agitation for war

against Russia. Hitler viewed the issue with regard to World War I, but he nonetheless made this comment in 1925 well after the Bolsheviks seized power:

"For decades the Social Democrats had carried on the most scoundrelly war agitation against Russia, and the Center for religious reasons had been most active in making the Austrian state the hinge and pivot of German policy. Now we had to suffer the consequences of this lunacy" (p. 160).

Hence, it was not just Stalin who thought that the German Social Democrats were not a good ally for the Soviet Union. Even Hitler thought the Social Democrats had been too bellicose toward Russia. Hitler too did not disguise that he had plans for taking Russian land, and he said there could be no alliance with the Soviet Union, but he thought the Social-Democrats were too rash in this regard. With that kind of history behind them, Stalin could see little basis for alliance with the Social Democrats against the Nazis. They had already proved themselves to be a party of imperialism and they might take advantage of the moment to carry out long-planned aggression against Russia.

The other point we will raise is his view of North America: "The Germanic inhabitant of the American continent, who has remained racially pure and unmixed, rose to be master of the continent; he will remain the master as long as he does not fall a victim to defilement of the blood" (p. 286.).

Distinguishing between Nazi views, the above view of Hitler was more moderate than other views which held that Jews dominated the United States. His own view was that the Jews were on their way but had not quite accomplished their goal. If Hitler needed to form an alliance with the United States to go divide the Soviet Union, he could always point to his quote above and bring a pause to his rivalry with the U.S. imperialists, especially if he had any

hope of bringing pro-German circles to power in the government, backed by the likes of Henry Ford. The RCP-USA and various Trotskyists have said that there was no need to fear an alliance of impe-

rialists to divide the Soviet Union. We believe the above quote shows why Stalin did indeed need to make sure the imperialists were divided.

Obituary: Karrim Essack

MIM is surprised and saddened by the sudden death of Pan Africanist Congress leader Karrim Essack of a heart attack. He was to attend the 25th anniversary celebration of the TKP/ML Turkish comrades in Germany, but he died just a few days earlier in May.

MIM met Karrim Essack in Gelsenkirchen in Germany at a 100th year celebration of Mao's Zedong's birth in 1993. At that time, Karrim Essack offered personal remembrances to MIM of China's internationalist aid to Tanzania. While Mao was alive, the Chinese government offered aid to other Third World countries, communist or non-communist. In the case of Tanzania, the Chinese helped build a famous railroad that would allow more trade amongst independent African countries without using the intermediaries of South African imperialist or other imperialist transportation. Such aid was proof that Third World countries need not follow Cuba's road of sacrificing political principles by allying with the Soviet Union – which had explicitly abandoned the armed struggle of the Third World.

Karrim Essack was himself a great force in the struggle. He pushed MIM for unity and action, and we do not doubt that he made a large contribution to the proletarian balance of subjective forces needed for revolution. In Africa, he assisted MIM in distributing MIM literature.

At the same time, MIM had its disagreements with Karrim Essack on issues of principle. For this reason we must report with regret that we were not able to struggle with Karrim Essack longer.

We find it most appropriate to put forward what unity we did have with Karrim Essack, especially in those areas he was pushing MIM to take action before his death.

GATT

Karrim Essack was one of those who once the Soviet bloc fell apart understood clearly that there was now a question of new imperialist blocs and contentions. Already in 1993 in his paper on GATT – "The Dunkel Draft and its Implications" – he was speaking of a tripolar economic world composed of Germany (leading Europe), Japan and the United States.

Right in page one, Karrim Essack says what MIM has also been saying about the phoniness of free trade as it exists under capitalism. Indeed, in trying to calculate the total superprofits extracted from the Third World, MIM too has found that "Export from one country to another is almost like transfer from one branch of a transnational corporation to its unit/affiliate or subsidiary. ... Prices cannot reflect free market conditions. They would be decided by the internal accounting considerations of the multinational corporations."

This is a very important point to understand, because the imperialist economists and their social-democratic allies say that Third World workers and peasants are not superexploited, because their goods sell at their free market price. In fact, much trade occurs within multinational corporations at whatever low price is convenient for the multinational corporation to utilize. In such a situation, the Third World workers are coerced by their lackey governments to take low wages and sell their product to

only one buyer – a foreign affiliate of the same multinational corporation. That is far from free trade which only exists when there is a multiplicity of suppliers, buyers and negotiations. It is at most a trade between imperialist lackeys on the one hand and imperialists on the other hand.

Hence, the imperialist countries import Third World goods at a small fraction of their true value and then resell them or re-finish them in the imperialist countries. This leads the imperialist country workers and businesspeople to tell tall tales of their productivity or marketing genius – when all they are doing is living off the labor of starving Third World workers kept in line by U.S.-puppet military regimes.

Karrim Essack was also quick to realize that as it stands now, the next inter-imperialist rivalries are taking shape around the regional free-trade zones constructed at the expense of global free trade – NAFTA, EEC, APEC, and so on. These agreements he called “free trade amongst the signatories and protectionism against others.”

Also like MIM, Karrim Essack was careful to point out the history since 1934 of the GATT, including seven rounds of agreements before the most recent GATT agreement. Reformists seeking to tail after the most reactionary and nationalist sections of imperialist capital speak of GATT as if knocking down the most recent agreement was all there was to GATT and the capitalist system, when in fact capitalism is a system and previous GATT treaties were also predatory.

On the subject of “intellectual property,” which is now the big buzzword and business of the imperialist countries, Karrim Essack correctly defended meager laws in India that prevent patents on agricultural goods and medicine. Now the imperialists wish to force India to allow free market competition in these goods, even if the result is that Indian people will have less to eat and less access to medicine.

He points out that the GATT is moving to set up international organizations to enforce the provisions of the GATT, which themselves are often literally just sections of U.S. law extended to the world. “True enough, this body like the U.N. will be based on one country one vote, but in practice the commands that will emanate from this body will be the voices of the industrialized countries. What this body proposes will have the force of law and will be binding on all the Third World countries.”

THE U.N.

In 1994, at age 55, Karrim Essack struggled to draw MIM's attention to Somalia and Rwanda. What he said to the Pan Africanist Congress Youth Secretariat was typical of his line. According to Karrim Essack, the military defeat in Somalia and the discrediting of the U.N. in Rwanda showed that Africa would not give in to the New World Order so easily:

“These two historical events completely destroyed the strategy of the international monopolies working through the U.N. for the recolonisation of Africa and placing certain countries under direct UN trusteeship.

“And if Rwanda were to come under U.N. trusteeship, just what type of rule would there be under personnel knowing nothing about Rwandan history, culture, language, and above all not sympathetic to the aspirations of the Rwandan people?”

RWANDA

Karrim Essack was busy promoting a book on Rwanda, and took time to select a section of the book to re-publish and send to MIM. In this pamphlet, we learn that the teaching, medical and religious professions all assisted in the genocide of a six-digit number of Tutsis and their friends amongst the Hutus in Rwanda in 1994. This included silence or participation in genocide by Anglican Protestants and Hutu Catholics. The people with the most success in protecting the Tutsis

from genocide in the 100 days after April 6, 1994 were poor Hutu farmers.

Although the Hutus and Tutsis lived in relative peace before colonialism, the imperialist media told the lie of inter-tribal conflict to explain why extremist Hutus carried out genocide against men, women, children and babies. This also helped to justify the U.N.'s inaction.

While offering the promise of global stability and an international police force above local ethnic conflicts, the U.N. troops failed to stop the massacre: “UNAMIR did very little to help people when the crisis began. People telephoned them in desperation. They had armoured carriers and tanks. What did they bring these weapons for if they are going to stand by when people are being butchered in front of their very eyes?”

Karrim Essack explained that the issue was difficult enough for the people of Rwanda, but the imperialists had no chance of understanding the realities of preventing genocide there. Relying on the U.N. only slowed the Rwandans themselves from solving their own problems. Pointing to the reactionary Spectator in the U.S., Karrim Essack explained precisely why the media presents stories of violence by Africans against Africans by quoting Paul K. Johnson: “Most African governments are not fit to govern themselves. ... The helpless Somalis can have no hope of a safe, prosperous future except as a colony of one of the civilized powers.” He recommended U.N. trusteeship. MIM agrees with Essack that the Western media is still motivated by national chauvinism and racism in its coverage of Africa. For this reason, it is false to rely on the major media to build the necessary movements to oppose “a new form of imperialism – collective imperialism through international bodies.”

Note: “African Rights, Rwanda: Death, Despair and Defiance,” 11 Marshalsea Rd., London SE1 1EP.

Robert F. Williams

Friend of the People: 1925-1996

All men must die, but death can vary in its significance....To die for the people is weightier than Mount Tai, but to work for the fascists and die for the exploiters and oppressors is lighter than a feather.

—Comrade Mao Zedong, "Serve the People," 8 September 1944

On October 15, 1996, Robert F. Williams died in Grand Rapids, Mich., at age 71. He was a friend of the people, and his death is weightier than Mount Tai. While MIM missed its chance to do so in a timely manner, we wish to seize this sad occasion as an opportunity to celebrate Williams' service to the people.(1)

Williams was a revolutionary Black nationalist who led the masses in Monroe, N.C., in the practice of armed self-defense against settler-inflicted terror while civil rights reformism and passive resistance were in vogue. He was not a communist, but he was a friend of the communist movement and a staunch fighter against imperialism. And imperialism took notice. Williams faced attempts on his life. The U.S. Federal Bureau of Investigation and other authorities hounded him for 15 years on a phony kidnapping charge that ultimately didn't stick in court. He spent 8 of these 15 years in exile.

WILLIAMS AND THE NAACP

Williams wrote:

"Before the Supreme Court desegregation decision of 1954, the NAACP [National Association for the Advancement of Colored People] was not a primary target of segregationists. In many places in the South, including Monroe, racists were not too concerned with the small local chapters. But the Supreme Court decision drastically altered this casual attitude. The Ku

Klux Klan and the White Citizens Councils made it their business to locate any NAACP chapter in their vicinity, and to find out who its officers and members were. Threats of violence and economic sanctions were applied to make people withdraw their membership. Chapters, already small, dwindled rapidly..."(2)

In 1955,

"The local Klan had threatened the small Union County NAACP chapter, which was the only local civil rights group. So the petty-bourgeois NAACP leaders wanted to dissolve the chapter in order to save themselves. When Williams, a new member, objected, they voted him in as President and then they resigned. Only Dr. Albert Perry, an older physician, agreed with Williams. Together they rebuilt the chapter by going to the grass-roots, always stressing the need for armed self-defense. ... To get inexpensive U.S. Army rifles, Williams formed a branch of the National Rifle Association. ... By 1957 the Monroe self-defense guard got its baptism of fire, driving off a Klan assault on Dr. Perry's house. Day and night New Afrikans kept an eye out for settler intruders, phoning reports into a self-defense headquarters which would alert armed units into full readiness..."(3)

THE OCTOBER 1958

"'Kissing Case' ... began when a young [7 year-old] Euro-American girl kissed a nine-year-old New Afrikan boy on the cheek as a greeting. When the girl's parents found out about it, they went to the Monroe police. The nine-year-old boy and a companion were arrested and eventually sentenced to 14 years in prison for rape. Unable at first to free the children, the

Monroe Movement struggled to wake people up about the case. Newspapers in Europe and then Afrika started writing about it. Soon it became an international scandal exposing U.S. colonial injustice. Enraged crowds stoned U.S. Embassies. Finally the White House had to intervene to release the young children and end the publicity. Williams and the Monroe Movement had to fight the 'Kissing Case' without any support from the National NAACP, which was trying to isolate or silence militants any way they could. Finally, in 1959, the National NAACP announced that it had suspended Williams for six months for publicly stating that New Afrikan men in Monroe would defend ['our women and children, our homes and ourselves'] against settler attacks..."(4)

Comrade Mao Zedong said, "To be attacked by the enemy is a good thing." On June 23, 1961, a settler attempted to take Williams' life. On August 27, 1961, Monroe police chief A. A. Mauney told him, "In 30 minutes you'll be hanging in the courthouse square." Williams was courageous, but he was no fool. Facing Mauney's threat and a phony kidnapping charge from the FBI (which was dismissed in court in 1976), Williams fled the country, initially to Cuba.

WILLIAMS AND CUBA

While the Cuban regime's claims to socialism were and are false, Fidel Castro's regime has done some progressive things in its contention with U.S. imperialism. One of these progressive acts was allowing Williams to stay in Cuba and helping him start "Radio Free Dixie," which broadcast Williams' Black nationalist message to North America.

In 1966, Cuban officials began to

demand to be allowed to censor Williams' newsletter and his radio program, so he went to live in then-socialist China. On 8 August 1966, he spoke bitterly of state-capitalist Cuba, which he incorrectly called socialist. Said Williams, "To our consternation, we have discovered that the bourgeois-oriented power structure of some socialist states, even one with a black and white population, would prefer to preserve a white reactionary anti-communist power structure in racist America." (5)

WILLIAMS AND MAO

On August 8, 1963, while Williams was still in Cuba, Comrade Mao Zedong issued a "Statement Calling on the People of the World to Unite to Oppose Racial Discrimination by U.S. Imperialism and Support the American Negroes in Their Struggle Against Racial Discrimination." Its opening words were:

"An American Negro leader now taking refuge in Cuba, Mr. Robert Williams, the former President of the Monroe, North Carolina, Chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People, has twice this year asked me for a statement in support of the American Negroes' struggle against racial discrimination. On behalf of the Chinese people, I wish to take this opportunity to express our resolute support for the American Negroes in their struggle against racial discrimination and for freedom and equal rights." (6)

Mao's statement correctly noted, "In the final analysis, a national struggle is a question of class struggle." (7) Mao's statement was not entirely correct, however. Mao incorrectly said: "In the United States, it is only the reactionary ruling circles among the whites who oppress the Negro people. They can in no way represent the workers, farmers, revolutionary intellectuals and other enlightened persons who comprise the

overwhelming majority of the white people." (7)

MIM agrees with H.W. Edwards, who responded,

"however desirable, [it] is just *not so*. And hundreds of thousands of Negroes at one time or another involved in the countless recorded race riots in big and little U.S. industrial centers and rural backwoods, like Detroit, Chicago, Los Angeles or anywhere in the benighted South, *know*; and the families and friends of unnumbered Negroes who have died in unspeakable agony in lynchings and beatings, or suffered in their millions the ignominy of racial harassment and segregation, *know* that it is *not* 'only the reactionary ruling circles' who 'oppress' them. They *know* that basic white workers in those cities, and poor white farmers and workers in the rural South perform the bestialities against them. This approach in Peking is on the same level as the one that sees a colonial army as a 'people's army' because the imperialists have no other choice than to people it with 'workers'. There is a real difference between a condition and a potential." (8)

ON THE LABOR ARISTOCRACY

Rob Williams, too, knew better. While in Cuba, he wrote that as long as white workers "have jobs and can buy automobiles and homes, they've got no real reason to rise up against the capitalists. Only those, like us Blacks, who are the victims of severe economic discrimination and racism, have the motivation to want to overthrow the system." (9)

On August 8, 1966, at a mass rally in Beijing celebrating the anniversary of Mao's statement in support of the Black struggle, Robert F. Williams spoke. He told the crowd:

"We have some white Americans with us in our struggle ... [but] some so-called socialists, whom we thought to be our comrades and class brothers, have joined the

international Ku Klux Klan fraternity for white supremacy and world domination. ... There is a mighty tendency, promoted by the sinister American devil himself, to engender more sympathy and fraternalism for the so-called 'good reasonable American' than for the wretched victims of vicious and brutal U.S. imperialism... What is the motive of those who plead for the exemption of liberal Americans whose feigned liberalism merely serves as a cloak and shield around the naked power of savage and racist U.S. imperialism? ... The myth of the good reasonable American who is yet to be heard is a ruse perpetrated by the psychological arm of the imperialist forces of tyranny. ... A good man who is silent and inactive in times of great injustice and oppression is no good man at all. He is no ally to freedom and justice, but is a silent partner to tyranny and oppression. ... Those who are without principle and conviction to declare themselves for the righteous cause of the oppressed must be prepared to suffer the consequences of the gathering storm of violent and turbulent ... retribution." (10)

PRESIDENT-IN-EXILE

On March 29-31, 1968, 500 Black nationalists attended the Black Government Conference convened in Detroit, Michigan by the Malcolm X Society. This conference established the Provisional Government of the Republic of New Afrika (PGRNA), which to this day seeks to govern over the "Black Belt" territory in what is currently known as the U.S. southeast, particularly what is currently known as Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina and Louisiana. The conference named Robert Williams its first President-in-exile. (11)

In 1969, Williams returned from what was then People's China to the U.S. empire, despite facing a continuing legal threat. He settled in Michigan, and North Carolina officials sought to extradite him on the old, phony kidnapping

charges. Upon Williams' return to the U.S. empire, the Maoist Black Panther Party (BPP)'s leader Huey Newton wrote a letter from his prison cell to the PGRNA and its President-in-exile. In this letter, Newton articulated a mostly correct response to the basic line of the PGRNA, marred only by apparent illusions about the United Nations on Newton's part and a lack of clarification regarding the difference between a genuine plebiscite and a phony, imperialist-controlled one. Newton wrote:

"As far as our stand on separation, we've demanded, as you very well know, a plebiscite of the U.N. to supervise, so that Blacks can decide whether they want to secede the union, or what position they'll take on it. As far as the Black Panther Party is concerned we're subject to the will of the majority of the people, but we feel that the people should have this choice, and we feel that the Republic of New Africa is perfectly justified in demanding and declaring the right to secede the union. So we don't have any contradiction between the Black Panther Party's position and the Republic of New Africa's position that I know, it's simply a matter of timing. We feel that certain conditions will have to exist before we're even given the right to make that choice. ... And again I think that it would be perfectly justified if the Blacks decided that they wanted to secede the union, but I think the question should be left up to the popular masses, the popular majority. So this is it in a nutshell." (12)

In 1976, the phony charges against Williams were finally dropped.

"Robert Williams never gave up on the goal of liberating Black people from imperialist oppression and until his death, he continued to be involved in local struggles against things like police brutality and discrimination in education." (13)

The most basic lesson we can learn from Robert Williams' life is that the

best way forward for the oppressed is to organize and defend themselves by any means necessary. "Self-defense prevented bloodshed and forced the law to establish order. This is the meaning of Monroe and I believe it marks a historic change in the life of my people." (2)

Long live the spirit of Robert F. Williams!

Long live revolutionary anti-imperialism!

Notes: 1. The delay in printing this points to the need for more people to write for MIM Notes and MIM Theory. This means you!

2. Robert F. Williams, *Negroes with Guns*. Marzani and Munsell: New York, 1962, as excerpted by the Trotskyist Spartacist League's *Workers Vanguard*, 8 November 1996, p. 7.

3. E. Tani and Kae Sera, *False Nationalism, False Internationalism: Class Contradictions in the Armed Struggle*. Seeds Beneath the Snow: 1985, p. 171. Tani and Sera here cite Williams, op. cit., p. 111.

4. Tani and Sera, op. cit., p. 172.

5. H. W. Edwards, *Labor Aristocracy: Mass Base for Social Democracy*. Aurora Press: Stockholm, 1978, p. 298. Available from MIM for \$10.

6. *Statements by Mao Tse-Tung Calling on the People of the World to Unite to Oppose the Aggressive and Bellicose Policies of U.S. Imperialism and Defend World Peace*. Foreign Languages Press: Beijing, 1964, p. 1.

7. Ibid, p. 5.

8. Edwards, op. cit., p. 299.

9. *Workers Vanguard*, 8 November 1996, p. 11.

10. Edwards, op. cit., pp. 298, 301.

11. Chokwe Lumumba, Chairperson of the New Afrikan People's Organization, "The Roots of the New Afrikan Independence Movement," Jackson, MI, -1991, pp. 3, 10.

12. Huey Newton, "To the R.N.A.," in Philip Foner, ed., *The Black Panthers Speak*. Da Capo Press: New York, 1995, pp. 70-73.

13. The crypto-Trotskyist Revolutionary Communist Party, USA's *Revolutionary Worker*, 17 November 1996, p. 7.

Putting MIM Theory to Work

RAIL HOLDS PSYCHOLOGY AND GENDER TALK

EAST COAST COLLEGE

On February 19, RAIL held a talk entitled "Psychology and Gender." The talk exposed psychology as a pseudo-science that helps to prop up patriarchy, either by providing a therapeutic justification for the gender aristocracy's parasitic existence, or as an avenue for incarceration of social rebels.

The RAIL comrades based their talk on the article "Abolish Psychology" in MIM Theory 2/3, MIM Theory 9, "Psychology and Imperialism." The comrades explained that in a dysfunctional oppressive society, people *should* have a problem adjusting! If anything, being perfectly well adjusted to life under imperialism should be considered abnormal.

Comrades pointed out how Ritalin and similar drugs are used wholesale in oppressed nation communities to control the children.

One of the RAIL comrades leading the talk raised the concept of "internalized oppression." This comrade argued that when people serve as actors in their own oppression, such as anorexics, bulimics, and people who attempt suicide or self-mutilation, they are internalizing this oppression.

Another RAIL comrade pointed out that this concept was not raised in the MIM Theory journal on psychology, and this comrade started a discussion on why those words were not chosen. This comrade, and some others, argued that this terminology confuses who the principal enemy is, and plays into the postmodern

"revolution within" conception of political struggle.

It is very correct to recognize how individuals buy into the oppressive system and facilitate its survival by their own actions or inaction. This is what the comrade who raised the term was trying to do. We recognize that it is the larger system that provides people with the "choices" they make, but it is an individual choice how to navigate them.

The comrade who argued for the term "internalized oppression" used it mostly in regard to gender, but s/he argued that it could also apply to Blacks who join the police force. By that argument, it could also be applied to all oppressed people. Every time that an exploited Filipino shows up for work, that could be called "internalized oppression."

But to MIM this puts too much emphasis on the personal decision and lets the system off the hook. To pick one example, anorexia is bad for a number of reasons, including the fact that it can physically injure or even kill you. The thing to focus on is the link between anorexia and patriarchy, and how the struggle against patriarchy is the best permanent solution to anorexia.

Find out More

Order MIM Theory 9, "Psychology and Imperialism," for \$6 — and sharpen your tools for attacking the psychology and its masters: imperialism and patriarchy.



Yeni Kadin Magazine Interviews MIM

Yeni Kadin (New Woman) is a Turkish wimmin's magazine based in exile. The magazine's representatives gave us the following interview questions. MIM's answers follow each. —ed.

Yeni Kadin: Where are you from and what is your organization name?

MIM: The Maoist Internationalist Movement (MIM), is based in North America.

YK: What do you understand from woman problems in society?

MIM: Wimmin are oppressed by the patriarchy, just as workers and poor people are oppressed by capitalism and as most nations and peoples are oppressed by imperialism. Of these, imperialism is principal. The principal contradiction in the world is between imperialism and the oppressed nations. But this does not mean that patriarchy and gender oppression do not deserve attention in their own right. Indeed, gender struggle must be waged for national liberation and class struggles to be successful. Comrade Mao Zedong said, "Women hold up half the sky." A national liberation struggle must be led by a proletarian and feminist line if it is to truly mobilize the nation and if it is to truly liberate its people. Even under socialism, gender struggle must be waged. Socialist revolutions have made tremendous gains for wimmin. No other path is comparable in its success. But no modern society, socialist or otherwise, has yet eliminated the power of men over wimmin. The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (China, 1966-1976) went the farthest.

YK: What is the most important woman's issue in your country?

MIM: You ask what the most important wimmin's issue is in North America. We at MIM say that *all* issues are wimmin's issues. Therefore, as for

men, the most important issue is imperialism and the need to agitate, educate, organize and mobilize against it. But that is an ideological answer to a political question. The most important gender issue in North America is parasitism. Particularly in the white/Amerikan oppressor nation, biological-wimmin within U.S. borders are principally oppressors, not oppressed. They are not only class and national oppressors, but gender oppressors as well. Gender and gender oppression are not fundamentally about anatomy or biology, but about the control of one group of people's bodies by another group of people. Imperialist-country biological-wimmin, then, are principally gender oppressors, because they benefit from the control of the bodies of both biological-wimmin and biological-men of the neocolonies. For example, imperialist-country biological-wimmin benefit when new forms of birth control are developed, but before this privileged gender aristocracy sees these products, the birth control devices are tested on the biological-wimmin of the neocolonies. All oppressor-nation people likewise benefit from the medical testing the imperialist patriarchy conducts on oppressed-nation people of both biological sexes. The result is that biological-wimmin within U.S. borders constitute a gender aristocracy and are in fact more male than female. They have an ideology which corresponds with this social position; an ideology MIM calls pseudo-feminism. While genuine feminists are for the liberation of the world's nationally-oppressed majority of men and wimmin from imperialism and patriarchy, the phony feminism of the gender aristocracy only fights for a greater share of privilege on the backs of the nationally-oppressed.

YK: Is there any woman's organization

tions in your country? What is these nature?

MIM: The most prominent wimmin's organization is NOW, the National Organization for Women. This organization's pseudofeminist politics are exemplified by its close ties with a commission of the fascist U.S.-Ramos regime in the Philippines. There are numerous other groups with similar reactionary and pseudofeminist politics, including local student groups which tend to make the reactionary call for a larger police presence on campus in the name of fighting rape. Unfortunately, many people still believe there is something "progressive" about these Amerikan-chauvinist groups. MIM does not lead a separate wimmin's organization at this time, but does lead the struggle for revolutionary feminism within U.S. borders. Redstockings is a group which is influenced by Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, but is not Maoist-led and not widely known. Gabriela is a legal component of the international Filipino national democratic movement. It is headquartered in the Philippines, but has a basis here. Women of All Red Nations (WARN) is a First Nations (indigenous peoples) group. The All-African Women's Revolutionary Union (A-AWRU) is led by the All-African People's Revolutionary Party (A-APRP), which upholds Pan-Africanism.

YK: What is the extend of the woman participation in the revolutionary?

MIM: There is no revolution in North America yet, only preparation for revolution. The revolutionary movement in North America is weak, due to the fact that the majority of people within U.S. borders are bribed by the imperialists with superprofits extracted from the workers and peasants of the neocolonies. This is true of both biological genders within U.S. borders. MIM would be much weaker than it is without the full participation of biological-wimmin at all levels of our organization. This is also true of the organizations MIM leads.

YK: Do people disappear after their

arrest in your country?

MIM: Generally, people do not disappear permanently after their arrest within U.S. borders, as they do in many Latin American and Asian countries. On the other hand, the U.S. empire has the highest imprisonment rate in the world. Many people (1.5 million and growing fast), particularly Black, Latino, and First Nations youth, are "buried alive" in these concentration camps. These people have been "disappeared" from the world outside to a great extent. Furthermore, the police have little need to "disappear" people here, because they shoot young brothers and sisters down in cold blood, then lie and say they did it in self-defense. The oppressed nations surrounded by the Amerikan nation will not tolerate this forever.

YK: We are called "New Woman". Could we have contact with the women groups in your country?

MIM: 7. MIM can be reached at P.O. Box 29670, Los Angeles, CA 90029-0670, USA. Redstockings' address as of 1994 was P.O. Box 744, Stuyvesant Station, New York, NY 10009, USA. NOW can be reached at 1000 16th St., NW, Ste. 700, Washington, DC 20036,

USA. Gabriela can be reached care of BAYAN, P.O. Box 10296 Broadway Centrum, Quezon City 1112, Philippines. This comrade had difficulty locating WARN's address. The A-AWRU can be reached care of the A-APRP, P.O. Box 3307, Washington, DC 20009.

YK: We publicise a magazine once in every three month. Can you send articles about women problems and their fight?

MIM: Yes, we can send you articles. We have given you our theoretical journal on gender and revolutionary feminism, and we will put you on our newspaper mailing list.

YK: Would winning equality against men makes women really free in the sense of exercising their rights?

MIM: No, winning equality with men is not enough to make wimmin really free. Wimmin are kept down not only by gender oppression, but by class oppression and national oppression as well. On the other hand, imperialist-country people of both biological genders are "free" in certain ways, but that kind of freedom is not a worthy goal, since it rests on the backs of the oppressed.

YK: Thank you.

MIM's Black Panther Newspaper Collection

Read full-text articles from the original BPP newspaper, now on MIM's world wide web site, and see the real history for yourself: **Maolism in the Black Panther Party. Point your browser to:**

<http://www.etext.org/Politics/MIM/bpp>



From the International Communist Movement

On Armed Struggle, Peace Negotiations & the International Communist Movement

Excerpts from:

An Interview with Jose Maria Sison
Founding Chairman, Communist Party of the Philippines

By Luis Arce Borja, Editor-in-chief,
El Diario Internacional
5 June 1997

What is the present reality of the armed struggle in the Philippines? What is the economic and social reality of the poor masses in the country? At which stage is the people's war?

The people's war in the Philippines is still at the stage of the strategic defensive. Tactical offensives are being carried out in the form of extensive and intensive guerrilla warfare on the basis of an ever widening and deepening mass base.

Under the neocolonial and neoliberal policies of the imperialists and the local exploiting classes of big compradors and landlords, the chronic crisis of the semicolonial and semifeudal ruling system is ever worsening and providing the fertile conditions for the growth in strength and advance of the armed revolution. The toiling masses of workers and peasants are driven to rise up in arms by oppression and exploitation.

In which manner does North American imperialism intervene in the "counterinsurgency" in the Philippines?

U.S. imperialism has engaged in direct military intervention in the Philippines by providing the strategic plan for total war and low-intensity conflict, officer training, recruitment of intelligence and psy-war assets, military and police advisors and trainers, comprehensive range of weapons, military transport and communications equipment, intelligence exchange,

psywar operations and electronic surveillance on the ground, by planes and by satellites.

The Philippines is imprisoned by US naval and air forces. In the light of international law, the armed revolutionary movement for national liberation and democracy is not a mere insurgent force but a co-belligerent force in a civil war with international characteristics due to US domination and intervention.

What are the short- and long-term perspectives of the revolution in your country?

The current stage of the Philippine revolution is new-democratic, under the leadership of the proletariat, through a protracted people's war. Upon nationwide seizure of political power, the socialist stage of the revolution can commence. As regards the protracted people's war aimed at the basic completion of the new-democratic revolution, the probable course of development includes the strategic defensive, the strategic stalemate and the strategic offensive.

At this stage of the revolution in the Philippines do forms of people's power already exist? What are these forms?

Since the beginning of the people's war in 1969, the revolutionary forces and the people have been building Red organs of political power in the countryside. First, the barrio organizing committees are formed as provisional organs of political power as a result of expansion work. Then, the barrio revolutionary committees are elected as regular organs of political power as a result of consolidation work. Consolidation work means building the mass organizations of workers, peasants, women, youth, cultural activists, children and so on and building the local branches of the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP).

The CPP is directly in charge of organs of political power at levels higher than the village. It has experimented with the establishment of the provisional revolutionary government at levels higher than the village and has drawn positive and negative lessons from the experiment. The National Democratic Front of the Philippines helps to pave the way for higher organs of political power by establishing secret united front committees at those higher levels.

What similarity exists between the revolution in the Philippines and the revolutionary process which directs the CP of Peru?

The current revolutions in the Philippines and in Peru are similarly new-democratic in character. They arise from basically similar semicolonial and semifeudal conditions. Both of them are led by a communist party guided by Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and involve the mobilization of the workers and peasants for the completion of the new-democratic revolution and for the consequent socialist revolution.

What are the lessons drawn from the rectification campaign within the CP of Philippines? What were the principal errors?

In ideology, the principal lesson is to uphold Marxism-Leninism-Maoism against the errors of modern revisionism, empiricism and dogmatism. In politics, the principal lesson is to adhere to the analysis of Philippine society as semicolonial and semifeudal and to carry forward the new-democratic revolution through a protracted people's war.

This is in opposition to the erroneous notion that the country has become highly urbanized and industrialized and that the cities have become the decisive ground for armed and legal struggles from the beginning to the end of the revolution. This notion led to both "Left" and Right opportunism.

The principal "Left" opportunist errors included the presumptions that urban insurrections and spontaneous mass actions are the leading factor and that the people's army is a purely military force, detached from painstaking mass work. The principal Right opportunist error advocated legal struggle as the main or principal form of struggle and wished to use the united front as the tool for liquidating the revolutionary party of the proletariat.

In organization, the principal lesson is to uphold democratic centralism against the errors of bureaucratism and ultrademocracy. Over a long period of time, bureaucratism ran rampant. Then, ultrademocracy was whipped up by a handful of revisionist and liquidationist elements.

What is your analysis of the international communist movement? What will be the ideological, political and programmatic basis for the unity of the communists at the international level?

The international communist movement has been undermined and weakened for decades by revisionist betrayal. The Marxist-Leninist-Maoist parties are in the best position to

comprise and develop the international communist movement because they adhere to Marxist-Leninist theory and practice, have the correct explanation for the phenomenon of modern revisionism and grasp the line of advance for the proletarian revolution.

The basis of ideological unity in the international communist movement is Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and opposition to revisionism and opportunism. However, parties that expressly adhere to Marxism-Leninism or Maoism can have conferences, seminars and fora to clarify the ideological and political line among themselves. They must also participate in international gatherings along a broad anti-imperialist line, try to build a broad international united front and struggle for the resurgence of the anti-imperialist and socialist movement.

More important than international gatherings are the revolutionary homework being done by the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist parties. The international communist movement can become strong again through the concrete application of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism in various countries and through serious efforts to wage armed revolution or prepare for this.

It is foolhardy to try building the ideological, political and organizational unity of communist and workers' parties on an international scale by putting together a hodgepodge of Marxist-Leninist and revisionist parties. The unity of the international communist movement should not be confused with the broad anti-imperialist united front.

From your viewpoint, what is the present expression of revisionism and opportunism? How does this occur in the trade union and political movement and even in certain armed movements?

In various countries, there are revisionist political parties and revisionist-led political movements which can criticize the concrete manifestations of oppression and exploitation but which systematically oppose the revolutionary essence of Marxism-Leninism. They neither wage armed revolution nor prepare for it ideologically, politically and organizationally.

In the trade union movement, revisionism and opportunism confine the working class to economic and legalistic struggles within the capitalist system and prevent the working class from undertaking revolutionary education and militant class struggles which are directed towards the overthrow of the entire system of oppression and exploitation.

An armed movement is not necessarily free from a revisionist and opportunist character and direction. We have seen in contemporary times national liberation movements led by the radical anti-imperialist petty-bourgeoisie and not by the revolutionary proletariat. Under the influence of revisionism and opportunism and dependent on external powers, the leaders of certain armed movements have gone into neocolonial compromises as in Africa and the most shameful forms of capitulation as in Central America.

[...]

What is the balance of the different international initiatives directed at coordinating the parties and organizations of the Left?

I presume that you are using the term "Left" in a broad journalistic sense. I will try therefore to cover the wide ground indicated.

Initiatives undertaken by classical and modern revisionist parties continue to have more participants than those undertaken by parties that adhere to Marxism-Leninism-Maoism or to Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism. The Socialist International of the social-democrats is still formally the largest. Zhuganov of the Communist Party of the Russian Federation is reported to be trying to organize his revisionist international.

It is pointless to try beating these pseudo-Left international formations by putting together a hodgepodge of Marxist-Leninist and revisionist parties and calling it the unity of the international communist movement. Once upon a time the Soviet social-imperialists boasted of having the largest international formation of communist and workers' parties. What has become of that formation?

In view of the decades of betrayal by the Soviet party and then by the Chinese party, it is understandable why there are but a few genuine Marxist-Leninist-Maoist parties in the meantime. Though currently small in number, the genuine communist parties have the quality and potential to increase their number and strength in the long course of the world proletarian revolution.

Right now, international groupings and gatherings which are based on the broad political ground of anti-imperialist solidarity get a far bigger number of participants, including parties, movements and mass organizations, than any ideologically defined grouping or gathering of parties and pre-party formations.

The Marxist-Leninist-Maoist parties can extend their reach through broad anti-imperialist gatherings. The Marxist-Leninist-Maoist ideological position requires the use of political struggle and the international united front to arouse, organize and mobilize the broad masses of the people.

In ideological gatherings of Marxist-Leninist-Maoist parties or in broad gatherings of anti-imperialist forces, there must be respect for the independence and equality of the participants. Coordination and arriving at resolutions must not be governed by democratic centralism or by some majority rule but by consensus of independent and equal participants.

What is the balance of the different processes of armed struggle in the world?

Revolutionary armed struggles led by the proletariat, as in the Philippines and Peru, are still small in number. But they play an inspiring and decisive role in upholding the revolutionary essence of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism in theoretical and practical terms.

They carry the torch to light the revolutionary way for the

proletariat and people of the entire world. They stand out against the revisionism or opportunism, the neocolonial compromises and capitulation that have betrayed the revolution in a number of countries.

For the time being, counterrevolutionary violence is more widespread in the world than revolutionary violence. Most of the violence today consists of one-sided brutal attacks of the imperialists and the local reactionaries on the people and internecine warfare among the reactionaries themselves. Interimperialist war also looms ahead. The new world disorder is the eve of the new upsurge of armed revolution.

What do you think of guerrillas who negotiate the revolution through peace dialogues and agreements?

When principal leaders of the Communist Party of the Philippines were arrested in the '70s, the Marcos fascist regime offered negotiations for "national unity and reconciliation". It offered the release of political prisoners, the legalization of the CPP and large amounts of money for "rehabilitation" in exchange for capitulation and ending the armed struggle. The CPP has consistently refused that kind of negotiations and agreement.

I think that the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Peru is correct in promptly upholding people's war and repudiating negotiations with the fascist Fujimori regime. It is the revolutionary leadership and the masses in the field that make the decisions. It is counterrevolutionary to consider stopping the people's war and capitulating to the enemy.

There are circumstances when revolutionary forces of whatever stage of development can and should negotiate and when they cannot and should not. To negotiate or not to negotiate should be decided by the determination and objective to further strengthen the armed revolution and never to stop it. Genuine revolutionaries never take the path of capitulation.

Negotiations and agreements can be correctly made in certain circumstances, like forging a truce and alliance with a smaller enemy to fight a bigger common enemy (e.g., CPC-KMT alliance against Japan), paving the way for a general offensive by effecting the withdrawal of a foreign aggressor and exchange of prisoners of war (e.g., Paris peace accord of 1972) and gaining points for the international recognition of the status of belligerency (e.g., the current negotiations of the National Democratic Front of the Philippines and the reactionary Manila government).

In the conduct of armed revolution, the united front policy must be used to take advantage of the splits among the reactionaries and to promote the armed revolution against the enemy. In this regard, negotiations and truce agreements are made with certain reactionaries in order to make the armed struggle more effective against the common enemy.

So far, the CPP has more experience in making temporary and unstable alliances with lesser reactionaries against bigger reactionaries than in negotiating with no less than the central

reactionary government for the purpose of gaining points for the recognition of the status of belligerency under international law. At any rate, the GRP-NDFP negotiations are bound by The Hague Joint Declaration of 1992, which prevents the Manila government from imposing its constitution on the NDFF.

Do the theses of Chairman Mao on bureaucrat capitalism, protracted people's war and the proletarian cultural revolution continue to be valid for you?

Yes, those theses of Mao remain valid. They were scientifically and socially proven in Mao's time. The evil consequences of negating those theses also verify their validity.

Protracted people's war is the invincible weapon of the people in semicolonial and semifeudal countries. This strategic line allows the proletariat to give the fullest play to its basic alliance with the peasantry in order to overthrow the enemy and install a people's democratic state.

Bureaucrat capitalism is characteristically the key force of the comprador big bourgeoisie in semicolonial and semifeudal

countries. After the new-democratic revolution is completed and when the socialist revolution is going on, failure to grasp class struggle as the key link can lead to the emergence of bureaucrat capitalism on the basis of a petty-bourgeoisified bureaucracy and intelligentsia and under the influence of the international bourgeoisie.

The basic principles and methods put forward in the theory of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship and in the practice of the great proletarian cultural revolution have been proven correct by the proletarian revolutionary forces and people in Mao's time as well as by the subsequent revisionist betrayal and capitalist restoration in the post-Mao period.

End of interview

Published by Committee Sol Peru - London

Press Commission

Committee Sol Peru is a member of the World Mobilisation Commission (WMC) to Defend the Revolution in Peru

On Monopoly Capitalist 'Globalization'

Excerpts From:

**On Monopoly Capitalist 'Globalization' —
Contribution of the Communist Party of the
Philippines to the 5th Conference of the
International Conference of Marxist-Leninist
Parties and Organizations (ICMLPO)
September 29, 1996**

Capitalism has been globalizing since the 16th century. In the manufacturing stage of capitalism, colonialism was a major part of the primitive accumulation of capital in addition to the exploitation of the proletariat and the peasants in Europe.

In their critique of capitalism, Marx and Engels saw the implications and consequences of colonialism and free trade in the period of free competition capitalism, when the industrial revolution was in progress and the bourgeoisie was wielding more political power than ever before. In fact, the propagandists of the neoliberal Right retrogressively pick up their liberal slogans from earlier centuries.

Towards the end of the 19th century, competition and the commercial crises led to concentration of capital and monopoly as the dominant force in the industrial capitalist countries. Industrial capital merged with bank capital to accelerate the

growth of capitalism as never before. The export of surplus capital gained crucial importance over the export of surplus commodities thus making the role of finance capital decisive. International combines of monopolies (cartels, syndicates and so on) arose. By the start of the 20th century, monopoly capitalism or modern imperialism had completely divided the world. Outside the imperialist countries, territories were divided into colonies, semicolonies and dependent countries.

Monopoly capitalism and the crisis of overproduction drove the imperialist powers to combine against each other in order to redivide the world and wage war. The first general crisis of monopoly capitalism led to World War I and the establishment of the first socialist country. The second general crisis of monopoly capitalism was even more severe. It led to World War II and to the rise of several socialist countries and the great wave of national liberation movements.

The third general crisis of monopoly capitalism did not result in any global war among the imperialist powers. The Cold War, which started out as the struggle between the capitalist camp and the socialist camp, eventually became a struggle between the imperialist alliance headed by the United States and Soviet social-imperialism. The revisionist rule and restoration of capitalism in the Soviet bloc countries since 1956 served to undermine the world proletarian revolution as

the two superpowers colluded against the interests of the world proletariat and people while they engaged in neocolonial competition.

Up to the middle of the '70s, however, the cause of world proletarian revolution advanced, especially through the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, the victory of the Indochinese revolution, and the perceivable strategic decline of US imperialism, despite the Soviet revisionist betrayal. But eventually, the traditional imperialist powers prevailed by integrating the revisionist-ruled countries, including China, and defeating the revisionist-ruled bureaucrat monopoly capitalism in the Soviet Union. The situation today is comparable to the early years of the 20th century before World War I. There is a unified world capitalist economy in the sense that no socialist country poses any serious challenge to the capitalist system. At the same time, this world economy has been divided among the traditional imperialist powers. But driven by monopoly competition and the crisis of overproduction, they strain to redivide the world, notwithstanding all their efforts to unify against the world proletariat and the people.

So far, monopoly capitalism has not made any fundamental departure from the five features of imperialism as defined by Lenin. We are still in the era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution. This is especially because imperialism has warded off the challenge of socialism and national liberation movements in the wake of World War II. It has done so by using military power, finance capital and neocolonialism and by taking

New edition of Philippine Society and Revolution

"Integrating Marxist-Leninist theory with Philippine practice is a two-way process. We do not merely take advantage of the victories achieved abroad so that we may succeed in our own revolution. But we also hope to add our own victory to those of others and make some worthwhile contribution to the advancement of Marxism-Leninism and the world proletarian revolution so that in the end mankind will be freed from the scourge of imperialism and enter the era of communism"

—Amado Guerrero

MIM hails the publication of the new edition of *Philippine Society and Revolution* by Amado Guerrero. This book is essential reading for people interested in understanding the basic principles of the national-democratic revolution in the Philippines. *Philippine Society and Revolution* is also a shining example of concretely applying the correct principles of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism to the specific characteristics of a society in a living way. MIM highly recommends this book to all of its readers and commends the Philippine Information Network Service for its work in getting the book re-published.

Armado Guerro (the *nom de guerre* of Jose Maria Sison, founding chairperson of the Communist Party of the Philippines) wrote *Philippine Society and Revolution* in 1970. The book presents the main strands of Philippine history and the basic problems facing the Filipino people today: feudalism, bureaucrat capitalism, and imperialism. The book also presents the basic tasks of the people's revolution, emphasizing 1) the leadership of the Communist Party and the struggle against modern revisionism, 2) protracted people's war and Chairman Mao's strategic line of encircling the cities from the countryside, and 3) the revolutionary united front.

This new edition also includes "Specific Characteristics of our People's War, Our Urgent Tasks," and several contemporary

articles by Jose Maria Sison. The first two works were written in the 1970s and expand the fundamental analysis of *Philippine Society and Revolution*, summing up the first few years of political organizing and armed struggle. The contemporary articles show that the basic analysis of *Philippine Society and Revolution* apply today — the Philippines is still semi-colonial and semi-feudal, and protracted people's war and the eventual development of socialism are still the keys to true national liberation.

In the late 80s and early 90s, "left" and right opportunist forces sought to derail the revolutionary movement by changing the basic analyses and perspective of the movement. The Second Great Rectification Campaign, launched in 1992, largely succeeded in reaffirming the guiding principles laid out in documents such as *Philippine Society and Revolution*. The publication of a new edition of *Philippine Society and Revolution* will help to thoroughly defeat the "left" and right opportunist lines and ensure that the revolutionary movement remains on the correct path.

Revolutionaries here inside American borders can learn several lessons from *Philippine Society and Revolution*. On the one hand, we can increase our knowledge of the specific characteristics of the Philippine situation and better expose and combat the crimes of American imperialism in the Philippines. On the other, *Philippine Society and Revolution* provides us with an excellent introduction to some of the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, and serves as an inspiration to us to take these principles and apply them to the concrete conditions here. Ultimately, we can best serve the revolutionary movement in the Philippines and all other societies by making revolution here.

The new edition of *Philippine Society and Revolution* is available from MIM for \$20. Write to MIM Distributors, PO Box 29670, Los Angeles, CA, 90029-0670.

advantage of the revisionist betrayal and capitalist restoration in the Soviet Union since 1956.

Since a long time ago, capitalism in the pursuit of profit has shrunk the globe by bombarding the backward countries with surplus commodities and surplus capital. It has been driven to do so by its own laws of motion, the class struggle between the bourgeoisie and proletariat, the struggle between the imperialists and oppressed peoples and nations and inter-imperialist contradictions. To free themselves effectively from the clutches of monopoly capitalism, the world proletariat and people have no choice but to wage class struggle and armed revolution in order to establish the proletarian dictatorship or the people's democratic dictatorship, as the case may be.

Interimperialist contradictions impelled the rapid scientific and technological advances during World War II and the Cold War. The use of nuclear, electronic and other new technologies in social production by the traditional imperialist powers was a major factor in the victory over Soviet bureaucrat monopoly capitalism, which had rushed headlong into the arms race and failed to renovate civil production and to compete in the production and marketing of new consumer products. Now, high technology is more than ever accelerating the crisis of monopoly capitalism and the intensification of the basic contradictions of the world capitalist system. Among the winning imperialists, the higher social character of high-tech production comes into a more severe contradiction with the greedier methods of private appropriation under the global monopoly capitalist policy of neoliberalism. The recrudescence of liberal jargon cannot change the nature of imperialism and its dire consequences to the world's proletariat and people.

I. THE TERM AND CONCEPT OF GLOBALIZATION

As used by the big bourgeoisie and its petty-bourgeois followers, "globalization" is a supraclass, supranational and universalist process of irresistible all-round homogenization of the world under the auspices of monopoly capitalism, through the multilateral agencies (United Nations (UN), International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank (WB)/IBRD and World Trade Organization (WTO)) and the multinational or transnational firms and banks.

It seeks to deny Lenin's theory of uneven development, his description of the current era as that of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution, the class struggle and the need for proletarian dictatorship in imperialist countries, the oppression of peoples and nations by imperialist states and foreign monopolies, and the need for the anti-imperialist revolutionary struggle under the leadership of the proletariat.

It seeks to obscure such basic contradictions in the world capitalist system as those between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, between the imperialists and the oppressed peoples and nations and among the imperialists and monopoly combines themselves. It seeks to deny the national and ultranation-

al character of the monopoly bourgeoisie and the need for establishing the proletarian dictatorship in specific countries. It is an idealist and reactionary concept for denying and glossing over the reality of imperialist states and exploiting classes, for exaggerating the unification of the industrial capitalist states and the monopolies, for metaphysically separating the imperialist states from the monopolies and then claiming that the latter decide on their own (without using their own states) the "development" or exploitation of the world.

Both petty-bourgeois exponents and critics of "globalization" agree on the same virtual reality that transnational corporations now rule the world independently of and more effectively than national states, as if there were no necessary connection between the monopolies and the national states as well as the imperialist-controlled multilateral agencies. They mystify "globalization", they browbeat and keep out of the discussion those who advocate anti-imperialist and class struggle and they limit the debate to one between outright pro-imperialism and reformism.

Marshall McLuhan (1962) first popularized the term "globalization", particularly in the use of his catchphrase "global village". He described the electronic means of instant global communications as changing the content of modern culture. Indeed, with the further development of modern communications and transport, the imperialists would gain another advantage and weapon for further seizing economic, political and cultural initiative and determining the trends of thought and entertainment in the world against their revolutionary opponents as well as their social-imperialist rival.

In the '60s and '70s, petty-bourgeois minded academics were encouraged with research grants to undermine or put aside Marxist-Leninist theory with pseudo-Marxist theorizing about the nature of the world capitalist system. Their ideas about the "post-industrial society" and "development" were sidestreams to the growing "mainstream" debate of the Keynesians and monetarists in bourgeois society.

Immanuel Wallerstein (1974) came forward with his "world system" theory, conceptually dividing the world into a center or core of industrial capitalist countries and the periphery of underdeveloped countries but exaggerating the coherence of the world capitalist system to the point of glossing over the distinction of national modes of production. The theorists of "dependent capitalism" played along with their own nuances on the unification of the world and dichotomy into metropolis and dependent countries. They slurred over the real differences between the far more numerous semifeudal countries and the fewer dependent capitalist countries and conceptually dissolved the former.

Petty-bourgeois technocrats in UN agencies, academics in the UN university system, bourgeois institutes of development, imperialist state agencies, neoconservative think tanks and the Munich-based Max Planck Institute orchestrated the propaga-

tion of the neo-Kautskyite notion that monopoly capitalism is benign, even if painful, criticizable and therefore reformable, because it supposedly breaks down precapitalist formations and opens the way to capitalist development and free market economies. In the '70s, the multinational corporations (MNCs) were quick to adopt "globalization" as a shibboleth and marketing strategy. They saw the combination of culture and market as the way to maximize the global sales of products through global advertising, exemplified by Coca Cola offering the image of an assembly of people of all nations singing in "perfect harmony".

While the Soviet social-imperialists competed with the US imperialists in neocolonialism and military interventions and prated about "noncapitalist development", China's Deng revisionist clique whipped up the Kautskyite "theory of productive forces" and pushed big comprador modernization by carrying out capitalist-oriented reforms and integrating China into the world capitalist system as a "developing" country.

The nationalization of oil production in OPEC countries and the demand of third world countries for a new international economic order were undercut by imperialist control of the global market and overloading of the neocolonial client states with loans to induce infrastructure building, an overproduction of raw materials, higher military spending, conspicuous consumption and bureaucratic corruption.

Since the '80s, the bourgeois economists have been celebrating as the most important feature of globalization the dismantling of national barriers to the operation of capital markets. Simultaneous dealing in the main markets of New York, London, Tokyo and Frankfurt is supposed to be beyond the control of any one national agency even as in fact the stocks and bonds traded are still mainly and characteristically those of the national shareholders, firms and governments in the country of the capital market. So far, without losing their national basing and instrumentation of their states, the monopolies have "globalized" most such aspects as finance capital, trade and the use of high-tech communications rather than productive capital. There is no such thing as the limitless internationalization of the capitalist mode of production as to dissolve the far more numerous semifeudal economies and the lesser number of dependent capitalist economies and the so-called newly-industrializing economies.

Reaganism and Thatcherism, the rise of monetarism, neoliberalism and the drive for privatization and deregulation, the collapse of revisionist-ruled states and the rampage of neocolonialism have meant the unification of the monopoly capitalists against the proletariat and oppressed peoples and nations, without eliminating nationality and monopoly competition among imperialists themselves.

Such instruments of capitalist "globalization" as the monopoly corporations and banks have not lost their national character (if one examines the main nationality of the investors

and the special advantages taken from their respective states). Multilateral agencies like the UN, IMF, WB, WTO, OECD, Group of 7, Group of 24 and so on involve the individual participation and combinations of imperialist states, according to their relative strengths, at the expense of a majority of states.

Both the illusion and some real degree of the unification and homogenization of the monopoly capitalists and the world capitalist system to the extent that there has yet been no inter-imperialist war, except the real localized and regional "proxy" wars between one imperialist and another social-imperialist power during the Cold War, have been the consequence of the US-led capitalist alliance since the end of World War II against several socialist countries and the great wave of national liberation movements.

To allow the expansion of capital, restrain interimperialist contradictions and defeat the socialist challenge in a constricted world market, the monopoly capitalists have used state monopoly capitalism to muster resources and create outlets for surplus capital in the reconstruction of war-ravaged capitalist economies, military research and development, the arms race, the competition in space exploration, suburbia and the car culture, the production of new consumer goods, neocolonialism and the penetration of the bureaucrat capitalist regimes.

In the wake of capitalist restoration in China and the collapse of the earlier revisionist-ruled states and economies in the Soviet bloc, the basic contradictions in the world capitalist system are exposed and intensified because the winning capitalist powers are now weighed down by both the costs of winning the Cold War and the ever pressing crisis of overproduction, which is accelerated by high technology for private profit and the self-defeating ravages of finance capital and neocolonialism. The costs of winning the Cold War include the colossal deficit-spending of the United States for the arms race and accommodating the exports of its allies for so many decades, the strengthening of capitalist allies which have become competitors, and the widescale neocolonial destruction of productive forces in most countries. The counterproductive character of neocolonialism is the result of imperialist financing for the overproduction of raw materials and some manufactures for the consumption of the capitalist countries and the upper classes in the underdeveloped countries since the '70s.

Even as the slogans of free market economies and free trade are ringing loud, the US, the European Union and Japan are scrambling to consolidate their respective national and regional markets and penetrate each other's secure markets.

Under the global regime of privatization, deregulation and free trade, the former Soviet bloc countries, China and India should be huge additions to the world capitalist system as fields for all sorts of investments and as markets. But the main thrust of the multinational firms is to take over profitable enterprises, dump their surplus products and speculative capital on these countries, undermine and close down national

industries without replacing them and prioritize in a few low-wage countries export-oriented sweatshop manufacturing which is now overproducing the consumer goods for the industrial capitalist countries.

The basic point to keep in mind about high technology for private profit is that it has an unprecedentedly high social character (so many units for society at so small a labor cost per unit) but the capitalist relations of production involve an unprecedentedly rapacious method of private appropriation.

Taking advantage of its lead in research and development and possession of property rights over high-tech processes, the US has been renovating its equipment, overproducing high-tech goods for production and consumption and unsettling the balance of its relations with the other industrial capitalist countries. The United States is now notorious for its bullying tactics in trying to break the Japanese market wide open for US products and to reduce or take back previous market accommodations to Japan in the Asia-Pacific.

The United States raises its own productive capacity for export and at the same time directly subordinates Japan through bilateral agreements on investments, trade, finance, technology, energy sourcing and security. It has the NAFTA as a regional market. And in East Asia, it puts Japan and other countries within the framework of US hegemony through the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC). While the US and Japan compete, they unite at the expense of other countries and the world proletariat and people.

It is only the low end of high technology, such as nonproductive manufacturing equipment and consumer goods, that is being brought to only a few underdeveloped countries and the "newly-industrializing economies." The high end of high technology or the know-how and equipment to produce high-tech equipment are held tightly by the few industrial capitalist countries.

The kind of equipment and processes that is brought to the underdeveloped countries of East Asia and elsewhere involve mainly the use of cheap labor for the reassembly of parts to make such consumer goods as electronic gadgets, clothes, toys, shoes and the like for the industrial capitalist countries as well as for a small portion (not more than 10 percent) of the local population.

However, in most of the underdeveloped countries where the low end of high technology does not reach, production with the use of older equipment becomes uncompetitive in the world capitalist market. There is today a widespread closure of old plants without any replacement. The overproduction of goods in a few "newly-industrializing economies" and underdeveloped countries crushes the production of goods by older equipment in a far greater number of underdeveloped countries.

International finance for the so-called emerging markets is used to stimulate the production and sale of consumer goods of

the multinational companies and to cover the debt service burden and the current budgetary and trade deficits of particular countries. A worse form of finance capitalism has arisen as a result of a series of IMF-WB structural adjustment programs (SAP). The amount of loan capital available for infrastructure building and stimulation of raw material production has decreased. But more than a trillion dollars of speculative capital move daily to finance consumerism, debt service, deficits and privatization of public assets. Ninety percent of the investments moving about daily are in the form of speculative portfolio investments and are concentrated in the United States, European Union and Japan.

In a social and cultural sense, "globalization" is nothing but a new fancy term for the old darned bourgeois cosmopolitanism that is so contemptuous of proletarian internationalism and the anti-imperialist solidarity of the peoples of the world. Like the petty bourgeois-minded academic pedants of the '60s and onward, the present-day petty-bourgeois camp followers of the big bourgeoisie, whose babbling numbers have increased in academia and NGOs due to official adoption and funding by imperialist agencies, love to spring the term "globalization" in a vain attempt to confound others and declare as "outdated" the Marxist-Leninists and anti-imperialists. To pass themselves off as progressive, they criticize to some extent the multilateral agencies of imperialism and the multinational firms and banks but they use the technocratic concepts and pseudoliberal language of the imperialists, the UN and bourgeois institutions and merely advocate some reforms within the world capitalist system.

In academic gibberish, they present themselves as "post-modern", departing from the abstractions of "modernism" and returning to the human shape in the form of "mass" or "pop" culture and "multiculturalism" or more precisely the bourgeois assimilation of folk culture in response to the criticism of "globalization" as cultural imperialism.

The petty-bourgeois camp followers, who parade under the signboard of "globalization", speak in the high-flown "classless", "supraclass", "universalist" terms of having a sense of the common fate of humanity, of being supranationalist at the level of individual commitment to "globalist" values and of engaging in social movements without class and national commitments, especially in such issues as environment, gender, ethnicity and the like, which they misappropriate for their anticommunist and pro-imperialist purposes.

In both industrialized capitalist countries and underdeveloped countries, monopoly capitalism has systematically and cleverly used the petty-bourgeois mentality to separate the white collars from the blue collars as well as the higher stratum of the blue collars from the lower strata and pave the way for the acceptance of the undiluted ideas of the big bourgeoisie.

The petty-bourgeois mentality has also been used to pene-

trate the working class movement and to subvert socialist societies and pave the way for the revision of the basic principles of scientific socialism, the coming to power of revisionist cliques and the emergence of bureaucrat monopoly capitalism.

Petty-bourgeois ideology and sentiments have been so well developed in bourgeois academic institutions and so well publicized by high-tech mass media in support of monopoly capitalism that the bourgeois concept of "globalization" has seeped into some parties that try to take the working class stand. The so-called information superhighway is littered with a great deal of trash. It is in fact a disinformation superhighway dispensing a glut of disinformation in the service of monopoly capitalism. The concept of "globalization" is inducing certain wrong notions such as the following:

1. That Lenin's era of imperialism and proletarian revolution belongs to the past and that neocolonialism is a post-imperialist phenomenon.

2. That Kautsky is after all correct with his theory of ultra-imperialism, contradicting Lenin's theory of uneven capitalist development and misrepresenting imperialism as a unified benign force that breaks down precapitalist formations and brings about industrial capitalist development and the growth of the working class on a global scale.

3. That the study of the Marxist-Leninist theory of state and revolution, class struggle and proletarian dictatorship can be put in the backburner to give priority to higher but purely economic demands (e.g. equal pay for equal work the world over) as the main preparation for the world proletarian revolution, instead of the burning issues (e.g. the current reality of rising mass unemployment and deteriorating wage and living conditions) that immediately make the class struggle a political struggle.

4. That the new-democratic revolution led by the proletariat in the underdeveloped countries cannot be but bourgeois-nationalist if it cannot await a new wave of socialist revolutions in the imperialist countries.

5. That the world proletarian revolution can only be the result of a simplified struggle between a globally unified monopoly bourgeoisie and the world proletariat and that the total collapse of that unified imperialism is impending despite the current state of the subjective forces of the revolution in the world.

II. FACTS ABOUT MONOPOLY CAPITALISM

The United Nations Commission on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) has been an outstanding propagandist of the line that transnational corporations (TNCs) have been internationalizing the capitalist mode of production to the extent that these entities have been doing away with their national basing and that these have little or no more national basing.

It preaches the following: "Enabled by increasingly liberal

policy frameworks, made possible by technological advances, and driven by competition, globalization more and more shapes today's world economy. Foreign direct investments by transnational corporations (TNCs) now play a major role in linking many national economies, building an integrated international productive system as the productive core of the globalizing world economy."

In the World Investment Report of 1995, where the above quotation appears, the UNCTAD unwittingly belies its own panegyric for the TNCs with the statistical data it provides. TNCs are exceedingly few in comparison to multinational corporations (MNCs). The overwhelming majority of monopoly firms that conduct international business are nationally based and are controlled by national shareholders. They practically carry national flags as they consolidate their control over their own national and regional markets and try to penetrate the markets of others.

They invest and trade multinationally but the large majority of their assets and sales are in their home countries. According to a 1993 listing of Fortune Global, only 18 of the 100 largest companies kept the majority of their assets abroad. Shareholdings are even more limited to nationals, especially because the underdeveloped host countries of subsidiaries succumb to the economic and political pressures of the imperialist states and allow nationals of a foreign country to own up to 100 percent of the subsidiary firm. It is also a myth that management is being internationalized. Only 2.1 percent of the board members of the top 500 US companies are foreign nationals.

All monopoly firms benefit from the industrial, financial, trade and security policies of their own states. Many of them are beneficiaries of contracts, export incentives, investment insurance and financial bailouts provided by their governments. State monopoly capitalism provides so many kinds of incentives to the monopoly firms. Most research and development are undertaken at home, often with state assistance. Imperialist states and monopoly firms of various states are increasingly engaged in industrial and economic intelligence and counterintelligence against each other.

According to UNCTAD's own index of transnationality, based on shares of foreign assets, foreign sales and foreign employment, the top 100 MNCs reduced their foreign activities because of depressed conditions in most underdeveloped countries. These activities include production and speculation.

Far from creating an international capitalist mode of production or an "integrated production system" on a global scale, the MNCs are reinforcing the economic domination of the world by a small minority of imperialist countries, are destroying national industries of other countries without replacing them with new productive assets and are making more grossly uneven the development of the world. They jealously guard and keep their basic technology and core processes in their

own countries and concentrate the low-end of high technology on some 10 countries in the world, where they avail of cheap labor in sweatshops that can be easily relocated as soon as the wage level rises. Rather than the TNCs, the MNCs are the principal instrument of the imperialist countries for competing with each other and redividing the world.

There is a growing surge of finance capital, especially in the form of speculative portfolio investments. This is pushed by recurrent recessions and stagnation in the industrial capitalist countries and by the economic devastation of the third world and the former Soviet bloc countries. Foreign direct investments (FDI) have increased five times faster than the value of trade and ten times faster than the value of world output since 1983, according to David Yaffe, who provides further data below.

From 1991 to 1993, global FDI stocks increased about twice as fast as global exports and three times as fast as global GDP. In 1995, the FDI of MNCs stood at around USD 230 billion. But it generated a global FDI stock of USD 2.6 trillion and global sales of foreign affiliates at USD 5.2 trillion and up to USD 7 trillion, including the subcontractors, franchise holders and licensees. The financial bloat is unprecedentedly large in the entire world history of capitalism.

Investment stocks and flows inward and outward are concentrated in the three global centers of capitalism, the United States, Japan and the European Union and their regional trading partners. Seventy per cent of the outflows from the imperialist countries (60-65 percent of global flows) comes from only 5 countries: US, Japan, Germany, France and the United Kingdom. Recently, the US has recovered the lead in FDI, accounting for one-quarter of the global stock and one-fifth of global flows.

FDI outflows from the third world economies are merely 10 percent of global FDI outflows in 1994 and come from a small number of so-called newly-industrializing economies (NIEs), mainly in East Asia, with Hongkong alone accounting for 64 per cent of the total. The outward investment involves moving labor-intensive activities to lower-wage countries in the same region. Only 6 percent of FDI outward stock is accounted for by third world economies, even as their share of global exports and global GDP are 23 and 21 percent, respectively.

FDI outflows from the imperialist countries into the third world countries increased from USD 35 billion in 1990 to USD 84 billion in 1994 and about USD 90 billion in 1995. Seventy-five percent of the inflows into third world countries went to only 10 countries in 1993, with China taking 37 percent of the total.

FDI stock of the imperialist countries abroad was also highly concentrated, with 67 percent going to only 10 countries. Asia accounted for 70 percent of total flows into the third world in 1994. Latin America received 24 percent, with

Mexico and Venezuela taking 71 percent of this. Africa got a measly 4 percent of the total flow into the third world. Thus, it continues to be the most abandoned continent, with FDI flowing mainly to oil-producing countries.

Central and Eastern Europe received USD 6.3 billion of FDI from the imperialist countries in 1994. The amount has been used mainly for taking over profitable enterprises and facilitating the dumping of surplus goods overproduced by the imperialist countries.

To demonstrate the worsening uneven development of the capitalist world, let us consider FDI in terms of its distribution among the world's population. The United States, Japan and European Union have only 14 percent of the world's population but have 75 percent of the total of global FDI flows.

If we add the population of China's coastal regions, into which flows the biggest part of the FDI from the imperialist countries, then only 28 percent of the world's population get 91.5 percent of FDI. Between 57 and 72 percent of the world's population receive only 8.5 percent of total global FDI. What integrated production system is UNCTAD babbling about? The promotion of export-oriented manufacturing in China's coastal regions as well as all the consumption-driven and import-dependent economic activities undertaken by the MNCs and the Chinese new bourgeoisie have undermined the comprehensive industrial foundation built under socialism and Mao. The heavy and basic industries under bureaucrat capitalist management are being bankrupted, breaking down, being opened to privatization or being closed down.

There are about 40,000 MNCs with 250,000 foreign affiliates today. The largest 100 MNCs (excluding those in banking and finance) have about USD 3.7 trillion of global assets, with USD 1.3 trillion outside their home countries. They account for a third of the combined FDI stock of their countries.

The world's 500 largest industrial corporations employ 0.05 percent of the world's population and control 25 percent of the world's economic output. A mere 1 percent of all MNCs own half of the global stock of FDI. Two-thirds of world trade is controlled by MNCs, with half of this or USD 1.3 trillion exports being intra-firm trade between MNCs and their affiliates. USD 4 out of USD 5 received for goods and services sold abroad by US MNCs are actually earned from goods and services produced by their foreign affiliates or sold to them. The goods are processed with cheap labor abroad.

The top five MNCs control nearly 70 percent of the global market for consumer durables. So do the top five firms in automotive, airline, aerospace, electrical components, electronics and steel industries control more than 50 percent of output. The top five MNCs in oil, personal computer and media industry account for more than 40 percent of global sales. The foreign affiliates of 23 MNCs account for 80 percent of the total world sales in electronics. Seventy to 80 percent of global research and development (R&D) expenditures and 80 to 90

percent of technology payments are within the confines of the MNCs.

Most FDI flowing into the imperialist countries do not involve new productive investments but mere speculation, ownership switching and busting of unions through mergers, acquisitions and privatizations. Ninety percent of the value of the FDI going to the US in 1993 was for acquisitions of existing companies. In the case of outward FDI from the US, the ratio of the number of new establishment to acquisitions was 0.96 in other imperialist countries and 1.8 in third world countries.

The FDI flowing from the MNCs to third world countries was only 7 percent of the domestic investment of these countries in 1993. The 10 countries where this FDI is concentrated are attractive to the MNCs for various reasons: high rates of profit, access to large markets, relatively good infrastructure, cheap labor, deregulated economy, security guarantees, repression of the working people and no requirements of environmental protection.

The rate of return to US FDI in third world countries in 1993 was officially at 16.8 percent, nearly twice the level in imperialist countries at 8.7 percent. The rate of return is actually far higher in third world countries, if we take into account transfer-pricing (overpricing imports and underpricing exports by MNCs in host countries). Under third world conditions of deteriorating terms of trade, debt servitude and policy subservience, the depreciation of labor power and tax avoidance are easily done.

Export-oriented manufacturing has been shifted by the MNCs to some countries in the third world and Eastern Europe because the cost of labor is low. Labor power can be as low as USD 1 per day in China compared to USD 31 per hour in Japan. Average labor cost in Eastern Europe is USD 1.50 per hour, while it is USD 26 in Germany. It is USD 5 per day in Mexico, while it is USD 16.17 per hour in the US.

UNCTAD and the MNCs expect that the FDI flows into the third world and East European countries can generate industrial development and a middle class as a consumer market even without the establishment of heavy and basic industries and in fact with the destruction of national industries. But what they miss is the growing overproduction in export-oriented manufacturing whose products are destined mainly for the imperialist countries. The overproduction of textile and apparel has been conspicuously worsening in China and the rest of East Asia since 1994. Likewise, the glut in the reassembly of electronic products is increasingly showing.

The sweatshops of China and the rest of East Asia are bound to be in trouble as the US expands the same type of operations in Mexico within the NAFTA framework, especially after the fall of the Mexican peso. This has made Mexican labor far cheaper than before. The crisis of overproduction in the imperialist countries results in mass unemployment and a

reduced market for the exports of the South and the East, where more and more countries are enticed to overproduce consumer goods for the imperialist countries. Previously devastated by the crisis of overproduction in raw material since the '70s, most of the third world countries are debt-ridden, depressed and impoverished. Now the tigers and kittens among them in export-oriented manufacturing are in for the crisis of overproduction in consumer manufactures for the imperialist countries. This coincides with the crisis of overproduction in high-tech and other goods in the imperialist countries.

The current rapid expansion of production and foreign trade, followed by crisis, is similar to that in the period before World War II. FDI stock was 9 percent of world output in 1913, while it was 8.5 percent in 1991. But far more unsettling to the world capitalist system now is the flow of USD 1.23 trillion a day through the foreign exchange system as investment firms and MNCs are increasingly drawn to speculation and sheer finance capital operations.

Third world debt, now at more than USD 1.8 trillion, continues to rise despite the resort to rapid local public borrowing, attraction of speculative portfolio investments, privatization of public assets and rising levels of taxation, if only to cover trade and budgetary deficits. The former Soviet bloc countries in general are afflicted with conditions similar to those of the third world countries. They are economically depressed and are weighed down by rising deficits and debt burden.

The global market for the imperialist countries is shrinking and giving rise to more intense competition among the imperialist countries. Despite the WTO, the imperialist countries gear themselves up for trade wars by consolidating national and regional markets and by trying to penetrate each other's markets. The interimperialist struggle to redivide the world is sharpening.

The development of the world capitalist system has become more grossly uneven than ever before. We should not see onesidedly only the integrative and constructive consequences of high technology in capitalist production for profit. It is absolutely necessary to see the disintegrative and destructive aspect. In fact, the destruction of productive forces is the main aspect adversely affecting all the imperialist countries and the underdeveloped countries, as a result of the concentration of high-tech production in a few imperialist countries, the rapid accumulation of capital there and the accelerated crisis of overproduction.

It is a basic law of monopoly capitalism that the expansion of productive capital in the world runs up to certain limits and goes into destruction of productive forces. The world capitalist system is now in the throes of a great spasm, which has already created a new world disorder.

III. PERSPECTIVE OF THE WORLD PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION

The scientific basis for the revolutionary optimism of the revolutionary forces of anti-imperialism and socialism is to be found in the accelerated contradiction between the forces and relations of production under capitalism.

Productivity has been raised so high by high technology and a far more educated and trained work force than ever before has arisen in the world. And yet the relations of production have become far more avaricious than ever before with the worst forms of finance capital and far more destructive than ever before to the forces of production. This fact is emphasized by the monopoly capitalist propagation of the dogma of neoliberalism. The irrationality of capitalism is seen most starkly in the unemployment and impoverishment of the people in the face of the stupendous amount of productivity available.

Computer technology is potentially a tool for socialist economic planning and obtaining the general and specific demands of the people. In the meantime, however, the imperialists use information technology for their own purposes in the mode of production and superstructure. The absurdity of capitalism is flagrant in the reign of imperialist and petty-bourgeois disinformation and miseducation with the use of powerful high-tech means of information and education. In due time, the class struggle between the bourgeoisie and proletariat will sharpen in the superstructure as the latter intensifies its resistance in all forms of social activity.

CONTRADICTIONS BETWEEN IMPERIALISM AND THE OPPRESSED PEOPLES AND NATIONS

Through the use of neocolonialism and wars of aggression, the imperialists have carried out the most bitter oppression and exploitation and the ruination of national economies in Asia, Africa and Latin America and in the former Soviet bloc countries in Eastern Europe and elsewhere. The new world disorder is currently on a rampage in the countries of the oppressed peoples and nations as a result of intensified exploitation under the banner of neoliberalism, privatization and free trade.

The intolerable economic dictates, blockades, intervention and aggression of the imperialist countries and the conflicts of reactionary cliques using the slogans of nationalism, ethnocentrism and religion are currently generating instability, tension and violence on a wide scale. There are revolutionary movements led by the revolutionary parties of the proletariat but are still few as a result of imperialist suppression, neocolonialism and revisionist betrayal. Even then the struggle between armed revolution and armed counterrevolution is focused on the countries of the oppressed peoples and nations. The world proletariat and people should cherish and support the armed revolutionary movements led by the proletariat because these are

the harbingers of the resurgence of the world proletarian revolution on an unprecedented scale.

CONTRADICTIONS AMONG THE IMPERIALISTS

Since the advent of Soviet monopoly bureaucrat capitalism in 1956, there had been a bitter interimperialist struggle between two superpowers even as the revisionists and social-imperialists misrepresented this as a struggle between capitalism and socialism during most of the run of the Cold War. In the wake of the collapse of the Soviet Union, the traditional capitalist powers headed by the United States have remade a world capitalist market without the challenge of a socialist productive system, and continue to be united against the revolutionary forces and the people. But they are increasingly competing and maneuvering against each other.

The expansion of capital from the traditional imperialist powers to China, the former Soviet bloc countries and other countries with some industrial foundation is aimed at the destruction of the national industries. The consequence is self-defeating for the imperialist countries because there is eventually a destruction of the market for their surplus capital and surplus goods. The global market becomes more constricted and becomes the ground for an increasingly intense and bitter competition among the imperialist powers.

But it will take some time for the worsening crisis of overproduction to sharpen the interimperialist contradictions to the point of breaking up the current alliance of imperialist countries and bring forth the imminent danger of interimperialist war. Local wars involving the intervention of the imperialists are on the rise. So far, the US has been able to use the authority of the UN Security Council or the name of the UN to expand its hegemonic interests, as in the war of aggression against Iraq in 1991 or at the least to come on top of interimperialist contradictions, as in Bosnia. The danger of a world war can arise not only from direct contradictions among the traditional imperialist powers due to competition and crisis that can bring forth counterrevolutionary nationalist and fascist movements but also due to the far more desperate situation of imperialist Russia which is driven to expand arms production and sales and is now prone to the rise of nationalism and military-led fascism. The foreign interventions of both principal and secondary imperialist powers can lead to collisions among them.

There is now neither an imminent interimperialist world war nor an impending total collapse of imperialism nor an unhindered and unlimited growth of industrial capitalism in the world. But there is more than enough disorder and instability to stimulate the emergence and development of revolutionary forces.

Marxist-Leninist resoluteness, militancy and a sense of protracted struggle are required of proletarian revolutionaries. Resistance is generated by the intolerable conditions of oppres-

sion and exploitation. Revolutionary mass struggles are rising in different parts of the world. The germinal formations of proletarian revolution must be prepared all over the world. In the foreseeable future, there can be a widespread and sustained upsurge of the broad anti-imperialist mass movement and socialist movement on an unprecedented scale. The new-democratic and socialist revolutions can be accomplished in specific countries under the leadership of specific revolutionary parties of the proletariat. It is probable for revolutions to occur in several countries at the same time because of the severity of the crisis on a world scale. But the revolution has to develop on the basis of the concrete conditions of a country and the proletarian dictatorship can arise only in each country.

The fundamental teachings of all the great communist thinkers and leaders retain their basic validity and will be upheld in the next round of new-democratic and socialist revolutions. There are ceaselessly new conditions to comprehend but there are also the qualitatively persistent conditions due to the continuing dominance of imperialism. We cannot presume that we are already in a post-imperialist situation. We continue to be in the era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution, especially because socialism was defeated in the Soviet Union in 1956 and further on in China in 1976 and because the full restoration of capitalism in these countries has undermined the comprehensive industrial foundation previously built by socialism.

Democratic & Socialist Revolutions in Colonial & Semicolonial Countries

Excerpts from:

Lenin & Stalin on the Relationship of Democratic & Socialist Revolutions in Colonial & Semicolonial Countries

By Jose Maria Sison

Founding Chairman

Communist Party of the Philippines

May 1997

Comrades and friends,

I wish to convey to all of you sincere greetings of solidarity on the occasion of this year's Brussels International Seminar, which is sponsored by the Workers' Party of Belgium and has as its theme the road of the October revolution, in advance celebration of the 80th anniversary of this great socialist revolution.

I thank the Workers' Party of Belgium for inviting me to participate in this seminar and to deliver the main report on Lenin and Stalin and on the relationship of the democratic and socialist revolution in colonies and semicolonies.

My presentation covers the teachings of Lenin on the two stages of the Russian revolution, the implementation of these teachings by Lenin and Stalin, the extension and further development of these in colonies and semicolonies, the violation of these by the modern revisionists and the continuing validity of

the Marxist-Leninist theory and practice of the two stages.

I. INTRODUCTION

Colonial and semicolonial countries have large survivals of feudalism. Thus, they are susceptible to imperialist domination. In countries where feudalism or semifeudalism reigns, there is categorically the need for a bourgeois-democratic revolution before there can be a socialist revolution. This is mainly in terms of taking into account the socioeconomic conditions in the revolutionary process and, as a matter of course, the antidemocratic character of the counterrevolutionary state.

Where there is a certain degree of industrial capitalist development as in the case of Germany during the time of Marx in 1856 or Russia during the time of Lenin in 1917 or due to imperialist domination as in the case of colonies and semicolonies, the industrial proletariat must forge an alliance with the peasantry to carry out an uninterrupted revolution from the stage of bourgeois-democratic revolution to that of socialist revolution.

At the end of the 1840's, Marx put forward the thesis of such an uninterrupted revolution in the "Address to the Communist League"; and subsequently pointed out the necessity of combining the peasant revolutionary movement with the proletarian revolution in a letter to Engels in 1856 by stating: "the whole thing in Germany will depend on the possibility of

backing the proletarian revolution, by some second edition of the Peasant War."

The foregoing ideas of Marx were not developed in the subsequent works of Marx and Engels. Neither did the theoreticians of the Second International and the West European social-democratic parties. They did their utmost to bury the ideas of Marx connecting the bourgeois-democratic revolution with the socialist revolution. They became obsessed with the Eurocentric notion of waiting for the industrial proletariat to become the majority of the population as the precondition to socialist revolution anywhere. They also took it for granted that after the bourgeois revolution the peasant masses would betray the revolution and a long "lull" of fifty or a hundred years would follow during which the proletariat would be "peacefully" and "lawfully" exploited by the bourgeoisie until the time came for the socialist revolution.

Lenin brought to light the forgotten ideas of Marx. He did not merely repeat them but developed them further. He molded them into a harmonious theory of socialist revolution by regarding the alliance of the proletariat with the peasantry and other semiproletarian elements of town and country as an indispensable factor of socialist revolution and as a condition for the victory of the proletarian revolution.

Lenin guided the Third Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Party in London in April 1905, to differentiate the Bolsheviks from the Mensheviks, on the basic tactics and line of class leadership of the proletariat in the bourgeois-democratic and socialist stages of the Russian revolution and the necessity of the worker-peasant alliance. In their own rump congress, the Mensheviks conceded to the bourgeoisie the class leadership in the bourgeois-democratic revolution and wanted the proletariat to be a mere appendage of the liberal bourgeoisie and a mere beggar of economic reforms in the course of the bourgeois-democratic revolution.

Subsequently, in June and July 1905, Lenin wrote *Two Tactics of Social Democracy in the Democratic Revolution* to clarify in a comprehensive, profound and thoroughgoing manner the bourgeois-democratic and socialist stages of the revolution and set forth the tactics of continuous proletarian class leadership through its revolutionary party, the alliance of the proletariat and the peasantry, the armed uprising for seizing political power, the provisional revolutionary government, the democratic dictatorship of the workers and peasants, the confiscation of land from the landlords and the realization of the 8-hour day and other immediate demands of the working class.

Stalin immediately and consistently followed the Leninist theory and tactics of revolution, with such works as: "Armed Insurrection and Our Tactics", "The Provisional Revolutionary

Government and Social Democracy" (1905), "Two Clashes," "The Present Situation and the Unity Congress of the Workers' Party" (1906), Preface to the Georgian edition of Karl Kautsky's Pamphlet, *The Driving Forces and Prospects of the Russian Revolution*" (February 1907).

II. THE PRECISION OF LENIN'S WORK

Lenin's *Two Tactics of Social Democracy in the Democratic Revolution* was precise in applying Marxism on the concrete conditions of Russia. It served as the programmatic guide of the Bolsheviks and the proletariat for the entire period from 1905 to their victory in the Great October Socialist Revolution in 1917.

Within that period, Russia could be correctly described in several ways. It was a military-feudal imperialist power, especially in relation to the many nationalities that it oppressed and exploited. It had a few industrial enclaves, surrounded by an ocean of feudalism and medievalism. It could produce industrial fuel and basic metals and chemicals but not machine tools and was therefore a weak capitalist country. It was a semi-colony of British, French and Belgian imperialism which provided the finance capital and capital equipment for the exploitation of the proletariat and the people.

The industrial proletariat was a minority of the population and could not make revolution of any kind without the alliance with the small peasantry and other semiproletarian masses who composed the overwhelming majority of the people. It could not aim for the socialist revolution without passing through the bourgeois-democratic revolution and without seizing the initiative and leadership of the revolution from the liberal bourgeoisie who acted as the agents of the big bourgeoisie and who courted the support of the peasantry. The wisdom of Lenin was to declare forthrightly that the proletariat was to seize the leadership of the bourgeois-democratic revolution so that this could pass on to the socialist revolution.

It was of decisive importance to define the basic tactics of the Bolsheviks and the proletariat because the Russian situation and the Russian revolution were complex and they were confronted with several types of opponents: the tsarist autocracy, the big bourgeoisie, the liberal bourgeoisie and the opportunists in the Russian Social-Democratic Party and the "socialist revolutionary" descendants of the Narodniks.

The tsarist autocracy, together with the landed aristocracy, blew hot and cold in countering the revolution, at one time pretending to make reforms and another time unabashedly escalating brutal reaction. The big bourgeoisie used the liberal bourgeoisie, the constitutional democrats, in an attempt to outwit the Bolsheviks and dupe the people with the proposal of a con-

stitutional monarchy and bourgeois-democratic reforms.

At the same time, there were the opportunists, the Mensheviks, who were avowedly for the overthrow of tsarism but who were open to compromise with the liberal bourgeoisie and who posed as Marxists but who wished the liberal bourgeoisie to lead the bourgeois-democratic revolution and make the proletariat its subsidiary. Further, there were the petty-bourgeois socialist revolutionaries, who advocated a populist nonclass kind of socialism and who were deeply hostile to the Bolsheviks and the proletariat.

While conducting ideological and political struggle against the Mensheviks, Lenin also resolutely conducted a parallel struggle against the opportunists and revisionists of other parties in the Second International on a comprehensive range of issues pertaining to imperialism and the proletarian revolution. He combated Kautsky's theory of "ultra imperialism" and the social-imperialist, social-chauvinist and social-pacifist position of the social-democratic parties, which collaborated with the blatantly bourgeois parties in supporting imperialism, increasing the war budget and the like.

The bankruptcy of the social democratic parties became exposed upon the outbreak of World War I. Lenin's description of imperialism as the eve of socialist revolution and his call to turn the imperialist war into a revolutionary civil war rang loud and clear. In 1916, he wrote *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* to consolidate his theory on imperialism and proletarian revolution. This work reinforced his *Two Tactics of Social Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*. Unfolding the theory of uneven development, he demonstrated that Russia was ripe for armed revolution for carrying out the consequent stages of bourgeois-democratic and socialist revolution, both under the leadership of the proletariat.

In the process of making the February bourgeois-democratic revolution of 1917, there was basically an objective alliance of different political forces determined to overthrow tsarism, especially after it became culpable for the catastrophic involvement of Russia in World War I. The situation became undoubtedly ripe for armed revolution. At the same time, there was a life-and-death contest for hegemony in the revolution between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie had the initiative of forming the provisional revolutionary government under Kerensky. But Lenin recognized that there was already dual power in Russia, involving the power in the hands of the Kerensky regime and the other in the hands of the soviets of workers, soldiers and peasants' deputies.

He upheld the independence of the revolutionary party of the proletariat and called for winning over the majority of the

soviets in order to make the bourgeois-democratic revolution pass on to the socialist revolution in October. The linkage of the soviets of workers' deputies with those of the soldiers' deputies under Bolshevik leadership meant the alliance of the proletariat and the peasantry because most of the soldiers were peasants. And when the Bolsheviks were able to win the majority of the soviets of peasant deputies, they were ready for the armed uprisings. The fate of the Kerensky regime was sealed.

With the slogan of bread and peace, the Bolsheviks were able to seize the initiative and galvanize the masses as the Kerensky regime made grievous mistakes arising from its bourgeois class nature and its puppetry to the Western imperialist powers that dictated the continued involvement of Russia in World War I. They resolutely and militantly led the proletariat and the people against such further involvement in the interimperialist war and against the threats posed by the diehard tsarist forces and the imperialists. They won political power by storming the urban centers of bourgeois political power.

Upon establishment of soviet power or the dictatorship of the proletariat, Lenin immediately issued a decree on nationalization of the land, involving the confiscation of land from the landlords for the benefit of the peasant masses. This was to complete the bourgeois-democratic revolution and to fulfill the longrunning peasant demand for land in keeping with the alliance of the working class and the peasantry. This also laid the ground for the subsequent victories of the Bolshevik in more extensive and intensive armed struggle.

The Bolsheviks were determined to withdraw Russia from the interimperialist war and proceeded to forge the Brest-Litovsk peace treaty with Germany in order to gain a breathing spell and consolidate the victory of the revolution. But the imperialists and the local reactionaries were hell-bent on recovering their lost power in Russia and launched the war of foreign military intervention and civil war, from 1918 to 1920.

The armed struggle was carried out mainly in the countryside. The Bolsheviks could win because of the basic tactic of worker-peasant alliance. The overwhelming support of the peasantry enabled the Bolshevik party and the Red Army to trounce the imperialists and the local reactionaries. In viewing the Russian revolution, it is incorrect to separate and isolate the urban armed uprisings from the subsequent armed struggle in the countryside.

After the war, the Bolsheviks had to restore the economy as soon as possible. To continue with "war communism" would be untenable and intolerable, especially to the peasantry from whom a tremendous amount of supplies had been requisitioned.

tioned for the war effort. Thus, Lenin put forward the New Economic Policy (NEP) as a transitory measure, giving concessions even to the rich peasants, small traders and entrepreneurs, from 1921 onward. At the same time, Bolsheviks continued to hold on to the commanding heights of the economy, the industries, the means of transport and communications, the banks and other major assets confiscated from the enemy.

After Lenin's death in 1924, Stalin assumed leadership of the Party, the state and the revolution. He comprehensively summed up and defended Leninism in his *Foundations of Leninism*, which was issued in the same year, against the anti-Leninist elements who had wished to take advantage of the illness and death of Lenin. This work defined Marxism-Leninism in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution.

He continued to implement the NEP. He fought and defeated Trotsky and his ilk who wished to terminate it prematurely. The objective of these "Left" opportunist scoundrels was to break up the worker-peasant alliance, subject the peasantry to intolerable exploitation and fulfill their prophecy that socialism in the Soviet Union was impossible.

From 1926 onward, Stalin vigorously pushed the line of socialist industrialization and from 1930 onward, the collectivization of agriculture in conjunction with socialist industry. He fought and defeated Bukharin and his Right opportunist ilk who wished to indefinitely prolong the temporary concessions given to the rural and urban bourgeoisie under the NEP. The Bolsheviks aroused, organized and mobilized the masses of small peasants against the rich peasants who carried out sabotage and other forms of violent resistance.

Under the leadership of Stalin, the worker-peasant alliance among the various nationalities in the Soviet Union was maintained through varied phases and in varied conditions. The workers in socialist industry needed the food and raw materials and the peasants in the collectives received in return the agricultural machinery, agrochemical and consumer manufactures from the workers. There was a dialectical and spiraling interaction of the two toiling classes in a series of five year plans which created a powerful socialist economic base and superstructure.

III. THE TWO STAGES IN THE COLONIES AND SEMICOLONIES IN THE EAST

In tracing the historical destiny of the doctrine of Karl Marx in 1913, Lenin marked three periods: the first, from the revolution of 1848 to the Paris Commune of 1871; the second, from the Paris Commune to the Russian Revolution of 1905, and the third, since the Russian revolution.

In the first period, the doctrine of Marx was proclaimed by

the Communist Manifesto. It started out as only one of the numerous trends of socialism. The revolutionary storms revealed the various classes in action and established the fact that the proletariat alone could lead the socialist revolution. Bourgeois society took shape. Liberalism was exposed as a tool of reaction. Pre-Marxian utopian trends of socialism were swept away. Independent proletarian parties were born: the First International (1864-72) and the German Social-Democratic Party.

In the second period (1872-1904), there were generally no revolutionary storms in the West inasmuch as in the main it had finished with bourgeois revolutions. Socialist parties, basically proletarian, were organized on a wide scale. The Marxian doctrine spread and was so predominant in the working class movement that liberalism tried to revitalize itself in the form of socialist opportunism.

In the third period, the East opened up in a big way as the source of great revolutionary storms. The bourgeois democratic revolutions in Russia, Turkey, Persia and China broke out one after another. And may I point out that the pioneer of the bourgeois-democratic revolutions in Asia was the Philippine revolution of 1896.

Lenin criticized the opportunists for singing without cease the praises of "social peace" and the nonnecessity of storms under "democracy" in the face of the revolutionary storms in Asia. He saw the Asian revolutions as revealing the spinelessness and baseness of liberalism and at the same time the sharp demarcation between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

At the same time, he saw the high cost of living and the oppression perpetrated by the trusts, engendering an intensification of the class struggle in Europe. He pointed to the feverish arming and the policy of imperialism turning the so-called social peace of Europe into a barrel of gunpowder more than anything else.

He recognized the growing importance of the East as the battlefield between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. He pointed out the potential dialectical interaction between the revolutionary movement in the East and that in the West. He was on the road of extending and further developing Marxism of 19th century free-competition capitalism to the stage of Leninism in the era of modern imperialism and proletarian revolution.

The opportunists and revisionists of the Second International acted as the social chauvinist and social pacifist tail of the direct parliamentary agents of the monopoly bourgeoisie in exploiting the proletariat in Europe, in raising war budgets and in encouraging imperialist policy and projects. Kautsky's theory of ultra-imperialism went so far as to pre-

sume that imperialism is benign and progressive because it is supposed to break down precapitalist formations and open the way to capitalist development and the growth of the proletariat in colonies and semicolonies.

Lenin categorically described imperialism as moribund capitalism and as the eve of socialist revolution. He put forward the theory of uneven development in order to demonstrate that imperialism involves the spasmodic and uneven expansion of capital and at the same time in a bigger way the destruction of productive forces in the wake of taking superprofits from the colonies, semicolonies and the dependent countries; and that where the oppression and exploitation is most intense on a wide scale revolutionary resistance arises. Thus, in addition to the slogan "workers of all countries, unite!", he issued the slogan for the oppressed peoples and nations to unite against imperialism and local reaction.

Under the theory of uneven development, Russia was the weakest link in the chain of imperialist countries and was where the proletarian revolution was most likely to win, provided the subjective forces were developed to take advantage of the ripening revolutionary situation. The economic and technological conditions in the stronger imperialist countries are more apt for socialism than those in the less-developed countries but their social and military power at home plus the superprofits taken from colonies and semicolonies provide the imperialists with more resources to preempt, crush or derail the proletarian revolution.

Lenin estimated that workers' uprisings in the West, especially in Germany would be helpful to the Russian revolution. But when these failed, he became even more determined to encourage the bourgeois-democratic revolutions in the East and place them within the framework of the world proletarian revolution. Thus, soon after the victory of the October revolution, he proceeded to form the Third International in 1919 in order to promote the building of proletarian revolutionary parties in both the imperialist countries and the dominated countries.

On the occasion of the first anniversary of the Third International at a meeting of the Moscow soviet in 1920, Lenin said,

"In the early period of the revolution many entertained the hope that the socialist revolution would begin in Western Europe immediately when the imperialist war ended; at the same time when the masses were armed there could have been a successful revolution in some of the Western countries as well. It could have taken place had it not been for the split within the proletariat of Western Europe being deeper and the treachery of the former socialist leaders

greater than had been imagined."

Lenin wrote the preliminary draft theses on the national and colonial questions and on the agrarian question for the Second Congress of the Communist International in 1920. At the Congress, he delivered the report on the national and colonial questions, where he made the following important points:

1. It is beyond doubt that any national movement can only be a bourgeois-democratic movement, since the overwhelming mass of the population in the backward countries consists of peasants who represent bourgeois-capitalist relations. It would be utopian to believe that proletarian parties in these backward countries, if indeed they can emerge from them, can pursue communist tactics and a communist policy, without establishing definite relations with the peasant movement and without giving it effective support.

2. It will readily be understood that peasants living in conditions of semifeudal dependence can easily assimilate and give effect to the idea of Soviet organization. It is also clear that the oppressed masses, those who are exploited, not only by merchant capital but also by the feudalists, and by a state based on feudalism, can apply this weapon, this type of organization, in their conditions too. The idea of Soviet organization is a simple one and is applicable, not only to proletarian, but also to peasant feudal and semifeudal relations.

3. The question was posed as follows: are we to consider as correct the assertion that the capitalist stage of economic development is inevitable for backward nations now on the road to emancipation and among whom a certain advance towards progress is to be seen since the war. We replied in the negative. If the victorious revolutionary proletariat conducts systematic propaganda among them, and the Soviet governments come to their aid with all the means at their disposal - in that event it will be erroneous to assume that the backward peoples must inevitably go through the capitalist stage of development.

Trotsky betrayed the Bolshevik revolution by stubbornly seeking to make it dependent on the workers' uprisings in Germany and in other imperialist countries, and by being contemptible of the oppressed nations and peoples, especially the peasantry in Russia and other backward countries and by failing to understand and attacking the theory and practice of the two-stage revolution.

Faithful to the legacy of Lenin, Stalin stood forthrightly for socialism in one country, availing of every possible support not only from the proletariat in imperialist countries but also from the oppressed peoples and nations outside the imperialist countries. And he paid close attention to the work of the Third

International.

The propagation of the two-stage revolution by Lenin and Stalin would bear abundant fruit in the form of people's democracies in Asia and Eastern Europe after World War II. The colonies and semicolonies proved to be the more fertile ground for the victory of the armed revolution led by the proletariat than in the imperialist countries.

The people's democracy in China was the most important of the revolutionary crop because of the huge population and size of the country and more importantly because here was to be seen the transition from the bourgeois-democratic revolution to socialism and the heroic effort to consolidate socialism against revisionism and the danger of capitalist restoration. The Chinese revolution under Mao Zedong's leadership grew in importance as modern revisionism took hold of the Soviet Union starting in 1956.

IV. FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF THE TWO-STAGE REVOLUTION

The salvoes of the October Revolution and the work of the Third International inspired and caused the establishment of the Communist Party of China (CPC) in 1921. In leading the CPC and the Chinese revolution, Mao Zedong learned from Lenin's theory and practice of the two-stage revolution under proletarian dictatorship and further developed it by making his own unique contributions.

He made concrete analysis of the concrete conditions of semicolonial and semifeudal China. He characterized the first stage of the Chinese revolution as bourgeois-democratic of the new type or new-democratic revolution against foreign monopoly capitalism, domestic feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism.

He identified the comprador big bourgeoisie and the landlord class as the class enemy within Chinese society and, among the motive forces of the revolution, the proletariat as the leading class, the peasantry as the main force and the worker-peasant alliance as the foundation of the revolutionary united front.

To come to the second stage of the Chinese revolution, which is socialist, the new-democratic revolution must be basically completed through the nationwide armed overthrow of the joint class dictatorship of the comprador big bourgeoisie and the landlord class and the establishment of the democratic dictatorship of the working class and the peasantry which is at the core and in essence the class dictatorship of the proletariat.

Mao regarded the new-democratic revolution through protracted people's war as the preparation for the socialist revolution. He pointed out that the new-democratic revolution was

distinguishable from but continuous with the socialist revolution because both stages were led by the revolutionary proletariat and were within the framework of the world proletarian-socialist revolution. As Lenin taught, he asserted that there was no need to pass the stage of capitalist development.

He repudiated the Trotskyite view, expressed most prominently by Chen Duxiu, the founding secretary of the Communist Party of China, that there was a separation of the bourgeois-democratic and socialist stages of the revolution and that the Chinese proletariat could only be an appendage of the Guomindang (GMD) because the proletariat was supposedly incapable of leading the bourgeois-democratic revolution. In fact, Chen Duxiu merged the CPP with the GMD and subordinated it to the latter in the 1924-27 period.

Mao pointed out that the proletariat could lead the bourgeois-democratic revolution and maintain its independence and initiative by strengthening itself ideologically, politically and organizationally as the advanced detachment of the proletariat; by having the peasantry for its main ally and by fulfilling the peasant demand for land as the main content of the democratic revolution. He was responsible for the establishment of the rural base areas, the first soviets of workers and peasants, which served the CPC in good stead after Chiang Kaishek's betrayal.

Regarding Party-building, Mao introduced the rectification campaign as the principle and method for confronting subjectivism, opportunism and other errors. He consistently espoused the line of trusting the masses, relying on them and mobilizing them as the way for carrying out and raising the revolutionary struggle from one level to a new and higher level.

He upheld the armed revolution as the main form of revolutionary struggle because the central task of the revolution is the seizure of political power. He was inspired by the declaration of Stalin that continuous armed struggle in China was an advantage of the Chinese revolution.

To this day, Mao is recognized as the master strategist and tactician with his theory and strategic line of people's war, involving the encirclement of the cities from the countryside over a protracted period of time in order to accumulate strength through tactical offensives until sufficient strength is built to seize the cities on a nationwide scale.

This theory and strategic line integrates the armed struggle, the agrarian revolution and the building of political power and the mass base. Mao demonstrated that in the course of the bourgeois-democratic revolution of the new type it was possible to respond to the peasant demand for land and to create Red political power based in the countryside even while the

power of the reactionaries is still entrenched in the cities. In the Russian experience, dual political power arose only in the February revolution.

Mao made a continuous class analysis of Chinese society in accordance with Marxism-Leninism to guide Party building, the armed struggle and united front work. Insofar as it had the support of the peasant masses and had absolute leadership over the people's army, whichever was the main enemy at a given time, the CPC could maintain its independence and initiative and at the same time handle correctly its other allies and range the broadest possible united front to isolate and destroy the enemy.

After nationwide victory of the bourgeois-democratic revolution under its leadership in 1949, the Chinese proletariat could commence the socialist revolution. The state that was established took the form of a people's democratic republic. At the core was the proletarian dictatorship. The main component of state power, the people's army, was under the absolute leadership of the proletariat through the CPC.

Mao basically followed the teachings and example of Lenin and Stalin in nationalizing the land and carrying out land reform as a bourgeois-democratic measure to satisfy the land hunger of the poor and lower middle peasants, in capturing the commanding heights of the economy for socialism by confiscating the productive assets of the imperialists and the domestic big bourgeoisie and in adopting the transitory measures for reviving the war-ravaged economy and realizing the basic socialist transformation of the entire economy. Under the leadership of Stalin, the Soviet Union assisted China.

In 1955 the peasants began to move towards collectivization from the level of mutual aid teams. In 1956 the basic socialist transformation of the Chinese economy was accomplished. The Right opportunists and revisionists began overtly and covertly to oppose the proletarian revolutionary line of Mao.

They wanted to perpetuate the concessions previously granted to the patriotic bourgeoisie and rich peasants and opposed the restriction of bourgeois rights. They prated about the consolidation of the national-democratic revolution and yet self-contradictorily about the dying out of the class struggle. They insisted that the main contradiction was between the backward forces of production and the advanced relations of production and that socialist progress was simply a matter of promoting the forces of production.

Mao upheld the line of socialist revolution and construction. He pointed out that the main contradiction in socialist society is between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. He followed Lenin's dictum that socialism would take a whole his-

torical epoch and that the defeated bourgeoisie would continue to resist socialism in so many ways.

He defined the correct handling of contradictions among the people and those between the people and the enemy. Thus, the middle and petty-bourgeoisie as well as the rich peasants could be subordinated to the socialist policy of the state and violent counterrevolution could be averted. He also adopted the policy of making heavy and basic industries as the leading factor, agriculture as the basis of the economy and bridging the two with light industry in order to accelerate delivery of producer and consumer goods to the peasant masses and thereby lighten their burden in the process of economic development.

He put forward the policy of the Great Leap Forward along the general line of socialist revolution and construction, involving "walking on two legs" and building the people's communes. The policy overcame the imperialist blockade, the natural calamities and the sabotage by the Soviet revisionist renegades as well as the Bukharinite Right opportunist opposition and "Left" opportunist "communist wind."

Following the resounding success of the Great Leap Forward and bountiful harvests from the communes, Mao launched a counteroffensive against the Right opportunists. He stressed that the key link to grasp in the class struggle and directed the socialist education movement against the Party bureaucrats taking the capitalist road.

He made a comprehensive critique of modern revisionism and engaged the Soviet revisionist party in an ideological debate. Taking into account the phenomenon of modern revisionism and the two-line struggle between the proletarian revolutionaries and the bourgeois renegades within the CPC, he subsequently put forward the theory of continuing revolution under proletarian dictatorship in order to combat revisionism, prevent the restoration of capitalism and consolidate socialism.

He put the theory into practice through the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR). This involved the all-round dialectical revolutionization of both the mode of production and the superstructure of socialist society.

It surpassed the widespread notion that dissolving the exploiting classes was merely a matter of doing so economically, legally and administratively and that building socialism was merely a matter of developing the productive forces and the technical expertise.

V. ANTISOCIALIST POLICY IN AGRICULTURE

So far, in the history of the world proletarian revolution, socialism has arisen in countries where feudal and semifeudal relations in agriculture exist to a significant extent. The backward conditions in agriculture necessitate the bourgeois-

democratic revolution, involving the completion of land reform and building the worker-peasant alliance. The question of social relations in agriculture is of fundamental importance in the transition from the bourgeois democratic revolution to the socialist revolution. Failure to complete land reform and advance from one stage of cooperativization to a higher one is fatal to the socialist revolution.

Excluded from the discussion are national liberation movements that were helpful to the anti-imperialist movement on a global scale but were essentially anticolonial, antiracist or antidespotic and came to power through neocolonial compromise or insurrection (e.g., several liberation fronts in Africa and the FSLN in Nicaragua) and confined themselves within the framework of an uncompleted bourgeois-democratic revolution of the old type. Some of them have not even tried to carry out genuine and thoroughgoing land reform and others have tried but have failed because of the lack of genuine proletarian class leadership and because of the lack of complementation by basic industrialization.

In all the people's democracies established after World War II, there was the debate between the proletarian revolutionaries and the Right opportunists concerning the social conditions and relations and the socialist path to be followed in agriculture. The teachings of Lenin and Stalin regarding measures of transition from the bourgeois-democratic to the socialist revolution in agriculture and collectivization of agriculture in connection with socialist industrialization guided the proletarian revolutionaries.

Tito of Yugoslavia, as pioneer of modern revisionism, abandoned land reform and collectivization in 1948 and allowed the rich peasants to persist. The question of agriculture was a pivot point for him in his overall antisocialist position of denying the necessity of central economic planning, atomizing the economy under the pretext of workers' self-management and raising the flag of bourgeois nationalism against the Cominform.

In most of the people's democracies in Eastern Europe, land reform and collectivization were either frustrated or delayed, reflecting the strength of the Right opportunist current in the ruling parties which were typically mergers of communists and social-democrats who posed overnight as communists. When modern revisionism prevailed in the Soviet Union and spread in Eastern Europe, starting in 1956, land reform and collectivization were either put off completely or tokens of these were undercut by the persistence of rich peasants, farm capitalists and merchants.

The revisionists in Eastern Europe underestimated the peasant question as something to be solved automatically by

the expansion of socialist industry and farm mechanization. The peasantry is supposed to be dissolved by employment generated by socialist industry and only a small number of farm workers is supposed to be needed to operate the farms.

But long before the promise in their argument is realized, the revisionists also use the backward conditions in agriculture as the factual basis for their argument for the retention or revival of the capitalist law of value, for the bourgeois freedom of dealing with labor power and means of production as commodities and for all related notions and practices of so-called market socialism.

In the Soviet Union, Khrushchov's drive to undo the socialist work of Lenin and Stalin included undermining and discrediting socialist agriculture in a series of clever moves. As first secretary of the Party, he pushed Malenkov the prime minister to plant the wrong crops on vast areas in order to discredit the latter as well as socialist agriculture. After taking all power into his hands, he broke the alliance of the working class and the peasantry. He dissolved the machine and tractor stations run by the proletariat, allowed the collectives to individually own, buy and sell farm machines and spare parts, expanded the private plots and the free markets and encouraged the reemergence of the rich peasants.

Soviet agriculture went into shambles before Khrushchov fell from power. This was one of the major reasons for his ouster. But his successors did not reverse his agricultural policy but continued to praise the supposedly higher productivity in the private plots than in the collective farms from which the rich peasants and free traders stole products.

With their "new economic system", Brezhnev and Kosygin expanded and aggravated the antisocialist policies initiated by Khrushchov in both industry and agriculture. The principal reason why Kremlinologists called the Brezhnev regime neo-Stalinist was that Brezhnev made a sham rehabilitation of Stalin and recentralized certain strategic industries to get revenues for the all-union bureaucracy and the arms race.

By the time Gorbachov came to power, the Soviet economy had become so depressed and bankrupted that he could easily disorganize and discredit it completely. He continued to misrepresent monopoly bureaucrat capitalism as socialism and moved towards his ultimate goal of open privatization of public productive assets. Finally, he called for "land reform" which meant the retrogression to private farming and the dissolution of state farms and collectives.

In a certain sense, the rise of modern revisionism in the Soviet Union in 1956 overtook the Chinese revolution. The right opportunists in the CPC became heavily influenced by Soviet revisionist ideas, including the economic ideas of the

late Nicolai Voznesensky and E. Lieberman, because of the continuing close Sino-Soviet relations then and the flow of Chinese students and trainees.

It is to the credit of Mao that he was able to stand up victoriously against Soviet modern revisionists and the domestic revisionists, who tried but failed to overthrow him, from 1956 to 1976. He was able to carry out socialist revolution and construction, build socialist industry and the people's communes, make a comprehensive critique and repudiation of modern revisionism and carry out the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.

But it should not be surprising that after his death his proletarian revolutionary line could be defeated. He himself was aware of the tremendous odds, involving the objective conditions and subjective factors. For him to move from one victory to another, he had to overcome the powerful opposition of the capitalist-roaders.

In Chinese agriculture, Mao put forward the line that agricultural cooperation could be realized, with mechanization progressively coming in as socialist industry could provide. The point was to preempt the further growth of the rural bourgeoisie, which had been tolerated in the period of transition. But Liu Xiaoli pushed the Bukharinite rich peasant line that cooperativization should always be preceded by mechanization or else it should not be undertaken at all.

They fielded "work" teams to nitpick and dissolve the cooperatives initiated by the peasant masses in 1955 in answer to Mao's call for these to be established wherever possible on the basis of the mutual aid teams. To oppose the building of the people's communes during the Great Leap Forward, they alternated between Right opportunism and whipping up the "communist wind". Up to the early '60s, they pushed the four big freedoms of the rich peasants - to hire labor, trade, lend money and rent out land.

After the death of Mao, the top Chinese revisionists or capitalist-roaders headed by Deng Xiaoping pushed their plan of big-comprador "modernization" and whipped up their line of capitalist reforms and opening up to foreign monopoly capitalism. They had as initial social base the national capitalists to whom they returned capital by redeeming the government bonds previously given in exchange for expropriated assets and the petty-bourgeoisified sections of the Party and state bureaucracy who were itching to have their revenge on Mao for the cultural revolution.

They proceeded to break up the people's communes, which by implication they derided as a system of collective irresponsibility, and revived the pre-revolutionary system of individual farming which they described as the individual

household responsibility system. The local Party cadres who complied with the new line rewarded their own families and friends with the choicest portions of land, including orchards and fishponds. The rich peasants were resurrected overnight and became the biggest social base of the Dengist counterrevolution.

The rural industries built on a widescale during the cultural revolution were privatized under the legal fiction of management lease. At the municipal, provincial and national levels, the bourgeoisie reemerged rapidly. As in the old days of the Guomindang, the biggest Chinese bourgeois are the bureaucrat capitalists, with the difference that they masquerade as communist to legitimize their rule. They retain the state enterprises as milking cows and at the same time run the most profitable private enterprises, in combination with the foreign monopolies.

Mao's thesis that as soon as the revisionists come to power they restore capitalism and become social fascist has been proven correct. They have deprived the workers of the right to strike and other democratic rights and subject them to severe exploitation and oppression under the pretext of "socialist labor discipline".

The myth is being spread that because of capitalist reforms and opening up to foreign monopoly capitalism, China has developed rapidly and that, good for socialism, the Chinese proletariat has increased in number. The truth is that the proletariat previously generated by a self-reliant socialist industry has been eroded and replaced by untenured cheap labor for sweatshops. Coolie labor of pre-revolutionary times has come back with a vengeance.

There is an explosive social polarization in China, with less than ten percent of the population getting high income and more than 90 percent reduced to a miserable level of subsistence and subjected to job insecurity and growing unemployment. While the imperialist and big-comprador enclaves of export-oriented manufacturing glisten in the coastal provinces, the west and central regions of China are rapidly plunging into lower levels of stagnation, depression and refeudalization.

The Communist Party of Turkey/Marxist Leninist celebrates the 25th anniversary of its founding

TO: THE MAOIST INTERNATIONALIST MOVEMENT,

Our party, the Communist Party of Turkey/Marxist Leninist (TKP/ML), the representative of the international proletariat and the vanguard of the oppressed masses and the working class in Turkey and Turkish Kurdistan, will be celebrating the 25th anniversary of its founding in 1997. There will be organised cultural, artistic, social and political activities in Turkey and Turkish Kurdistan and various European countries to celebrate this auspicious occasion. We also would like to celebrate this joyous occasion with you, our friends, by expressing exemplary solidarity in our common struggle. To this end an international conference will be organized in Frankfurt, Germany on the 10th and 11th of May 1997. The agenda for this international conference is as follows:

1. The position and significance of the TKP/ML in Turkey on the 25th anniversary of its founding.
2. The importance and significance of Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR) within the International proletarian class struggle, on the 30th anniversary of the GPCR.

The first point of the agenda of the international conference will include the fundamental discussions on our party's 25 years of experience and practice, the importance of our party within the context of the revolutionary struggle in Turkey and Turkish Kurdistan and also, world revolution and the national and international background within which our party was founded.

As it may already be known to you, our party, the Communist Party of Turkey/Marxist Leninist, was founded by Ibrahim Kaypakkaya and a group of his comrades. Kaypakkaya, while defining the TKP/ML's political, ideological and organisational line, stressed clearly that TKP/ML was a product of the 1871 Paris Commune, the 1917 Great October Revolution, the 1949 New Democratic Revolution in China and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution led by Mao Tse Tung against modern revisionism.

Kaypakkaya and his comrades were involved in the struggle within the Revolutionary Workers and Peasants Party of Turkey (TIKP), where they were also conducting a two-line struggle against revisionist and reformist line existing within the party. This continued until there was no longer any possibility of maintaining unity and a red flag had to be raised against the revisionist and reformist line. It was then that the TKP/ML was founded on the 24th of April 1972. The establishment of TKP/ML was an MLM advance against the 50 years of dominance of revisionism and reformism within the revolutionary movement of Turkey. Many serious issues which no one had even dared to touch upon were analysed in details and brought into daylight by TKP/ML.

The second item on the agenda of the international conference will be the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR), which greatly influenced the founding of our party and its process of defining the political, ideological and organisational line. The GPCR, from our party's point of view, represents the highest point of the achievements of the international proletariat. Shanghai workers in the 1967 January Storm, represented the best and the most advanced detachments of the international proletariat raising the GPCR to its highest. 1997 will be the 30th anniversary of the GPCR at its peak.

Without understanding the historic significance of the GPCR in the Chinese revolution and the revolutionary movement, and without being aware of the new types of bourgeoisie, revisionists and capitalists within the Communist party, one cannot understand the importance of the struggle against the bourgeoisie on all fronts. Without understanding the essence of GPCR one cannot analyse socialism deeply, or have a complete understanding of classes and class struggle under socialism, or fully explain the reasons behind the capitalist restorations. Our party cannot celebrate the 25th anniversary of its founding without giving the precedence to the GPCR, which forms the cornerstone of the thoughts of all communists and revolutionaries of the world and those who

aspire towards a classless society without exploitation of man by man. The study of the GPCR is fundamental for all communists who believe that Mao contributed to the development of ML and that he advanced ML to a new qualitative level.

Our party believes that GPCR is [of] enormous value for all communists of the world and [for] the class struggle of the international proletariat. We consider this to be an important step forward to advance our views especially on GPCR and to arm ourselves with deep knowledge on such concrete issues. It will be an unprecedented opportunity to gather Maoist forces from all over the world to discuss these common topics and offering an occasion for all those forces fighting in different countries to meet and getting to know more about one another politically and ideologically.

It is important for our party that all fraternal parties which recognise Mao's qualitative contributions to ML and realise the international value of GPCR, should take part in this international conference providing the dates do not coincide with other arrangements. We would appreciate it if you could let us know whether you would be attending this conference by the last week of February and also, if you could send your contributions on the conference topics by the last week of March at the latest. Your contributions can be in English, German or French. Our party will meet the travelling expenses of those delegates attending from Latin America, Asia and Africa.

The Communist Party of Turkey / Marxist Leninist wishes you success in your revolutionary struggle against our common class enemy.

With internationalist revolutionary greetings.

December 1996

The Communist Party of Turkey/Marxist Leninist
International Relations Bureau

MIM commemorates the TKP/ML's 25th anniversary

MIM read the following statement on 10 May 1997, the first day of the Frankfurt, Germany conference commemorating the 25th anniversary of the Communist Party of Turkey / Marxist Leninist (TKP/ML) -ed.

MIM enthusiastically salutes the Communist Party of Turkey / Marxist Leninist on its 25th anniversary. The people of North America have a particular duty to support the revolution in Turkey and Turkish Kurdistan and the Party which leads it, because U.S. imperialism is the principal political and military enemy of the Turkish and Kurdish peoples. It was the U.S. government's Central Intelligence Agency which, in May 1973, tortured and murdered Ibrahim Kaypakkaya, the main founder and leader of the TKP/ML. The U.S. government claims to act in the name of "the American people" when it

oppresses nations such as Turkey and Kurdistan. And unfortunately it is true that large numbers of Amerikkans have been bribed by a share of the superprofits imperialism extracts from the oppressed nations of the world. This bribed majority supports U.S. imperialist aggression.

But there is also a minority within U.S. borders which opposes U.S. imperialism and is disgusted that the U.S. government claims to act in their name. These internationalists support the struggle of the Turkish and Kurdish peoples because this is an anti-imperialist struggle. Furthermore, the most advanced internationalists support the TKP/ML. The TKP/ML earns our support by opposing Modern Revisionism, by firmly upholding the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and its lessons, and by waging protracted people's war. Maoists within U.S. borders support the revolution led by the TKP/ML in the best way possible—by building public opinion and independent people's institutions in order to prepare the North American masses to make anti-imperialist revolution in the belly of the beast.

Long live the TKP/ML!

Victory to the Turkish and Kurdish people's war!

Long live Marxism-Leninism-Maoism!

International conference on TKP/ML's 25th

by MIM

On May 10 and 11, Maoists from around the world met in Frankfurt, Germany at an international conference convened by the Communist Party of Turkey / Marxist Leninist (TKP/ML) in celebration of the 25th anniversary of its 24 April 1972 founding.

The TKP/ML is the representative of the international proletariat and the vanguard of the oppressed masses and the working class in Turkey and Turkish Kurdistan. Its 25th anniversary was celebrated in various European countries as well as in Turkey and Turkish Kurdistan. The agenda for the Frankfurt conference was as follows:

1. The position and significance of the TKP/ML in Turkey on the 25th anniversary of its founding.

2. The importance and significance of Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR) within the international proletarian class struggle, on the 30th anniversary of the GPCR.

The first point of the agenda of the international confer-

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

ence included the fundamental discussions on the TKP/ML's 25 years of experience and practice, its importance within the context of the revolutionary struggle in Turkey and Turkish Kurdistan and also, world revolution and the national and international background within which the TKP/ML was founded.

The second item on the agenda of the international conference was the GPCR, which greatly influenced the founding of the TKP/ML and its process of defining the political, ideological and organisational line. The GPCR represents the highest point of the achievements of the international proletariat. As the TKP/ML stated, "Our party cannot celebrate the 25th anniversary of its founding without giving the precedence to the GPCR, which forms the cornerstone of the thoughts of all communists and revolutionaries of the world and those who aspire towards a classless society without exploitation of man by man. The study of the GPCR is fundamental for all communists who believe that Mao contributed to the development of ML [Marxism-Leninism] and that he advanced ML to a new qualitative level.

"Our party believes that GPCR is [of] enormous value for all communists of the world and [for] the class struggle of the international proletariat. We consider this to be an important step forward to advance our views especially on GPCR and to arm ourselves with deep knowledge on such concrete issues. It will be an unprecedented opportunity to gather Maoist forces from all over the world to discuss these common topics and offering an occasion for all those forces fighting in different countries to meet and getting to know more about one another politically and ideologically."

Over 100 people attended the conference. Most were Turkish and Kurdish people living in exile in Europe. International delegates included representatives of MIM; the Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist) / Janashakti (People's Strength); the ex-USSR's All-Union Bolshevik Party of Communists; el Partido Comunista Revolucionaria del Argentina (Revolutionary Communist Party of Argentina); the Communist Party of Greece / Marxist-Leninist; the Proletarian Party of Purba Bangla (East Bengal or Greater Bangladesh); the Congrès des Progressistes pour la Libération (Congress of Progressives for Liberation)-Zaire; the Workers' Party of Belgium (PTB); el Partido Comunista de España (reconstituido) (PCE(r), Communist Party of Spain (reconstituted)); Rossoperaio (Red Workers' Organization)-Italy; Moroccan comrades; a Vietnamese comrade; and a comrade from a country in the Middle East. International supporters present in a less official capacity hailed from Germany's Gesellschaft organization and from Indonesia.

Among those invited but unable to attend were: the crypto-Trotskyist RCP-USA; the Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist); the Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist)-

People's War Group (unable to attend due to repression); the Workers Communist Party of Norway; the Workers Party of New Zealand; Luis Arce Borja of El Diario Internacional (which exists to support the revolution in Peru); the Marxist-Leninist Party of Italy; Professor Pao-Yu Ching; author Carol Andreas; Joan and William Hinton; and Germany's MLPD.

There were no noteworthy disputes on the conference floor. The conference was marked by a high degree of unity, and by a desire to seriously examine the positive and negative lessons of the most advanced movements led by communists to date, principally the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. Comrades benefitted both from the lectures and from more informal exchanges of ideas and information between conference sessions.

The conference hall was decorated with four banners:

1. The faces of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao.
2. "Long Live Marxism-Leninism-Maoism!"
3. "Long Live Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution!"
4. "Glory to the 25th Anniversary of the Communist Party of Turkey / Marxist Leninist!"

DAY ONE

The first day, May 10, was dedicated to the first conference topic, the TKP/ML, as well as to introductions of the parties and organizations attending.

MIM was among the organizations given the opportunity to read a statement of solidarity with the TKP/ML and a statement introducing MIM. MIM's statement emphasized the responsibility people from the U.S. empire bear to stand in solidarity with Turkish, Kurdish, and other oppressed peoples, and with these peoples' revolutionary leadership bodies. The U.S. government claims to conduct all of its actions in the name of "the American people." U.S. imperialism is the principal military and political enemy of the Turkish and Kurdish peoples. It was the U.S. government's Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) which collaborated with the fascist Turkish government to torture the TKP/ML's principal founder and leader, Ibrahim Kaypakkaya, to death on 18 May 1973. MIM was pleased that the TKP/ML host correctly referred to MIM as being "from North America" instead of incorrectly referring to the "USA" as if it were a legitimate political-geographic entity.

A TKP/ML statement explained that Turkey is half capitalist and half feudal. The TKP-ML leads a worker-peasant alliance in a New Democratic protracted people's war against compradors, landlords, loan sharks, imperialists, and the fascist Turkish regime. TKP/ML martyr Kaypakkaya correctly pointed out that the Kurdish people constitute a nation found inside the borders of Turkey, Iran, Iraq, Syria, and the ex-USSR. Kaypakkaya stood for Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution against Modern Revisionism and Soviet-style social-imperialism. He recognized that Mao's contributions

constituted a deepening of Marxism-Leninism. His 1973 martyrdom created a leadership vacuum in the TKP/ML for a short time, but in 1974, the Party regrouped. In 1978, it centralized and engaged in ideological and political struggle to demarcate itself from revisionist sectarian groups. The TKP/ML speaker did the same, correctly demarcating against Hoxhaism and Gorbachevism, and standing for the use of revolutionary violence, proletarian dictatorship, and revolution under proletarian dictatorship.

A Greek comrade explained her party's history. In 1946-1949, Greek communists waged armed struggle which ultimately ended in defeat. (Kostas Mavrakīs discusses this in his book *On Trotskyism*). In 1955, comrades in exile began working to rebuild the Party which had been crushed. In 1956, they formed the Organization of Political Refugees (Marxist-Leninist), which was illegal not only in Greece but in the phony-socialist Eastern bloc where many of the exiles resided. In 1964, the Communist Party of Greece / Marxist-Leninist was founded. In the 1970s, it split twice – once over the Three Worlds Theory, which it opposes, and once over Hoxhaism, which it correctly opposes. Today, it is legal and it has a newspaper, a theory journal, and an emphasis on youth.

The representative of the ex-USSR's All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks (AUCPB) called for the restoration of the USSR. MIM disagrees with this call, believing that it pays insufficient attention to the support for separate nation-states which was generated by the great-nation Russian chauvinism promoted by the social-imperialist regimes of Khrushchev, Brezhnev, Gorbachev and so on. The speaker also noted that this November will be the 80th anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution. He noted that opportunism and revisionism run rampant in the ex-USSR, and that Züganov's Communist Party of the Russian Federation (CPRF) is part of Yeltsin's regime, and is social-democratic in actual fact, "red" rhetoric notwithstanding. The AUCPB believes that the revolutionary situation and the revolutionary tendency are both growing in the ex-USSR.

The AUCPB representative surprised MIM by ending his speech – which did not mention Mao or China – with the slogans, "Long live Marxism-Leninism-Maoism!" and "Long live the red banner of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao!"

When the floor was opened to questions, MIM asked the AUCPB delegate, "What is your assessment of the historical role of Mao Zedong, and of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in particular?" The AUCPB's evasive but suggestive answer was that Lenin and Stalin taught that class struggle continues under socialism and throughout the period of socialist construction; that opportunists, Mensheviks, Trotskyists, Khrushchevites, Gorbachevites, and Yeltsinists all are enemies of the people whom the AUCPB fights; that the same class struggle which took place in the CP of the Soviet Union "has happened and is happening in the Communist Party of

China"; and that the AUCPB evaluates the GPCR in this context.

Speaking just a week before Laurent Kabila's rebels overthrew Mobutu Sese Seko and renamed Zaire as the Democratic Republic of Congo, a comrade from the CPL-Zaire praised Kabila's movement as progressive, democratic, and anti-anti-communist, while noting that it is not anti-imperialist. The comrade noted that Kabila's movement involves the masses and strengthens them politically. Imperialism has left Zaire/Congo with four currencies of money: the U.S. dollar, the Belgian franc, the old Zairean franc, and the new Zairean franc. The CPL comrade called for national democratic revolution, for breaking dependence on imperialism, for land reform, and for the liberation of the productive forces from imperialism. He said that the united front of the workers, peasants, and petit-bourgeoisie must be developed so it can control the state and the resources of Zaire. Zaire's mines and location are strategically key for imperialism. Thus, on a tactical level, the CPL seeks to advance without antagonizing imperialism and provoking its direct intervention.

The national democratic movement of the Philippines was represented by Luis Jalandoni, the chief negotiator representing the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP)-led National Democratic Front of the Philippines (NDFP) in its peace negotiations with the fascist Government of the Republic of the Philippines, and by Professor Jose Maria Sison, founding chairperson of the CPP and current advisor to the NDFP panel in the peace negotiations. Jalandoni read the "Message of Comradeship to TKP/ML from the Communist Party of the Philippines."

Sison spoke on the CPP. Sison emphasized that the Party and its Army both started very small, but have grown significantly. As Chairperson Mao Zedong said, "The correctness or otherwise of the ideological and political line decides everything. When the Party's line is correct, then everything will come its way. If it has no followers, then it can have followers; if it has guns, then it can have guns; if it has no political power, then it can have political power." Lest anyone think the road was easy, Sison stressed that "There were many twists and turns along the way." He explained that he was in particular talking about "left" and right opportunist deviations which held sway in the CPP Central Committee, notably from 1988 to 1992. In 1992, a campaign of rectification began, reaffirming the Party's basic principles of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought or Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and rooting out opportunist and subjectivist petit-bourgeois deviations which relegated Maoism to the back burner. Among other things, reaffirming Maoist principles meant rejecting urban insurrectionism in favor of the Maoist political-military line for the semi-colonies of protracted people's war, surrounding the cities from the countryside. Sison reminded the audience that the essence of Marxism-Leninism is the overthrow of the

class enemy and the establishment of red political power.

The speaker from the PCR-Argentina explained that his Party was born in 1967 and 1968 in struggle against Modern Revisionism. The PCR-A supports Argentina-born Che' Guevara against the Modern Revisionists of the USSR and Cuba who PCR-A says betrayed him. In 1972, the PCR-A arrived at Maoism. It advances the line of New Democratic revolution. Its principal work is underground, but it leads legal work as well. In the PCR-A's assessment, the left in Argentina and in Latin America is in an upswing.

The Proletarian Party of Purba Bangla (East Bengal) is one of three parties upholding Maoism and the GPCR in greater Bangladesh, which includes existing Bangladesh and parts of India and Burma. The PP and Shamabadi Dal are members of the Avakianist (crypto-Trotskyist) Revolutionary Internationalist Movement (RIM), while the East Bengal Communist Party is not. All are underground and trying to launch armed struggle, while taking different approaches to mass front formation. Two other Bengali parties are Mao-sympathisers, but not Maoists.

Spain's PCE(r) also introduced itself. The Spanish comrades have been able to sustain armed struggle for some time now.

The Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist)-Janashakti discussed the history of its party. The Maoist movement in India has been divided for over two decades now. The CPIML-J called for the reunification of Indian Maoists into one party and for a rectification campaign.

The Workers Party of Belgium, like MIM, emerged from student struggles. MIM has disagreements with the PTB over the labor aristocracy question and other questions, but these did not come to the fore in the conference. The PTB used its floor time to talk about recent events in Belgium. In 1996, the disappearance and murder of Belgian children provoked a massive democratic movement. This movement, said the PTB, has improved the Belgian masses' consciousness regarding the bourgeois state. For one thing, the masses learned that elements of the Belgian ruling class were involved in child pornography and the like. For another, the state exposed itself as a tool of the ruling class: the police serve the rich and powerful, but sat on their hands when poor and immigrant workers' children were stolen. The state also banned the distribution of a PTB pamphlet to a mass rally around this issue. (The PTB distributed 100,000 pamphlets anyway). The Belgian Central Bureau of Investigation investigated every single Turk in Belgium, but did not really investigate the kidnappings. Instead, they used the kidnappings as an excuse to create a new "anti-crime" (anti-progressive, anti-people) law.

Italy's Rossoperaio, a supporter of the Avakianist (crypto-Trotskyist) RIM, noted its opposition to Italy's intervention in Albania, where the masses are engaging in just and righteous rebellion.

It was a pleasure to hear a Vietnamese comrade stand up for Maoism, including the GPCR and the continuation of class struggle under the dictatorship of the proletariat. The Vietnamese people demonstrated the validity of Mao's military strategy of protracted people's war, but failed to demarcate against Soviet social-imperialism and thus failed to build socialism.

In Morocco, the Maoist forces are undergoing a process of reconstituting a Party. A Moroccan comrade defended Maoism as the third stage of Marxism. He pointed out that the Arab world is the battleground of a fierce inter-imperialist struggle between French imperialism and U.S. imperialism, with most Arab regimes obeying French imperialism. The Moroccan comrades seek the overthrow of imperialism, principally French imperialism, as well as the overthrow of the comprador bourgeoisie, the big bourgeoisie, feudal remnants, and the bourgeoisie's reactionary regime.

DAY TWO

The second day, May 11, was dedicated to the question of the GPCR. MIM used its time on the floor to read a statement on the historical role of "Gang of Four" leader Jiang Qing, who faced sexist and other slanders and died under house arrest, all for her efforts to continue the GPCR and keep China on the socialist road after Mao Zedong died in 1976.

The TKP/ML pointed out that comrade Stalin made errors which aided capitalist-restorationist Khrushchev's rise to power. Also, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union did not fail alone in the 1950s when it dropped the red banner of socialism. Except for the CP of China and the Party of Labor of Albania, the International Communist Movement failed.

Professor Sison read "The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution: Impact on the Philippines and Continuing Global Significance" [<http://www.geocities.com/~cpp-ndf/intl7.htm>], adding some new comments. Of particular note were Sison's new comments on Hua Guofeng. In MIM Theory 5 (1994), MIM wrote, "It is an area of concern that MIM has no statement from the CPP on Hua Guofeng." At the conference, Sison spoke clearly, correctly, and in some detail about Hua's counterrevolutionary role. Not only did Hua have the "Gang of Four" arrested, said Sison, but Hua was one of the four people (Deng Xiaoping was among them) who moved against the left in the CCP after Mao's death. This counterrevolutionary gang expelled 30% of the CCP in order to attain its rightist ends. Hua's "left" face, said Sison, "was only a matter of form." Sison also recommended the "10,000-character text" by Ding-Li Chun, a Chinese leftist under Deng, as one of the better texts from China available in English.

The worst item read from the conference floor was from Joan Hinton, author William Hinton's sister. Ms. Hinton, who was unable to attend, is a longtime resident of China of American origin. Her letter did not name Hua or the "Gang of

Four" by name, but clearly was a defense of the former and condemnation of the latter.

Many conference attendees were saddened to learn that the Maoist-influenced anti-imperialist author Karim Essack of Tanzania, who had wanted to attend the TKP/ML conference, had died of a heart attack during the week.

Two resolutions were brought to the floor. MIM signed both. The first, from the TKP/ML, regarded the situation of the people in Turkey and Turkish Kurdistan. The second, from the Communist Party of Greece / Marxist-Leninist, regarded the situation in Albania.

BETWEEN SESSIONS

Many comrades were curious to learn MIM's assessment of the crypto-Trotskyist RCP-USA and the RCP-USA-led RIM. Opinions on the RIM varied. Some vigorously agreed with MIM's assessment of RIM as hegemonist and crypto-Trotskyist-led. Some requested more information from MIM. Others defended RIM and the hegemonist RIM line that a new Comintern is needed. For the TKP/ML's part, one of the newspapers it distributes contains a criticism of RIM by *El Diario Internacional*'s Luis Arce Borja.

CONCLUSION

The conference ended as it began with the Internationale. The conference provided an excellent opportunity for comrades from different parties and different local conditions to get to know each other ideologically and politically. It also illustrated that the world's revolutionary tendencies are recovering from past mistakes and setbacks and are moving forward. The world situation is fine.

Conference Resolution on Turkey and Turkish Kurdistan

The following was submitted by the Communist Party of Turkey / Marxist Leninist (TKP/ML) to the international delegates attending the 10-11 May 1997 conference commemorating the TKP/ML's 25th anniversary. MIM was among the signatories. —ed.

To the International Conference:

The poverty and the oppression of workers, peasants, students and the civil servants in Turkey and Turkish Kurdistan

has increased in the recent years.

A part of the country is under continuous blockade. The villages have been burnt down and the peasants have been forcibly removed and have been sent the other parts of the country. The people who had to leave their home towns, now living in big cities and are under unbearable strain. In the Dersim province 184 villages out of 420 and 625 small units out of 1179 have been evicted. In total 18,436 persons were forcibly removed from these areas only. Food is allocated through the local authority. The borders of the town are now under strict control and the military authorities' permission is needed to enter/exit the town. Random checks on the streets, and taking hold of the food parcels by the military are common practices. Those people are left to fight for their survival in their home towns where their animals are wasted routinely by the authorities. Dersim is not the only province where these atrocities happen. In many places of the Kurdish part of the country, similar incidents have taken place such as Tokat and Sivas provinces. Every day different areas are effected.

In 1996, total evicted villages were 67. Systematic state violence is increasing on a daily basis. The Government declared terrorist nearly half of the population and increased its oppression accordingly.

We, the undersigned, protest the destruction of the villages, blockade and forced migration policies of the Turkish Government.

Conference Resolution on Albania

The following was submitted by the Communist Party of Greece / Marxist-Leninist to the international delegates attending the 10-11 May 1997 conference commemorating the Communist Party of Turkey / Marxist Leninist (TKP/ML)'s 25th anniversary. MIM was among the signatories. —ed.

The Albanian people live under dramatic conditions after the recent reactionary overthrow that brought to political power the most antipopular, right wing forces: that is, a clique coming from the new bourgeois forces which has led people to hunger and sordid poverty, as well as [subordinating] the country to the long arm of imperialists. The pseudo-banks [pyramid schemes] gave the opportunity to people's masses to rise up, get the weapons and fight for the overthrow of Berisha's reactionary, fascist regime. They form people's committees in order to strengthen their fight, and through general meetings they elect political coordinating organs and decide on how

they will confront the critical situation. At the same time, they declare that they will not hand over guns if Berisha's clique does not fall.

Both American and European imperialists, being frightened from the Albanian people's armed uprising, mobilize immediately, forming a multi-ethnic military force and invading Albania, aiming at reinforcing and maintaining the reactionary regime through the disarmament and the suppression of the people's uprising.

It is the communists', the left wingers', and the progressive people's duty to express their active solidarity to the

Albanian people's fight, so that Albanian people get courage and strength to go on [with] their fair fight.

We must condemn in every part of the earth the imperialist military invasion.

We must set the demand to the people's fight: "Out with the imperialists from Albania."

"Set the Albanian people free to decide on their future."

Long live the Albanian people's uprising

Down with Berisha's fascist regime

Out with the imperialists from Albania

Concluding Statement of the Conference

**On the 25th anniversary of the establishment of
TKP/ML and the 30th anniversary of January
Storm 1967 in the Great Proletarian Cultural
Revolution in China**

**TKPIML (Communist Party of Turkey I Marxist-
Leninist)
10 May 1997
Frankfurt, Germany**

*This document was scanned by MIM for reprinting here. Some errors may have occurred. We also made several minor changes in grammar and spelling of the English translation.
—ed.*

I would like to salute everybody in this conference which has been held by our party TKP/ML. Dear comrades and friends, At the beginning of my speech I would like to read a quote from Gonzalo.

"The first military school of the party is its most important asset. It also shows the opening and the closure of the party. It is an important asset in the peace time and a tool that leads us to our armed struggle."

"Comrades, our struggle without arms have ended. Our armed struggle started today. Our continuous Marxist-Leninist and Maoist struggle resulted with the uprising of the masses and the peasants. Our aim is to come to power. We represent the future. There is a violent fight between revolutionaries and the counter-revolutionaries. The bourgeoisie today does not use its old blood ridden tactics but resorts to massacring the prisoners, the students, the workers, and the peasants in the villages. This violent power, started its most cruel practises. The armed struggle is a

determining factor in the fight against the bourgeoisie. We should be prepared that armed struggle will be rejected by the reactionaries. They will send their servants and their army to defeat us. These powers are ready to eliminate the revolutionary wing of the working class and of the peasantry. But we know that we represent the future and will seize power through armed struggle. The armed struggle is a must and the only path to take the power."

The above speech belongs to Gonzalo and was made 17 years ago. I will again quote from his speech which was made 6 years ago.

"The struggle of our party has never stopped and defeated even for a short period. Our war is the peoples war and has continued even in the hardest of times. Our strategy is to set up red political authorities and set up political and economical power through democratic peoples revolution. We will set up new democratic peoples republic and we will capture the country piece by piece. Our path is Mao's theory of peoples war. As Mao once said we carry on our struggle while treating our injuries."

There is a huge duty in front of us, Marxist-Leninists. While we fight against imperialism, Capitalism, feudalism and all kind of reactionaries with our guns, at the same time we carry on our theoretical struggle against opportunism, revisionism, reformism, parliamentarism and Trotskyism. We can not defend Marxism and Leninism without defending Maoism.

The most important difference between TKP/ML and other revolutionary organisations is Maoism. Without relying on this idea we cannot explain the current system. The time when Marx lived had different contradictions than Mao's time. It became more complicated. Maoism is a social science which is dynamic not static it could be adapted to today's world.

Briefly it is today's interpretation of Marxism Leninism. Under the socialist system the contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the working class is not yet resolved. In fact it still is the main contradiction. Mao emphasised that in the socialist system it is necessary to make cultural revolutions over and over again.

These are the first steps of socialism. There are three elements of Marxism: Scientific Socialism, Political Economy and Philosophy.

Maoism is a light for the oppressed peoples of today's

world, it shines in today's darkness.

Maoism explained that the imperialism is a paper tiger and the only way to liberation of the people is people's war.

The three weapons of the revolution is the party, the military power and the united front. Without Maoism it is not possible to understand and to produce solutions to the problems of the revolution and the socialism today.

I would like to salute all the comrades who attended this conference especially our guest delegation.

The road of the October Revolution, the road of the liberation of the workers

Submitted by TPK/ML
(Communist Party of Turkey / Marxist Leninist)
May 2-4, 1997
Brussels, Belgium

This document was scanned by MIM for reprinting here. Some errors may have occurred. We also made several minor changes in grammar and spelling of the English translation.
—ed.

THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION

There is no wonder, if we do not count the Paris Commune that has lasted a few months, that the October Revolution is the biggest effort on salvation of mankind and the biggest, the most deeply rooted and the first effort under the blue sky for the liberation of labour. With October a hole was opened in the ramparts of capitalism that is based on slavery of labour, the ice was broken and a victorious way was shown for [the] proletariat and his neighbours. And October has shown us the magic key of getting rid of the burdens in front of social development.

First of all October is a way of freeing labour of [the] bourgeois yoke by socialism and what's more October is a perfect way of solving the contradictions of capitalism.

Like Marx's famous word in Capital, *October is unpossession of possessors*. It is understood that with this revolution the productive tools has been taken from bourgeoisie and big land owners, and for the first time in human history, a new type of state, a super type of state which is called dictatorship of the

proletariat has been founded and with this big effort the era of proletarian revolutions have started.

Just like yesterday today too October is most urgent with its aliveness and October is a point of reference.

The foundations of October's reference points that have basic and international veins are the foundations that we too shall arise.

The experience of October will be based on the following main thesis not counting the other ones.

First, the last paragraph of Communist Manifesto has been proved right with October and following revolutions. *"Communists are openly declaring that they can reach their aims only by pulling down the existing social conditions by force."* Starting with October revolution every revolution has took its place in history as a glorious victory of revolutionary force pulling down reactionary force. This method is still the only method and a method that we will never give up, every revolution's basic principle is insisting on this principle.

Second, as a revolutionary transition period October is for the first time the proletarian dictatorship becoming a part of the real life from being a theoretic event. With October for the first time in history the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and big land owners has ended and again for the first time a revolutionary class dictatorship of the majority was established, the dictatorship of proletariat on the bourgeoisie and their accomplices. With October for the first time in history the dictatorship of the proletariat was established.

Third, October is for the first time a proof of Marx's theory of leadership of the proletariat.

Fourth, October is the practice of victory over private ownership.

Fifth, October experience is the victory of socialism. But never the last victory. Because October is the name of the struggle between two ways, two classes, two lines whose answer is later given by Mao.

Sixth, October is the entrance way of mankind getting away from the power of capitalism and exploitation, to a way without exploitation and without social classes.

Seventh, October is not only breaking the chains of capitalist-imperialist chains on one link and forming a socialist centre under the blockade of this reactionary system, it is also as Stalin said the first phase of world revolution and a good base for the development of it.

Eighth, October has created a new revolutionary front and formed a bridge between socialist west and enslaved east. And October has widened the horizons of national problem and *"stopped it being a special problem against the national oppression to a problem of freeing oppressed nations and semi-colonies from imperialism."* Thus October has drawn east to an axis of common struggle against imperialism.

Ninth, October is an expression of collecting peasantry around the proletariat.

Tenth, October by starting the era of proletarian revolutions started a big era worldwide.

October is a necessity today also. It is a need and desire of humankind. This should be grasped clearly. The defeat of the first attempt world-wide, and especially, October's being stabbed at the back in the motherland of socialism and thus reconstruction of capitalism in this monumental land should be understood as a temporary retreat and defeat in the historic march of the proletariat. It is known that revolutions are not a single assault, or a single fighting. After a chain of victories and defeats, zigzags, turning backs and rising up against a successful revolutions existence can be rooted and permanent. We see clearly that the practices of October have been backstabbed by the new Bourgeoisie that was created in them.

The country of Lenin and Stalin, starting with the Khrushchev era of modern revisionism, has turned into its opposite. This modern revisionism has directly united domestically with classic capitalism and internationally with capitalist imperialist world market with Gorbachov coming to power in 1985. China, Albania and other base fields of socialism has shared the same destiny in different dates but with same methods. Thus, the first attempt of October could not be able to root its first victory with a final victory, and was defeated leaving behind an enormous experience.

But one shouldn't forget that this is, as Mao very rightly points out, "history changing its way slightly and goes backward a little bit." Do you think that the theorist of October, Lenin, said these words for nothing: *"it is not scientific and dialectic thinking to presume that world history would forever*

go forward without any shagginess and without showing great turning backs, this thinking is theoretically wrong. "Can one say that these words are wrong? Of course not.

The importance of October is that the right way is shown. At three years left to the 21st Century even if we do not have any base to rely on under this blue sky, even if all restoration attempts have come true and come in front of us as a reality of life, even if the attraction and charm of socialism have greatly decreased, and lastly even if capitalism has been repolished and offered as a solution under the umbrella of "new world order", the way of October is the most monumental, most noble and most glorious way of overcoming the cruel orders that aims the slavery of labour. The only prescription to save humankind from the bloodthirsty capitalism.

The defeat of socialism's first world wide attempt is relative. If we look at the events and developments on a wider window, and if we measure things not with a few years but with a few decades, or maybe a few fifty years, we will see that history will prove us right. Look at the history of the bourgeoisie. The bourgeois revolutions has nearly 400 years of history starting with the 1649 England revolution. And history shows us that the bourgeois powers have only been successful after a few times of changing hands.

The bourgeoisie had the final power after times of tide between the bourgeoisie and feudalism. Even the succeeding of an exploiting minority for another exploiting minority has taken many years, victories and defeats and stubborn fighting; it is the ABC of history of revolutions that a completely different kind of revolution where the exploiting minority is overthrown but the exploited majority, the proletariat dictatorship or its variations democratic people's dictatorships, which are an enormous revolt to private proprietorship of hundreds of years, will take a much more intensive struggle, temporary defeats once or more unaccomplishments and a series of efforts.

The first attempt of October's way that became unsuccessful by the capitalist way decides that has arisen in itself is an urgency. As long as on one hand the intensifying of the capital as a result of social products usurped by the private capitalist, on the other hand the opposite direction, that is concentration of poverty stay glued to each other and as a reason for existence of each other, as long as concentration of poverty is creating its opposite, as long as this ends create the capital as a result of his own labour, who can turn his back to such an antagonism under this blue sky?

Don't you think that this antagonism that is created out of proletariat and bourgeoisie class contradiction still doesn't preserve its dynamics? Can we overlook the contradiction between the social production and capitalist concentration? It is known that only the modern proletariat can solve this contradiction. The only motor power to lead humanity to its final freedom is the proletariat. This job is the proletariat's. Despite

temporary defeats in historical walk, and many mistakes, *October* has showed in practice that he can overcome this duty in tens of practical examples. What is to be done is to believe, persist and resist with loyalty in this road that has been examined in the laboratories of life.

A socialist theory that has passed between the hammer and anvil, and distilled from millions of successful revolutionaries practice has been remained. The bridge to 21st Century is only possible from the inheritance of 20th Century's revolutions and socialist practice. Any initiative that turns its back on this practice has no chance of being successful, it may only be a temporary station.

It is very clear that the most important inheritance that 20th Century practices has left us is the practice of dictatorship of the proletariat. And it is known that the main problem of the labour movement is the problem of dictatorship of the proletariat. As Lenin said, *"the compulsory condition of social revolution is dictatorship of the proletariat."*

DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT

No doubt that between capitalism and communism there is a passing period that bears the specialties of both social economic orders' specialties. This period is a period of struggle between capitalism that is defeated but still surviving, defeated but still ready to be born from the social pores of the community — and communism that represents new and right but that is still in the embryo stage. The state of this passing stage is dictatorship of the proletariat. As Marx said, *"From capitalist society to communist society there will be a revolutionary transformation period. And this is a political transforming period and in this period the stage can be nothing but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat."* That means that the proletariat, as the dominating class, needs the existence of a state in transforming from capitalism to communism. And this is the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Marx, who has put the concept of dictatorship of the proletariat in the right place in the practical results of the 1848-1849 wars, in his letter to Weydermeyer on March 8, 1852, states that the class struggle inevitably leads to dictatorship of the proletariat and thus develops the dictatorship theory in depth. Lastly, years after in 1871 Marx, after the Paris Commune lasted for two and a half months, draws conclusions about the inevitability of dictatorship of the proletariat.

First of all dictatorship of the proletariat is the essence of proletarian revolution. Without understanding the domestic character and meaning of proletarian revolution, it is impossible to understand dictatorship of the proletariat which is the basic content of this revolution.

Therefore to express the basic differences of proletarian revolution from bourgeois revolution is a compulsory start for the scientific explanation of dictatorship of the proletariat.

Bourgeois revolution has started when the capitalist order

was more or less present in the feudal society. On the other hand the socialist revolution has started when this order was not present at all or was present on a very small scale. The main task of the bourgeois revolution was only to take the power and deliver it to the existing bourgeois economy; on the other hand the main task of the socialist revolution is construction of a socialist economy. Similarly the bourgeois revolution ends by seizing the power, but the socialist revolution does not end by seizing of the power, it will be just a start to build the new democracy. Lastly the bourgeois revolution overthrows an exploiting minority to take to power as another exploiting minority, but the socialist revolution overthrows all exploiting minorities and destroys the existing state order and builds up a new state order.

These are the most important specifications of proletarian revolution found by revolutionary Marxism. Without proletarian revolution the old bourgeois relations cannot be changed completely and it is impossible to put a socialist re-construction in its place. *"Salvation of the exploited class will not be possible not only by making a revolution but also by demolishing the state apparatus created by the sovereign class."* The problem of proletarian dictatorship is the problem of the relation of the proletarian state with the bourgeois state and the relation of proletarian democracy with bourgeois democracy.

Dictatorship is a method which is directly based on force and not limited with any law. *"The revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat is a method that is gained by the proletariat by using force on the bourgeoisie and a method which is not limited by any law."* Dictatorship of the proletariat is not possible without demolishing the state mechanism of the bourgeoisie and putting in its place a temporary revolutionary state order.

As the founders and followers of Marxism also stated in the old times the problem was explained this way: *"Proletariat has to overthrow bourgeoisie, get into political power, and establish a revolutionary dictatorship in order to grant his salvation"*. But later on the problem was explained this way: *"Transformation to communist society from capitalist society is not possible without a political transformation stage, and the state of this transforming period can only be the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat."*

In the most general sense the *"dictatorship of the proletariat is a special kind of alliance between the proletariat and other labourer classes that are not proletariat (like petite bourgeoisie, peasants, little real estate owners, intellectuals etc.)"*. But in this alliance the basic thought of the leadership, the hegemony of the proletariat can never be ignored.

The ideological and political leadership of the proletariat and being right in the centre of the dictatorship is the most sacred principle of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Lenin enlightens this problem sufficiently by saying, *"the high principle of dictatorship is to support the alliance*

between the proletariat and peasantry which is compulsory for the proletariat to maintain its leadership."

The first principle of the dictatorship of the proletariat as a transforming period is that it is based on force. Because dictatorship of the proletariat is applying force against bourgeoisie to put it under pressure, to break its resistance and to scare it. This is the basic principle of its existence. The compulsory issue of the dictatorship the main principle and the most important factor that determines its character is depressing the bourgeoisie by force. Marx in his letter that he sent to Kugelman in April 1871 emphasises the problem of force on our subject and says, *"I state that the next revolution attempt in France will be not only conquer the military and bureaucratic mechanism as it was until today, but the main aim will be to demolish it."*

This means that the main task of the revolution is not conquering the existing mechanism but to tear, to demolish it. And it is known that Marx came to this conclusion in the light of Paris Commune experience.

That is why Lenin persistently writes about dictatorship as a method that is based on force in all of his writings. He says that the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat is a method gained and maintained against the bourgeoisie by force and not limited by any law.

That mans overthrowing and demolishing the old mechanism is not enough; in its place a new kind of state must be established, what's more the new order must apply revolutionary force to the overthrown bourgeoisie, or else application of revolution dictatorship will only be a dream. It is understood that revolutionary force is a compulsory must of dictatorship of the proletariat.

Since depression of the exploiters by force is a compulsory rule of the dictatorship, is it possible to run dictatorship of the proletariat by giving democracy to exploiters?

This problem was solved by Lenin years ago against Kautsky, but these days the same problem is raised again in a much funny boldness than Kautsky by the disciples of neo-liberalism and reformo-liquidators in the name of revolutionarism. This is an embarrassing return from revolutionarism and deformation of dictatorship of the proletariat in a Kautskian way.

It is very clear that the dictatorship of the proletariat is seizing power based of force.

Against whom?

Against bourgeoisie.

What do the disciples that follow the Kautskian way advocate? Democracy and freedom to the bourgeoisie also. But is it not known that if the depressed classes gain freedom and democracy again the reason of existence of dictatorship of the proletariat ends. It is known that as long as state exists as state the proletariat needs it not for freedom but to depress its rivals, mainly the bourgeoisie and the exploiters. This is the nature of

the state.

People who wish democracy for the bourgeoisie seem to forget that democracy has class characteristics too. And they say on the basis of democracy the proletarian state should go further than the bourgeoisie and should represent even further aims. But how? To give a chance to the bourgeoisie and all other thoughts to be able to organise and to give them to get into power. Yes, something is very clear. Democracy is one of the state types, and bourgeois democracy is a development compared to feudal democracy. But it is now completely reactionary compared to democracy of the proletariat. In a bourgeois state there is bourgeois democracy is for the exploiters. And the state is an apparatus of restraint that maintains the sovereignty of the exploiters, the continuance of paid labour's exploitation by capital. Thus it is understood that this would be a democracy just for the exploiters.

On the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat a completely different situation appears. Democracy for the exploited, dictatorship for the exploiters. Engels says that as long as the proletariat needs a state they use them to demolish their enemies. The socialist state that aims to demolish the bourgeoisie, keep them under pressure, and to stop the bourgeoisie's hopes from coming back, if this state behaves to enlarge the democracy in a bourgeois way, it treats the bourgeoisie as his equal instead of expelling it from its democracy, leaves the question of democracy for which class unanswered in a society where classes still exist. And it immunises democracy from its class basis, and this simply means the end of the proletariat's class sovereignty.

To give praises to the false beauties of the bourgeois democracy but on the other hand to leave the proletarian democracy which is a million times more democratic under layers of, and not to see the two faced side of the bourgeois democracy which is merely an apparatus of sucking the live labour by the capital like a vampire, means just seeing its nominal values like votes and elections.

The followers of the Kautsky line who deform the Marxist dictatorship of the proletariat in a Kautskian way advocate democracy for the bourgeoisie also, right for organisation for different thoughts, and cries for democracy of getting to power, seem to have a very democratic attitude in appearance. But on the other hand they do not have an answer to Marxist question of democracy for whom? On the other hand proletarian democracy, as being the domination of the majority over the minority, and organisation that enables the use of force of the exploited majority to the exploiting minority, is a form of state. Therefore democracy would only have a meaning if it is held on a class basis. That's why when we talk about democracy of the class we can see that "pure" democracy is only an illusion.

But if we insist on democracy for the bourgeoisie also although we know the fact that even a long time after the revo-

lution the exploiters still keep a series of their advantageous positions in education, finance, international relations, technical, and military art, etc. And although we are still not sure who will overcome this struggle throughout the time of revolutionary dictatorship, if we still insist on democracy for the bourgeoisie this will be the end of dictatorship of the proletariat. *If we envy the bourgeois democracy we also shouldn't forget that in the capitalist society the bourgeois democracy is limited with the capitalist exploitation. It's being underdeveloped, limitedness, normalness and its' being two faced is the frames of this exploitation.* Therefore this kind of democracy is neither over classes or pure, it's just for the sake of a bourgeois minority. Because democracy always has a class character. Democracy of the proletariat is also on a class basis and what's more it's an organisation that depresses the exploiting bourgeois minority for the sake of the exploited majority.

Since democracy is a way of state, when the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat vanishes the dictatorship will vanish with it too. Therefore it should be never forgotten that as long as there is democracy it also contains using force against the bourgeoisie.

Years ago when Lenin stated very righteously that to try to solve the concrete problems of dictatorship of the proletariat with classical "equality" and "democracy" concepts is agreeing to all the theories and principles of the bourgeoisie, he was showing us the only right way. *To claim it is possible to pass from capitalism to communism without dictatorship is an idiotic utopia*

Really we would like to ask if the bourgeoisie applied democracy in France in 1793, or in England in 1649 to a monarchy and to nobles that were the overthrown old ruling powers that were still aimed to the existence bourgeoisie power? Of course not. Nowadays can we talk about democracy for people in the "bottom" in nominal democracies? Of course not.

Engels in his article "On Authority" states that *"If the victorious party doesn't want to fall to the position to have fought in vain they must preserve their victory with their arms causing fear to the reactionaries."*

The proletariat which gained its sovereignty in the civil war with the direct force of the people can maintain its sovereignty only by a revolutionary dictatorship. Therefore Lenin stubbornly repeats his theory that the compulsory condition of a social revolution is the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is known that the dictatorship of the proletariat is a form of class struggle used as civil war before and during the revolution, now used after the revolution with the aid of the state apparatus.

It is understood that revolutionary force is a compulsory condition of the dictatorship of the proletariat and a basic principle of the dictatorship. And in this dictatorship the leadership of the proletariat is the most important thing of all. *"However*

the proletariat who has gained the political sovereignty although it gets it with the consciousness that it must have it alone, that is although the proletariat doesn't share its sovereignty with other classes, it doesn't mean that they do not need the solidarity and help of the other working classes and exploited masses. On the contrary this power can only be strengthened with a special alliance between the proletariat and other working masses of the petite bourgeoisie, and mainly with the labourer masses of peasantry."

These words that we have recited from Lenin clearly shows us the most sacred principle of the dictatorship which is supporting the alliance of the proletariat with the peasantry in order to preserve and develop its power.

On the other hand tens of revolutionary transition phases to the dictatorship of the proletariat have been proved with revolutionary practice. We know that history has created in historic and political wise, the first proletarian state in 1871 with Paris Commune, and then in 1917 February and October proletarian states, and then in and after the second imperialist world war another type of proletarian states, and then later Democratic People's dictatorship of China, in the future it is sure that it will create other type of proletarian states in the developing historic periods showing the characteristic of a revolutionary dictatorship, that is *"a dictatorship that is not established by a law issued by a central government, but a dictatorship that is issued by direct rising demands of the people, and only showing differences in the amount of the alliance of the proletariat with the peasantry."*

However it is clear that, the experiences of world revolutions have proved that, the revolutionary transition to the dictatorship of the proletariat has only existed in mainly three types. In the march from capitalism to communism there will be different political revolution types which are based on the dictatorship of the proletariat. Just like there have been different types of states based on the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

The revolutions in different countries that have different types of economic and politic structures, although they will be same in the basic, it is certain that they will show different types of revolutionary transition. Different economic and politic structures and different national structures will end up in different revolutionary transitions on the road of dictatorship of the proletariat. This will happen mainly in three ways

A) Dictatorship of the proletariat as direct transition to dictatorship of the proletariat:

1917 October period Revolution Soviets, France, England, Germany, USA etc., that is countries that have strong productive powers. In these countries the major aim of the program is to pass to dictatorship of the proletariat directly.

B) Revolutionary worker-peasant dictatorship as an indirect way of passing to dictatorship of the proletariat:

1917 February period Soviets, Portugal, Poland, Hungary, Balkans, and other countries where capitalism shows an inter-

mediate development. Here the main aim of the program is to pass to dictatorship of the proletariat not directly but indirectly through the dictatorship of workers and peasants.

C) Democratic people's Revolution as an indirect way of passing to dictatorship of the proletariat:

Pre-revolution time China, India, Turkey, Iran etc., that is colonised or semicolonised countries. Here the main aim of the program is not passing to dictatorship of the proletariat directly, but indirectly through democratic people's dictatorship.

Communist International Program gives the following expression about transition types: *"The different conditions and types of transition to the dictatorship of the proletariat can be three types schematically."* Stalin answers those who deny the existence of these transition types and say that there are only two types that is capitalist and colonised countries type and says this: *"These comrades are not right when they overlook that there are three types of transition types."*

We should underline that all these three types of transitions are the same in basis, one is a bit backward type of the former. As Lenin says, *"the politic types show great differences in passing from capitalism to communism but all of these types will be the same in essence: dictatorship of the proletariat."* Mao, who shares the same right ideas with Lenin will declare years later that the dictatorship of the proletariat in peoples democracies and dictatorship of the proletariat that is formed after October Revolution in Russia are the same in essence.

The direct transition to dictatorship of the proletariat involves only one class but on the other hand an indirect transition will involve a common dictatorship of more than one class. Both workers-peasants dictatorship and democratic people's dictatorship is a common dictatorship of more than one class under the leadership of the proletariat and in a lesser level.

All three existing transition types although they show differences in limits of their class basis or class alliance, they are all the same in political qualities and aims.

From 1903 to February 1917 in Soviet revolution in the first stage the class alliance is proletariat plus peasantry. In this stage when the proletariat the disactivates bourgeoisie it will demolish autocracy by force and through alliance with peasant masses will realise the democratic revolution.

From March 1917 to October 1917 which is the second stage the class alliance is proletariat plus poor peasantry. In this second stage the proletariat in order to win a victory over the bourgeoisie by force, and in order to neutralise the irresolute petite bourgeoisie and peasantry they made an alliance with semi-proletariats and realised the socialist revolution.

Like above in the Chinese Revolution the proletariat made alliances with all revolutionary classes and overcame the compradors, big land owners and fascist dictators. In this revolution and in the democratic People's Revolution which is the

essence of this revolution the limits of the class alliances are: proletariat plus petite bourgeoisie and plus the left wing of national bourgeoisie.

The revolutionary workers-peasant dictatorship that is represented in the first stage of soviet revolution, and democratic people's revolution that is realised in countries like China, all three types, although they show differences in class alliances, they are the same so long as they all represent the power of the popular masses' direct revolutionary force.

We want to recite a paragraph from Lenin to witness our words *"First with all the peasants to oppose the order of medieval ages (up to this stage the revolution has bourgeois character, it is bourgeois democratic), then with poor peasants, semi proletariat against capitalism including all exploiters, rich villagers, Kulaks, and speculators (at this stage a socialist revolution is aimed). To put a Great Wall of China between the first stage and the second, to put any limits than the preparation of the proletariat and degree of alliance with peasantry is deforming Marxism, to try to make it useless and to attempt to put liberalism instead."*

One may ask what is the essence that unites those three stages. In other words what is the essence of the dictatorship of the proletariat?

First of all, to clarify this question, one must take the starting point the first proletarian revolution, the experience of 1871 Paris Commune.

It is known that until the Commune experience the most developed kind of state type was parliamentary democratic republic. In this type of republic the power belongs to the parliament. Making laws, applying them and judgment are the usual. A permanent army, police and a privileged and over the people group of state officers are cornerstones of this order.

However, both the Paris Commune and revolutionary periods following it made another type of state, a superior type of democratic state came to life. As Engels says, *this new period, is not a classical state of yesterday. This state is a kind of state that instead of an army and police different from the people, the state provides arms to the people directly.* In 1871 for nearly three months this type of state was brilliantly alive in Paris Commune. Many decades later in 1917 in Russia, later on in China, Albania, East Europe etc., the states founded were all Paris Commune type states. Their essence were the same.

What was this essence?

1) The foundation of the power is the direct revolutionary force of the people. The foundation of the power is not a law approved by the parliament before.

2) Instead of forces like army and police that opposes the people, whole of the people are armed, the civil order is maintained by the people directly

3) The bundle of civil officers are replaced by the people or at least severely controlled by the people. These officers may taken from their duty by the wish of the people. On the

other hand this privileged group will take a normal wage as a worker.

This is the essence of Paris Commune. All the new types of states that were formed later used this same essence.

What was Paris Commune?

Engels answers. *"All right gentleman, do you want to know what this dictatorship looks like? Look at the Paris Commune. The Paris Commune was the dictatorship of the proletariat."*

The answer to the question do all the transition stages that aims the dictatorship of the proletariat have the same essence is yes: Yes because, all three kinds of dictatorship bears the same specifications that make the essence of Paris Commune. That is the power is not taken from a law by the government, but from the direct application of force by the people, instead of an army and police different from the people, direct armament of the people, replacement of bureaucracy and civil servants group with people directly, elections for all civil positions, and resignation of the elected people by the same method. These are the basic specifications of all three kind of dictatorships.

It could be either dictatorship of the proletariat depending on one class's dictatorship or it could be a bit backward stage of dictatorship of the proletariat depending on the dictatorship of the workers and peasants and democratic people's dictatorship all three have the very same essence that makes the essence of the Paris Commune.

However the armament of the people instead of the army and the police have not found itself a place in practice after the period of Marx.

One can ask the question that since the dictatorships of the proletariat has not used the way of replacing the army and the police with the people, have they not displaced themselves from the Paris Commune and therefore from Marx?

We should confess that, neither in the October revolution nor in China's revolution or the other proletariat dictatorships or people's dictatorship's which represent a backward stage of these revolutions are not organisational models that replace armament of people with permanent army and police.

In this aspect they did not identify with Marx's theory that came out of the Paris Commune. What's more the practice of 20th Century revolutions did not collide with commune example in this way. On the other hand Lenin, a few months before the October Revolution, in his masterpiece of Marxism "State and Revolution," wrote that as commune example shows they will abolish permanent army and put armed people instead as the first regulation the Paris Commune issued.

By saying this Lenin was referring to the Paris Commune example and the limited experience of Marx. But the new and alive practice of October, events in Hungary, experience of temporary German Revolutions and most important of all events in Russia, the Motherland of the Revolution, the resis-

tance of the defeated classes of the old world made it compulsory for the proletariat to have a central and united force.

Thus the experiences of October and later evaluated the thesis of "armed people instead of a permanent army" that spurred out of commune experience as an exceeded point of view. That's why Lenin left his views in State and Revolution after October and accepted the necessity of a state that has a permanent army. In 1920 Lenin advocated that there should be a centralised force to oppose the centralised and united force of the bourgeoisie. This was a new and practical theory of Lenin coming out of the new revolutionary movement.

New and alive, the shoot of theory coming from October has exceeded the limited experience of Paris Commune. Revolutions after October and especially the revolution of China followed the example of October in permanent revolutionary army. Under capitalist - imperialist siege, in transforming phase from capitalism to communism under the fire of class contradictions and class struggles without a centralised authority, without means of oppression, shortly without "revolutionary force" it is impossible to overcome socialist phase which is full of contradictions to a further phase and it is impossible to demolish the bourgeoisie step by step.

The state is a means to organise the force. In a socialist society that bears classes if this force is understood as armament of all the people and organising a state that does not have a permanent army, then it would mean disarmament of the proletariat for the benefit of the bourgeoisie under conditions that antithesis are colliding in economical, political and cultural areas, and especially under conditions in which it is still not clear who will overcome who. On the other hand armament of the people, inherited with deformed human nature of the capitalism (deforming, making unconscious, effecting ideologically etc.) means a great disorder among people and producing "anarchy of authority". Just like organisational anarchy.

What's more the limits of the people's education and culture level, and the limits of social conditions will not permit a kind of state that is based on the armament of whole people.

It is clear that the revolutionary communists are in favour of abolishing this state and the army that is based on this state however proletariat this state may be. But this won't happen immediately. This is one of the main principles that diverges communists from anarchists, and especially the M. Bakunin type anarchists. (Not to mention that when in practice like in Civil war of Spain they leave aside their anti-state, anti-authority attitude)

The limits of social conditions in the socialist phase makes the existence of the state a necessity. As far as the foundations like imperialism, bourgeoisie, and classes that feeds this conditions are alive an "iron fist" of revolutionary dictatorship of brass based on a permanent army is a necessity. The limited experience of the Paris Commune in Marx's time was not enough to comprehend this practice and therefore was unable

to reach the dictatorship theory of October. On the other hand Marx's and Engels' idea of a European revolution played an isolator role to reach this theory.

The relative defeat of socialism in the world scale is sought in some circles as a result of "armed people-permanent army" axis. This is getting away from the theory that has been proved by many experiences. If in the 20th Century the power relying on the sovereignty of the labour has survived for decades, if it managed to survive despite all the attempts of the siege of imperialism and revisionism, can we deny the supplement of the "iron fist" of the dictatorship of the proletariat relying on a centralised revolutionary army?

The most revolutionary side of Marx's theory is the dictatorship of the proletariat. The experiences of former Russian, Chinese, etc. experiences show us that if there were no armed terror of the sovereign class and other exploited classes over the bourgeoisie the power could not have existed even for a second.

This means that to crush the resistance of bourgeoisie and to win the class struggle it is compulsory to have a revolutionary dictatorship. And as in the very important words of Mao states to run the revolution under the leadership of the proletariat is compulsory throughout the transition period. Revolutionary dictatorship is the armament of the class and under socialism and ideological, political and economic revolution can only be maintained with an armament like dictatorship. Certain idiots who try to sacrifice Marxism by pulling it to the right and thus deform it do also know that in an environment sieged with wolves, dogs and pigs aiming a transition without a revolutionary dictatorship means taking sides with the bourgeoisie.

In the period extending from Marx to Mao the theory of dictatorship of the proletariat has been enriched. Lastly, Mao, by disclosing the theory of pursuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat, has accelerated revolutionary Marxism and repeatedly explained the necessity of a revolutionary dictatorship throughout the history of socialism. Mao clearly points out that throughout the historic period of socialism since it is not clear which class will win the struggle, it is extremely important to "comprehend the revolution". Therefore in 1957 China conditions he was already saying the following:

"The proletariat is trying to change the world according to its point of view bourgeoisie too does the same. In this point of view it is still not clear who will win: bourgeoisie or proletariat."

Mao, who disclosed the nature of socialism and its spirit rooted deep inside in a very clear way, states that even after the two sectors of socialist economy kolhoz and sovkos has been sovereign, it is still compulsory to maintain the revolution. Even after the sovereignty of these two sectors the class struggle does not end; what's more the class struggle between

the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and other political powers exists as a long and hard struggle, and even intensifies to the limit from time to time. Even after Kolhoz and Sovhos sectors sovereign the country's economy, that is even after the collective economy replaces private economy, that is even after this economic revolution to pursue the revolution under the leadership of the dictatorship of the proletariat is the essence of a real socialist revolution. Two roads, two lines, two classes are always front to front under the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Socialist way or capitalist way? Marxism or revisionism? Proletariat or bourgeoisie?

Yes, even after the economic revolution these questions are still unanswered.

Who will win? Which way, which class, which line?

The real key of these questions will be the real truth of life in Maoism. Mao disclosed that a real socialist revolution does not settle with an economic revolution. This kind of revolution is not enough alone. The essence is to keep up the revolution in political and ideological areas.

A socialist revolution with three fronts is the essence to understand the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat.

A real revolution should have a trivet: Economy, politics and ideology.

The road can only be taken with an insistent and continuous struggle. Because the bourgeoisie is still alive in the socialist society with its new form and existence as an antithesis of the proletariat. Yes property has been socialised, yes, capitalism has been defeated, yes it's crushed, but it is still not vanished. And it can not be vanished in the near future. And what is more in the middle of the communist party there is a nested group of old and new bourgeoisie giving hard resistance from time to time.

As a result of socialist society's special nature and pressure of the tense environment of the siege of capitalism-imperialism and the truth of the bourgeois pressure turn the party, state and government apparatus soil of new bourgeoisie shoots. The disciples of capitalist way try thousands of tricks to realise their hopes of turning back.

Mao clearly states that under the conditions of dictatorship of the proletariat the fire line of the revolution is the communist party. This field is the field of the most intense struggle and a decisive war. Which means that understanding, comprehending the revolution is the most important link in the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat. That is why Mao made some people who believe that there can be contradictions in the socialist society very astonished by saying: "Some say that there may be contradictions in the socialist society. I think this is not the right way of putting the problem. The problem is not that there may be contradictions in the socialist society, but the truth is socialist society is full of contradictions."

The only way to overcome the contradiction is the dicta-

torship of the proletariat.

REVOLUTIONARY VIOLENCE

As early as the Communist Manifesto Marx and Engels declare to the world underlining the truth of: "Communists... openly declare that they can only reach their aims by demolishing all social conditions by force." *Years later in Capital Marx states that: Force is the midwife of all societies that are pregnant to a new society.* And lastly Engels on his letter to Gerson Trier on 18 December 1889 writes the following: "We agree that the proletariat would not conquer the only gate opening to a new society by a revolution depending on force to maintain its political sovereignty."

It is understood that revolutionary violence is the compulsory lift of the revolutions. Both founders of Marxism, Marx and Engels, and followers Lenin, Stalin and Mao underlined this fact very carefully. Reactionary violence can only be finished by revolutionary violence and the bourgeoisie will never give up its power if violence is not applied. Many revolutionary experiences have proved this principle right. Leaving the Commune aside, all the revolutionary storms starting with October have brought the proletariat to political sovereignty by using violence as a tool of the revolution.

But the relative defeat of socialism, the loss of spell and attraction of socialism and revolution in the historic phase, retreat of socialism to shoal waters and therefore being blown about to the right has fed reformo-liquidation in the revolutionary ranks and therefore the thesis of violence being the compulsory lift of the revolution has started being negotiated. Such that instead of Marx's theory of class struggle class collaboration, instead of revolution bourgeoisie reformism, and instead of breaks and jumps in continuous dialectic a simple evolution theory has been fashionable.

With a bourgeois interpretation of revolutionary Marxism direct dragging from Jacobean perspective to an easy constitutional dreams, to deform revolutionary countersigns and to soften them, to reform them and to re-scale them appropriate to the slavery of labour and lastly with a "mass party" fairy tale to prevent proletariat from its class independence and its historic role of class sovereignty for favour of bourgeoisie has become the main principles of the international liquidation wave. When the revolutionary movement had come to a stop on a world scale and counterrevolutionary wave started to attack this well known movement has come foreword and started to act in the historic arena as the left foot of the bourgeoisie.

It is known and proved by history many times that by pulling the revolutionary theory and practice to the established order, by denying illegal struggle and putting foreword legalism and its sharp side legal party, this liquidator wave has declared the peaceful struggle as the only way of struggle and denying the truth that the class will never gain its political sov-

ereignty unless they make a revolution using violence. *This road is the principal base of the "universal liquidators".* This base is the base that today a number of revolutionary parties and organisations of the past have also approved.

But it is a truth and has been proven by many revolutions in the past that the world proletarian revolutions, and our revolutions form of existence, and most legal, most needed and most wonderful weapon is revolutionary violence and the thesis of overthrowing bourgeois power by violence is more truth than ever.

In these conditions where revolution and socialism have drawn back to shoal waters the people who could not comprehend the October and later revolutions traditions, in the work of liberating labour from the yoke of bourgeoisie they do not aim to break that yoke to pieces but they aim to collaborate with it, to secure class peace and therefore they do not choose the tools of revolution but they choose peaceful tools in accordance with harmonious capitalist development theory. As Lenin states *the minute you abolish class struggle based on revolutionary violence the bourgeois will start to walk hand in hand with the liquidators of this thought.*

A pioneer will not fit into the borders of the establishment with his aims and his methods and tools to reach this aims. Marx and Engels in "Communist Party Manifesto" that they wrote 150 years ago openly stated that the communists will reach their aims only by using force. Because it is known that the only program of revolutionary communism is recognition of a civil war. As the founders of Marxism repeatedly declared *revolution is one part of the society declaring their will to the other part of the society by using violence.* Any revolutionary brain that is not affected by the evolutionary draggings of today will easily understand this principle:

We, as Lenin said years ago, must bear the winds of the "storm". This is our compulsory strategy: Because it is known that *the first principle of the revolution is to see revolutionary violence as a basic lift.*

On his important article "On War and Strategy Problems" Mao's following words are as basic today as they were yesterday. *"Seizing power by using arms, and to solve the problem by war is the main task of the revolution and its highest form. This Marxist-Leninist revolutionary principle is valid internationally both for China and for all other countries."*

It is understood that revolutionary violence is the basic and compulsory principle of Marxism. To deny or to deform this principle means denying or deforming the revolution: Because it is known that revolution based on violence is the international rule of the revolution. Because revolution as Lenin put it, revolution is overthrowing at a moment of time the superior political structure that cannot cope with the new production relations by using violence.

Besides this principle all kinds of reformist thoughts, peaceful transition by reforms or any transition theory based

on voting in the parliament is treason to the class: It is known that thoughts that do not the revolutionary force as a continuous specialty of the revolutions and ways starting with Kautsky and Bernstein that depends in voting in parliament and aiming to gain majority in parliament with bourgeois voting systems is poisoning the consciousness of the working class and represents treason: As Lenin years ago in his polemics with Kautsky emphasised very importantly only the idiots and dishonest can advocate that proletariat can seize power by voting in the bourgeois parliament:

There is no other way to break the existing social conditions but violence: All international communist movement history and all the revolution experiences that cover nearly one-third of the world are clear proofs of that theory:

How cleverly Mao said one time: *Power is at the point of the barrel.*

It is known that these words belong to Marx: *the first condition of every popular revolution is to break down the bureaucratic-military machine:*

Certain reformo-liquidators that run away from the revolution as if running away from plague should know that a great revolution can not be thought without a civil war:

And all the great problems of the people can only be solved by violence:

Just like yesterday today also the principle of proletariat's seizing power by using violence is the main principle that we will base the Marxism thesis on the revolution:

And we know that relative defeats, retreat of revolution, is only a temporary retreat, a small break in the long historic walk in the life of class titans: History never routes a straight road forward. And revolution is never one fight or one attempt. The world is at the eve of a new revolutionary wave. And history will show us how compulsory is the role of violence in this revolutionary wave.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE DEMOCRATIC AND THE SOCIALIST REVOLUTION

Democratic and socialist revolution are separate phases of the revolutionary movement. *First is a necessary preparation for the second, and second is an inevitable result of the first.* One cannot put the Great Wall of China between them but you cannot treat as if both are same or equalise them in a common denominator.

First of all democratic and socialist struggles are different in their conditions. *Democratic revolution as peasants land reform is not socialist but a democratic movement* This movement as Lenin puts it, has a bourgeois character in economic and politic point of view But on the other hand this movement is a part, and an ally of world proletariat socialist revolution. In driving forces, in positioning of the classes and it's perspectives democratic revolution and socialist revolution are two separate stages.

But although they are separately staged, because they aim imperialism, feudalism and comprador capitalism, and because they aim to overthrow the power that enslaves the labour, as a special backward organisation of dictatorship of the proletariat, democratic people's dictatorship aims to see the working class, peasantry, petite bourgeoisie and national bourgeoisie under the left wing therefore democratic revolution is a stage of the labour front against the capital.

What is democratic revolution and what are the conditions that form a basis to this revolution?

As social basis based on the peasantry and has not solved the national problem yet, has not yet reached the level of economics to free itself from the loneliness of field life, is still being affected by the deadening pressure of the feudal law vice, has still not been able to break the feudal exploiting order that stops the social development, before catching the train of the bourgeois revolution tied by the exploiting chain of foreign capitalism and turned to the back garden of imperialism, these are the economic political and social characteristics of the countries that are candidate to democratic revolution. And in these countries the revolution is based on land revolution.

In these countries the economic order is the unification of feudal and capitalist economy's specifications, and it is impossible to calculate where the first finishes and the second starts. The lines of capitalist and feudal economy are united in this order. And these countries are semi-colonies, semi feudal in social status. The anti-imperialist anti-feudal contradictions that arise in the social pyramid of countries in these status discloses the following important tasks:

- 1) The nature of the revolution is democratic.
- 2) The strategic aim of this revolution is to overthrow imperialism, feudalism and comprador capitalism.
- 3) To establish Dictatorship People's Power instead of the power overthrown.

In these countries the main tasks are to realise land revolution of the peasants against the economic order of feudal and pre capitalist economic orders, and to give national independence struggle against imperialism. In this first stage of the revolution democracy and independence, and in the second stage socialist tasks are basic.

This revolution in its first step, that is in democratic revolution phase is bourgeois democratic in nature. Its objective aim is to open the road for the development of capitalism. But this revolution, in its first step is a revolution that is made under the leadership of the proletariat a new democratic society formed by the partnership of all revolutionary classes and aims to form a democratic state.

These theses that are clearly defined in Lenin's and Stalin's writings reached to a rich synthesis with Mao. Mao, especially in his article "On New Democracy" has disclosed democratic revolution deeply and widely and gives a rich theoretic explanation:

Democratic revolution is against imperialism, feudalism and comprador capitalism. The capitalism that is targeted at is a kind of capitalism that is directly connected to foreign capitalism and that is tied to foreign countries. As the masters repeatedly tell in the first phase of the revolution the national bourgeoisie is not one of the targets.

On the contrary the duty of the first stage is to clear all the organisations that are the remainders of the medieval ages and economical production types of pre-capitalist stage and open the road for the development of national capitalism. This means that the victory of democratic revolution does not target to end capitalism, but on the contrary creates a wider foundation for the development of it and accelerates and intensifies its development. On the other hand socialist revolution demolishes capitalism.

This revolution contrary the socialist revolution gives its struggle with a part of the bourgeoisie, mainly with the left wing of the bourgeoisie and at the same time this bourgeoisie is a strategic ally in the revolutionary united front. On the other hand socialist revolution targets whole of the bourgeoisie. While Democratic revolution targets feudal organisations allying with all peasants, socialist revolution targets all bourgeoisie allying with poor peasants.

This revolution will not affect the basis of capitalism. Along with a full and stable democracy a wide land reform will also clear the factories from Asian type slavery remainders. Although the revolution in the first stage has a bourgeois economic and social character, and does not bear a socialism character, it is still a part of proletariat socialist world revolution under the leadership of the proletariat.

Let's give some details.

The new democratic revolution, the revolution targeting the international bourgeoisie, while going on the path of democratising the peasantry, clearing the obstacles in front of the productive forces, taking the land of rich landowners, and spreading the land to peasants that have no land or very little land, in social and political essence it still shows the character of the bourgeoisie. In general it does not abolish capitalism and does not touch national capitalism.

The capitalism that this revolution target' is the kind of capitalism as Stalin defines the capitalism that plays the intermediate role between financial capitalism and domestic market, and as Mao defines it the kind of capitalism grown and fed by imperialism and being the imperialism's social support, that is comprador capitalism for short:

Mao clearly defines the targets of this revolution with his following words: "... politically, it struggles for the revolutionary classes and to establish to form a common dictatorship against imperialists, traitors and reactionaries... economically targets imperialism, traitors and reactionaries, all big investments and nationalisation of their capital and distribute the land owned by big landowners to the peasants." However this

kind of revolution, this new democratic revolution "preserves private capitalist investments in general and does not liquidate rich peasantry economy. Thus this new democratic revolution while on one hand permits development of capitalism and on the other hand prepares conditions for socialism."

Therefore democratic People's revolution will walk on the road to abolish semi-feudal semi-colonial society and to construct socialist society.

This revolution at the moment does not walk in the road of nationalising of all productive tools and does not show the character of socialism. As Lenin says "democratic revolution is bourgeois in character. A general re-spreading, or the slogan of land and freedom - the slogan of peasant masses that are oppressed, unconscious but still in need of enlightenment and happiness - a bourgeois slogan. But we Marxists know that for the proletariat and peasantry the road leading to real freedom is the road of bourgeois freedom and bourgeois development. We should not forget that to reach socialism today there is no other device than a complete political freedom, a democratic republic and revolutionary democratic dictatorship of proletariat and peasantry."

These visions that are formulated by Lenin in the Russian revolution practice has been even more developed by Mao and the difference between the two phases of the revolution will thus be clarified. New democratic revolution in China shows differences from socialist revolution in overthrowing imperialism, traitors and reactionaries power but not touching the part of capitalism that is involved in anti imperialist and anti feudal struggle.

It is known that the new democratic revolution in the leadership by the proletariat has to bear a character that targets independence demolishing of imperialism to maintain the national salvation outside and demolishing the power and population of comprador classes in the cities and demolishing feudal relations in rural areas. New democratic revolution is gathering forces to transmit to socialism, to prepare the necessary conditions for it. This revolution will not abolish capitalism that in general helps anti-imperialist anti-feudal struggle but on the contrary the revolution will try to preserve that kind of capitalism. This revolution is a national revolution because it struggles against imperialism and its servants and this revolution fights for the independence of the country. It's democratic because it frees the peasant masses from the oppression of feudalism and solve the land problem. This revolution is the anti-imperialist anti-feudal struggle of large labourer masses in the leadership of the proletariat.

The class leadership of this new democratic revolution is not in the hands of the bourgeoisie like in the old days but it is in the hands of proletariat. This means that the head rising on the body of the peasantry in the revolution belongs to proletariat at its ideological, political and organisational leadership. New democratic revolution is a peasant revolution in its character.

In democratic revolution any attitude against peasantry should be presumed against the revolution.

Revolutionary Marxism is the theory of the movement of salvation of proletariat:

However this movement will never be successful if one of its legs does not lean on peasantry: *Lenin, when saying that if the capitalist country's proletariat does not form a block with oppressed masses of the enslaved colonies the victory of world revolution is not possible, he was underlying the importance he gave to the peasant class.* On the other hand these words he said for the Russian revolution underlines the importance he gives to peasant dynamism: as long as there is no revolutions in other countries only an alliance with peasantry will save the socialist revolution in Russia: If we make a short journey in history we will see that every revolution that misses peasantry has been obliged to failure: In 1840-1850 years and in 1871 if revolutionary attempts have been unsuccessful, among other things one of the most important factors are that peasantry has taken sides with bourgeoisie.

In preparing the revolution, in revolution and afterwards the destiny of the revolution depends on which side the labour-masses of the peasantry will take:

The founders and applicators of Marxism are very clear on peasantry: This principle should never be set aside especially in colonial and semi colonial countries: *a revolution that does not rely on peasantry will never be successful. The experience of 20th Century revolutions has proved this principle right.*

"Communist International Program" clarified the following for the countries that are locked in the axis of this kind of revolution: *"In these countries it is decisive to struggle against feudalism and pre-capitalist exploitation types, continuously struggle for realisation of a peasantry land reform and struggle against foreign imperialism and for national independence."* It is a special duty of this revolution that a special role be given to peasantry. And this importance is one of the basic principles of new democratic revolution. It is a basic principle because in this revolution peasantry is a principle force and therefore an irrevocable leg of the revolution. On the other hand in socialist revolution peasantry is not a principle force. Only poor peasantry will join the proletariat as an ally in the socialist revolution. In socialist revolution the proletariat is both leader and the principle force of the revolution.

On the other hand the alliance with national bourgeoisie in new democratic revolution is of special importance. Because national bourgeoisie is an alliance of the revolution and when domestic contradiction is the principle contradiction, that is in the democratic phase of the revolution it participates in the revolution as a member of the revolutionary united front.

Socialist revolution on the other hand develops against all parts of the bourgeoisie. The reason for this is the revolution in

colonial and semi-colonial countries differ from the revolution in imperialist countries because in imperialist countries the bourgeoisie is completely counterrevolutionary and therefore the target of the revolution whereas in colonial and semi-colonial countries the bourgeoisie splits in two. The comprador bourgeoisie which is the leaning point of imperialism is counterrevolutionary whereas the left wing of national bourgeoisie plays a revolutionary role as a member of the revolutionary united front.

In these countries the best weapon to overcome the enemy is the united front.

The front has a very special meaning in countries living the revolution phase. In the revolutions of these countries the united front plays a decisive role in breaking the state to pieces which means organised violence to overcome the enemy. This truth is the irrevocable specifications of these kind of states. *The front finds life on a pyramid formed by economical politic and organisational pyramid formed by all revolutionary classes with the leadership of the proletariat. It should be noted that except for the proletariat other classes would never have a united will power.* The thesis that the proletariat would never have the same will power with the national bourgeoisie is out of any basis because it is based on a view that does not see the Marxist realities and therefore is based on a metaphysical interpretation of single will power.

We as socialists who are well aware of the socialist revolution and democratic revolution in historic and logical differences cannot say that the will power that is not present in struggle for socialism and for the problems of socialism is present in the problems of democracy and in the problems of independence. To forget this concrete truth means forgetting that democratic revolution is the revolution of all the people. However beyond the limits of democracy and land problem we cannot talk about a single will power of the proletariat peasantry, petite and national bourgeoisie.

On the other hand in socialist revolution since these problems were solved with democratic revolution, or has been solved in bourgeois revolution one cannot talk about a common will power of the proletariat with those classes. Because socialist revolution targets the bourgeoisie as a whole. Therefore it's only the proletariat's will power that is considered.

In these kind of countries the main task is construction of an independent, democratic state at the end of a long people's war against semi-colonial semi-feudal construction.

(February 1997)

The Universal Lessons of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution of China

Paper presented by - Samar chowdhury,
for the Central Committee CPI(M-L) Janashakti

This document was scanned by MIM for reprinting here. Some errors may have occurred. —ed.

The Central Committee of the CPI (M-L)-Janashakti expresses its revolutionary fraternal greetings to the TKP/ML for organising a conference marking the 30th anniversary of the GPCR on the occasion of the 25th year of founding of the TKP/ML and also for clearly owing its building to the GPCR. The formation of the M-L movement and party in India also owes to the GPCR, as like many other parties and organisations world over. We are thankful to the leadership of TKP/ML for inviting us to be present in this solemn occasion.

Comrades, it is more than 20 years now, you cannot hear anymore the slogan from Radio Peking, very deep meaning one, that, 'Are you searching for a bourgeois? You need not look outside. They are very much inside your party.' The Deng-Tsiao Ping regime of China has proved how deep and farsighted was this slogan. But, to begin with, it is better to go back to those days when we heard that 'To rebel is justified' and 'Bombard the headquarter.' We all know that it was none other than comrade Mao who conceived the basic ideas and methods of a completely new type of revolution — a revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat. The revolution Mao kindled was neither limited to nor a necessity for China alone. The tremors and pressure-waves were spread and felt everywhere. And for all theoretical and practical purposes, it was a new light, a new weapon for the international communist movement. For the first time in the history of the ICM, it was comprehensively and precisely formulated that for the entire period of socialist transition the principal contradiction remains as between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat and class struggle is the key link. So the other guiding principles like 'Put politics in command' and 'Red and expert' were quite natural to follow.

During the GPCR also it was emphasized to be modest. Still,

when Mao, a person modesty incarnated, said number of times that he himself could not foresee all the width and depth that the movement unfolded, most probably from both poles of the class division — it was not mere modesty. We have to continue to learn not only from the positive and universal lessons of the GPCR has left behind for us, but also try to understand the reasons for its defeat. Otherwise, we are afraid that, we may land ourselves in uttering some platitudes and rigmaroles. We are hopeful that the discussion in this august gathering of Marxist-Leninist-Maoists will be beneficial for us to develop our understanding.

THE GPCR AND THE INDIAN REVOLUTION

The great Soviet revolution of 1917 brought Marxism-Leninism to India. Although the Communist Party of India was founded in the second decade of the twentieth century, it took more or less fifty years to come out of the domain of revisionism and neo-revisionism. The revolutionary ranks were hoodwinked in 1964 when the neo-revisionist party the CPI (M) was formed after splitting from the CPI. The inner party struggle started taking organised shape since 1965. Then followed the open rebellion of the Marxist-Leninists through the peasant armed struggle of 1967, viz. Naxalbari armed peasant struggle. In April 1969 the CPI (M-L) was formed. Everybody knows that those were the hey days of the Cultural Revolution.

Comrade Charu Majumdar, the leader of the Naxalbari struggle and the founder General Secretary of the party said in '69 that "at the time of the Cultural Revolution when the Chairman declared in his thunderous voice 'To rebel is justified' then we got our courage, we got the tremendous strength to stand on our own feet, we ignored the revisionist leadership, and independently took upon the path of developing the armed struggle of the peasant masses ... we created Naxalbari. And as a result of the huge support given by the great glorious and correct communist party of China the revolutionaries all over India became united ... the Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist) was born". Comrade Charu Majumdar was of the opinion that, after the great October (November) revolution of 1917 and the new democratic revolution of China in

1949 "The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution is the third revolution which has influenced the world system". This was also stated in 1969 when the GPCR was scoring victories after victories and everyone, like him, was convinced that the danger of restoration of capitalism in China has been prevented and China will not become like the USSR under Khrushchev and Breznev. But now, after more than twenty years of the defeat of the GPCR, reviewing hindsight, one can compare the GPCR more likely with the Paris Commune. Yes, Paris Commune failed, it was defeated, but we all know the lessons and its impact it left behind for the proletariat and the toiling masses for the upcoming successful revolutions which were budding and started to come into existence within less than fifty years. And fifty years is too short a period in the history of mankind. We hasten to add, which is unfamiliar with the commune, that the leader of the G. P.C.R. has positively contributed a concrete theory also, which as an additional weapon in the hands of the international proletariat.

UNIQUE SITUATION AND UNIVERSAL ANSWER

Comrade Lenin, the great leader of the first successful socialist revolution and, the leader of the world proletariat after Marx and Engels, did not get the opportunity to have the experience of building socialism and discover and sum up the complex - most problems of leading the class struggle under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Still, whatever little time he got after 1917 revolution, he never failed to educate and warn the proletariat that the defeated enemy not only tries but also increases its attempt ten fold, hundred fold, even more, to rest back the power it lost. He also pointed out the danger of capitalist restoration brewing in the new born society itself from the numerous, and spread to every corner of the land, petty producers that were and would be there for a long period of time.

History gave the responsibility to comrade Stalin the task of leading the proletariat towards building the first socialist state in very weak, poor and vast country, encircled by the worst possible enemies. The USSR led by Stalin became a strong industrial country and the whole world was astonished when the Soviet red-army and the people not only save the USSR but inflicted a crushing defeat on Hitlerite fascism.

At the same time anti-Jap war in China became victorious and next four years Chinese people went through another civil war under the leadership of the Communist Party of China led by Mao. The reactionary ruling classes of the comprador big bourgeois and feudal warlords were defeated and the new-democratic peoples republic of China was born in October 1949. In every stage of this protracted revolution Mao put forward the theoretical guide line, basing on Marxism-Leninism, Summing up the experiences of the entire revolutionary prac-

tice in a concrete reality, a typical social milieu, the colonial semicolonial - semifeudal China. The world proletariat especially the toiling people of the backward dependent countries became armed with the frill blown theory of New Democracy, strategy and tactics of peoples war, and the orientation of building two types of united front in two different situation of the same revolution.

Within a short period of time, Mao was confronting a totally different situation in home and abroad. First - Stalin was no more, and Stalin's Russia was turning to be Khrushchev's Russia; Second - Internationally this was the first experience that in a socialist state, even after more or less 40 years of dictatorship of the proletariat, a relatively peaceful transition to capitalist restoration was very much near conclusion, which would finally develop into a social - imperialist super power, as Mao defined it. And it came out with a frill fledged modern revisionist theory - the notorious 'three peace' theory of Khrushchev, and the theory of 'people's state' as against the dictatorship of the proletariat.

This was really an unique situation never experienced by the international communist movement. Lenin warned about the possibility. Stalin fought ruthlessly, albeit along with his shortcomings of understanding the danger in totality, against any attempt to destroy socialism. But Mao faced a situation without any precedence. On the one hand at the ideological political level, he had to lead a struggle, defending and upholding the revolutionary essence of Marxism - Leninism and defending Stalin against the modern revisionist onslaught (CPC - CPSU ' great debate), on the other hand he had to define and expose the real character of the USSR since the 20th Congress of the CPSU leading to and growing in frill up to its period of open aggression of Chekoslovakia in 1968 and onwards. Included in this period are that of withdrawing all helps and supports, by the USSR, to the building of socialist Chinese economy and, finally, threatening the Chinese border with the mighty military power of Breznev's USSR.

These are all now a part of history. And history has proven that if there was no Mao at that period to take up the challenge against modern revisionism, his slogan was "revisionism is the main danger", there would have been no M-L parties and organisations today in large number of countries. And everyone would have been in a situation of homeless child like the revisionist compradors after the collapse of the USSR. You can still carry on a debate how wrong or even "nationalist" it was to define the then USSR as "social-imperialist", or how much the pulse - beat of "socialism" still could be felt in Khrushchev - Breznev period. But facts remains as such, and human bloods spilt over Afghanistan or Angola, and the amount of loots and plunder by the "New Tsars" in India and elsewhere speak for themselves, Mao meant to say that

"Revisionism in power means capitalism is power"

Back home, in China during the same period Mao, and the Party and the state he was leading, was faced with the other side of the coin. Mao had to resign from the state-presidency, but gave the call for the 'Great Leap Forward'. The 8th Congress of the CPC was won over, more or less, by Liu-Deng, rather by the theory of 'dying out of the class struggle' in China also. Taking cue from the CPSU 20th Congress, anti-Stalinism was gaining ground in China. The Lushan Conference of 1959 experienced the ninth major struggle in the history of CPC Mao described this struggle with Peng Teh Huai as also a "struggle between two headquarters" and next comes the struggle with "China's Khrushchev" - Liu Shao Chi.

Here, a point or two will not be out of context. First, during the period and through the practice of the new democratic revolution of China, Mao not only came out with his theory of New democracy and others as we have already mentioned but also contributed generally to the arsenal of knowledge of Marxism-Leninism, specially in the field of philosophy, on the question of contradiction, determination of principal contradiction etc. well back in 1937.

Second - Mao had his high regards for Stalin, with genuine felling of indebtedness towards Stalin for his moral and material support to the Anti-Jap war of the Chinese people, whom he described as "the leader of great Soviet Union, of the great Communist International and of the liberation movement of the mankind". He also used to refer Stalin as the "Leader of the world revolution". And, Mao had his criticisms of Stalin too, some of them are bitter and severe, but he never made it public, and never made any comment against Stalin when it was not absolutely necessary or out of context, that too while discussing within the leading representatives or bodies of the CPC. Mao had highest appreciation for Stalin for his historic role in building first socialist state and defending that. But Mao definitely had his criticisms about Stalin's understanding and handling of the contradictions in the socialist society. In mid-fifties Mao wrote his famous essay "on correct handling of the contradiction".

Third, the very nature of the revolution Mao led to completion i.e., anti-imperialist and anti-feudal new democratic revolution in itself is inherently poised with high degree of nationalism and bourgeois petty-bourgeois ambitions. This objective basis in the new society would definitely have its influence inside the party. And one can imagine how strong a social base was ready, particularly in China the country of largest population always, for the "capitalist roaders in power". In addition to that they had their mentor and friend in the international level, that is from the then USSR.

So, Mao's concept, and his best contribution also, of continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat was

not in any way subjective idea coming out of the blue. It was his concrete answer, we repeat - concrete contribution, to the concrete problem of preventing the danger of capitalist restoration and defending dictatorship of the proletariat and carrying forward the task of building socialism.

This cannot be just a rectification campaign of old type which Mao had led earlier. The party no doubt has to be rectified and further proletarianised. But the entire superstructure has to be proletarianised and powers have to be rest back wherever that have gone in the control of the 'capitalist roaders'. The struggle is not just alone the matter of suppressing this or that group of defeated enemies or cliques of counter-revolutionaries which can be handled through the state power. Along with that a new bourgeoisie has developed from inside the party itself. Of course the main target is the 'capitalist roaders' as the May 16th circular (1966) precisely pointed out, but the main danger is revisionism gaining fertile ground on "old culture, old customs, old habits". So, its a revolution not only to recapture power from the capitalist roaders (As Mao said 'Revisionism in power means capitalism in power' similarly he said that- "The handful of capitalist roaders in power our party are the representatives of the bourgeoisie in our party."), its a revolution to remold, re-educate, further revolutionize the entire working class and the masses. Naturally the precise guiding slogan could only be - 'Fight self, repudiate revisionism' which was clarified further that 'without fighting self, you cannot repudiate revisionism'. So Mao had his method of cultural revolution, the practice of and developing the 'mass line' to its new height, for the strategy of 'continuing revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat.' "The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution is in essence a great political revolution under socialist condition" and now it has become like a truism, still it is true only, what the resolution of the eleventh plenum quoted from Mao. "To overthrow a political power, it is always necessary, first of all, to create public opinion, to work in the ideological sphere". The GPCR did more than creating public opinion and work in the ideological sphere. It created means and suitable forms of organisation and style of functioning for this completely unprecedented revolution - a revolution under 'socialist condition'.

DEFEAT OF THE GPCR IN POST MAO PERIOD

In 1967 Comrade Mao said - "The victory or defeat of the revolution can be determined only over a long period of time If it is badly handled, there is always the danger of a capitalist restoration. All members of the party and all the people of our country must not think that after one, two, three or four great cultural revolutions there will be peace and quiet. They must always be on the alert and must never relax their vigilance."

This was not done after Mao's death. Rather, the opposite was done. And within two years time, of transition, Deng's capitalist, regime established its control and started shouting at the top of their voice, about the "disastrous" effect of the GPCR.

While talking in a report meeting in October '66 Mao remarked that- "what I'm responsible for is the division into first and second lines. Why did we make this division into the first and second lines? The first reason is that my health is not very good, the second was the lesson of the Soviet Union. Malenkov was not mature enough and before Stalin died he had not wielded power. I wanted to establish their prestige before I die. I never imagined that things might move in the opposite direction.

Thao Chu Comments - 'Supreme power has slipped from your hands.'

Mao said - "This is because I deliberately relinquished it. Now, however, they have set up independent kingdoms. "

Just on the next day, in the central work conference Mao makes more revelations - "There are some things I should have kept a grip on which I did not. So I am responsible, we cannot just blame them. Why do I say that I bear some responsibility?

First - It was I who proposed that the standing committee be divided into two lines and that a secretariat be set up. Everyone agreed with this. Moreover, I put too much trust in others

Then he talked about another aspect of the limitations. About the beginning of the GPCR he said "... It all happened within a very short period less than five months.... No wonder the comrades did not understand too much. The time was so short and the events so violent. I myself had not foreseen that as soon as the Peking University poster was broadcast, the whole country would be thrown into turmoil..."

It is a fact that for ten years, 1966-76, the attempt of 'capitalist restoration' could be prevented and in many quarters powers were seized back from the capitalist roaders.

It is also a historical fact that Mao realized and warned that "another revolution within few years and 'two, three, four, great cultural revolutions" would be necessary. But, even though Mao referred to the lessons taken from Soviet Union while candidly telling about Malenkov experience, not so much better than Malenkov (Hua Guo Feng in case of China) could be seen there in China after Mao.

One thing we can state confidently that at least in the initial stages of the GPCR "Left", in appearance but basically rightist, phrase mongering and deification (of Mao) started causing havoc to the very basic aims and tasks of the revolution. Lin Piao was elected as successor and his introduction to the 'Red book' was spread everywhere. The "completely a new era" concept and only "red book and "three articles for everyday reading" prescription also caused havoc, we can say, at least in

the life and practice of the CPI(M-L).

Well, it is understandable now, after the Lin Piao episode that - 'one tendency covers up another' and 'as there is a process of unfolding of a tendency so there is a process to understand that', but certain problems still remain to be understood, for the further interest, from the negative sides that were born during the same period.

With the materials available we could be relatively clear about the factors like ultra-democracy and tremendous factionalism grown everywhere. About the factions we came to know, as William Hinton tells us, that even the targets of the GPCR built, through their children and followers, their own "red guards", who were claiming to be "pro Mao", opposing the other group of red guards. And we all know about the "self-criticisms" made by Deng only as an art to cover-up and bidding for renewed opportunity. But, is it a fact that Deng and the likes were treated liberally? Or, when in 1975 Deng was taken back for a short period, by then, did Mao actually lost control for his ailments or otherwise?

The most pertinent questions are two One-how it was possible that, even after taking lessons from the Soviet experience, why the reality could not be otherwise that the rightists, capitalist roaders were so close to power that they could win total power within a short period after Mao's death? Second, was it a fact, as some well meaning persons feel and have a criticism also, that Mao didn't launch a total campaign against the pseudo "lefts" with the apprehension that the rightist would take advantage of that? But actually, they feel, the misdeeds of the "lefts" caused havoc and created a fertile ground for the rightists to mobilise support in their favour.

We have no hesitation to say that we have to know and learn quite a few more lessons not only from the positive sides of the GPCR, but also from the negative developments during that period. We firmly believe and uphold that the theory and orientation of the GPCR as formulated by Mao and the CPC was hundred percent correct. As the lessons of Paris commune could lead the proletariat to usher in the era of socialism through the method of cultural revolution, the lessons of the GPCR of 1966-76 will lead the proletariat to win victories in the next cultural revolutions wherever it may start

Let the dogs bark over the "disastrous effect of the cultural revolution". We cannot but remember what Engels wrote to Bebel, even after 13 years of the Commune, that it was the "birthplace of international Communism."

Africa and Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought

Congrès des Progressistes pour la Libération -
CPL- (former UMP) Zaïre
(Delivered at the International Seminar on
Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought in
Hyderabad, India in March 1995)

This document was scanned by MIM for reprinting here. Some errors may have occurred. —ed.

The big question that we have today is whether Marx, Lenin and Mao can still be considered as the classics of the revolutionary movement in Africa.

We do not need any expert to confirm the deterioration of the material conditions of the people of Africa, particularly south of the Sahara. Social collapse and genocide have become the keywords to describe the situation in Africa. At the same time we do not see any stirring of social forces aimed at bringing down the neocolonial order which is responsible for the disaster of our times, despite the existence of the working masses. The ideologues of imperialism speak of the recolonization of the continent as a solution to its problem. American "scientists" even undertake research on the blacks' genes to prove the source of their incapacity. The African revolutionary movement seems to be on the ebb. Therefore, we understand that the ripening of the objective conditions alone cannot generate revolution as long as the subjective conditions fail to ripen.

The role of the revolutionary theory in all social movements for the overthrow of the oppressive order cannot be denied. The most important merit of Marx and Engels, says Lenin, is that they gave a theoretical foundation to the historical role of the proletariat as an imposing revolutionary force capable of destroying the capitalist regime and establishing a new society, a communist society. They showed the proletariat and the working masses the way to emancipation, proved the necessity of the communist party as a leading force in the workers' movement, and elaborated the scientific foundations of its strategy and tactics.

Today, the necessity of Marxism-Leninism for the national liberation movement in Africa is unquestionable. The existing poverty of the African revolutionary movement shows that the essential elements of the classics pointed out by Lenin are still relevant. Correct analysis of the neo-colonial system, and the confidence that the revolutionary way is the only means to lib-

erate subjected peoples cannot be the result of a simple report of local daily deterioration. Use of the theory is indispensable in order to understand and assimilate one's own experiences and those of other struggles all over the world — the struggle of the proletariat against capitalism and the struggle of the peoples against imperialism. So, Marxism-Leninism is in fact important for the national liberation struggle and social emancipation in Africa.

The reduction of Marxist influence in Africa has made the introduction of all kinds of neo-colonial, petty-bourgeois and confusing theses possible. Instead of the establishment of parties representing the working class interest, the establishment of non-governmental organizations were recommended as the solution to the fundamental problems of the masses of the people. The international community, we mean the IMF and the World Bank, have suppressed all local collective initiatives. In such confusion, it was difficult for the people to realize the alliance of the proletariat and the peasantry, which is a necessary condition to form a striking force of the African revolution. Marxist-Leninist parties are, in the present conditions, the only effective instruments to prevent the extermination of the African people. The extent of the genocide in Rwanda is partly due to the absence of such a party. On the national level, we know now that the military superiority of the neocolonial regime was not enough to eliminate one million people in three or four weeks. The agents of neocolonialism has spread the ideology of the extreme right.

This has been decisive in reducing the resistance of the Rwandese people to nothing, leading a part of the population to collaborate with the fascists. On the international level, the propaganda line of the imperialist-controlled mass media has hindered the solidarity of democrats and revolutionaries of the world with the people to denounce the Western powers who supported the slaughterers. The political conflicts related to the neocolonial crisis are presented as conflicts caused by ethnic hatred among the blacks and are explained away by the line that they are used to kill each other. Only a Marxist party capable of making a correct analysis of African societies and educating the working masses could, on the one hand, protect them from the influence of the ideology of extreme right and, on the other hand, furnish on an international scale the necessary means to refute imperialist propaganda.

The October Revolution and the Chinese revolution, fruits of Marxist thought, did not leave the African people uncon-

cerned. They were the best examples of liberation and produced reliable allies. The national liberation movement became more radical. We had unquestionable victories over imperialism, even if some of them ended in an impasse. In the fifties and sixties, nobody could call himself revolutionary without having had any contact with Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought, even if only sporadically. Several mass and guerrilla movements called themselves Marxist. These included the insurrections of Congo-Kinshasa, Congo-Brazzaville, Cameroon, the guerrillas of Guinea-Bissau, Angola, Mozambique, Zimbabwe and many others. We do not know of any large progressive mass movement that did not come in contact with Marxism-Leninism:

some closely and others distantly.

Although the contact between Marxism-Leninism and African revolutionary movements is a reality, it remains nevertheless small and superficial. Marxism-Leninism penetrated Africa more through revisionist misrepresentation which robbed it of its revolutionary essence. "Marxist" works did not go beyond the petty-bourgeois sphere. Marxist thought are practically not translated into African languages south of the Sahara. So the theory is not accessible to the broad masses. The immediate consequence is that African Marxists do not care to make profound studies in order to understand the specific problems of Africa. For example, in many regions, the issue of peasant demand for land is not a big problem. What specific slogans should be used in order to mobilise the peasants so that they join the revolutionary movement? In Zaire and Cameroon, the rural guerrillas did not have a long-lasting impact. Among other reasons, the revolutionary leaders of these movements simply plagiarized Mao's texts about working among the peasants. The work of revisionism has been disastrous: putschism replaced people's war, the petty-bourgeois party replaced proletarian party.

Among those who were presented as great Maoists who recommended popular struggle, we saw that they only retained its

rebellious spirit, its tactic of surrounding the city from the countryside. But they did not retain much of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism directed at the necessity of concrete analysis of concrete condition and of the existence of the party. This practice is not the exclusive right of African revolutionaries; many parties and Marxist-Leninist currents throughout the world have regularly committed the same mistakes.

Many "Marxist-Leninists" have abandoned the positions of great thinkers of Marxism-Leninism. Marx, Lenin and Mao, throughout their practice, were not simply content with the conclusions of their predecessors. They systematically developed theory at all times, which led them back regularly to dialectical and historical materialism. They knew that the best way to understand the conclusions of others was to be certain of the method used. They could thus correctly relate the conclusions to the context of the period when the thinker made his studies. For example, Lenin complemented Marx when he designated the poor peasantry as the proletariat's ally in the revolution in a backward country. Mao complemented Lenin when he elaborated the strategy of the protracted people's war.

All this means that even if we have a high opinion of a Marxist thinker, we should never dwell only on his practical conclusions. Without belittling the practical victory of socialism as a means of stimulating the revolutionaries to draw their inspiration from Marxist classics, we should, in the Marxist spirit, further make profound studies of all big problems that we encounter in organizing society, in waging class struggle, and in building the party.

The African revolutionaries have the urgent task of making Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought penetrate deeply into the working masses by translating them into people's languages, making specific studies, and founding proletarian parties. That is a vital necessity because the salvation of Africa will come only with the mobilization of the people against imperialist domination and the building of a new society, a socialist society.

The Communist Movement and the Democratic Movement in Africa

Congrès des Progressistes pour la Libération
(CPL) Zaïre
Brussels, June 1996

This document was scanned by MIM for reprinting here. Some errors may have occurred. —ed.

The catastrophe that has besieged Africa now forces us, the "Congrès des Progressistes pour La Libération" of Zaïre, to reexamine the role of communists in the building of a democratic movement, the principal pedestal of the democratic and national revolution.

Africa is once again the theatre of multiple tragedies, making her the most oppressed place of our planet. The terrible images coming from Africa are enough to illustrate the horror generated by the neocolonial dictatorships. From Liberia, we are shown chopped heads displayed on the table. In another place, Rwanda was a world news for the massacre of one million people within a few weeks. Debts and the structural adjustment program imposed by the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank have caused the collapse of all economic infrastructure in most African countries. Consequently, whole cities are inhabited by jobless people, multiple epidemics have resurfaced and the modern education system has been completely destroyed. This new implosion of African society has plunged the whole population into a generalized distress and undermined the future of the coming generations.

After independence, revolutionaries and democrats of many African countries were hunted down jointly by the repressive services of the neocolonial states and imperialist powers. These losses inflicted upon Africans are at the root of the weakness in the African people's resistance, which has remained uncertain and ill-organized.

The present catastrophe in Africa has its origin in the multitude of crimes — political assassinations, massacres and loot-

ing perpetrated by imperialist forces. The extent of damage is inversely proportional to the scale of the democratic movement. The latter has remained trapped in its stage of gestation. The enslavement of Africans, colonization, and now neocolonization have negatively affected African society such that the development of a democratic movement has not been easy. It is, to this day, the least developed on this planet.

In many cases, there naturally exists a dialectical link between the democratic movement and the communist movement. When the communists are isolated or exterminated, the democratic movement regresses to the point of complete degeneration. On the other hand, when communists are able to break their isolation, the democratic movement gains in strength and its revolutionary wing plays the role of the protector of constructive initiatives for the society.

The African petty bourgeoisie, which up to now leads the resistance, has proven itself unable to build a democratic movement capable of limiting the destructions caused by imperialist forces. There are no autonomous democratic structures to defend the interests of the Africans. There is no serious campaign to denounce the slave trade and colonization. Since then, only a communist movement can develop the democratic movement in Africa.

Do African communists consider as a priority the construction of a democratic movement?

Before examining the attitude of the African communists about the democratic movement, one must first take note of the major difficulties facing the development of communist work in Africa.

1) The great repression was directed against the communists with the support of the secret service of the western powers. We recall that the assassination of great leaders of the African revolutionary movement such as Felix Moumie in Cameroun, Modlane in Mozambique, Amilcar Cabral in Guinea Bissau and Patrice Lumumba in Congo (Zai re) was

done directly or indirectly with the participation of these services.

2) The short-lived communist movement in Africa (with very limited political experience) has not made a considerable impact on the African masses. In many Sub-Saharan countries, the communist movement emerged in the 50s. The low development of productive forces or the lack of industrialization has not facilitated the concentration of workers in big cities as in others region of the world. For a long time, communist work has been done only by personalities or small groups, themselves diluted in mass organizations known as "liberation fronts."

Fundamentally, African communists have never included in their agenda the building of a democratic movement in Africa. Relying for a long time on the research of external god-fathers, they never developed an independent political and ideological line. This attitude is essentially due to the influence of revisionism.

Some of us have sought to copy the experiences of parties that enjoy great prestige at the international level. They have fallen in total indifference to the realities of their respective countries. This has led to a wrong conception of revolutionary work among the masses. For them, work among the masses had only one objective: to recruit elements who should lead "revolutionary" actions able to overthrow the neocolonial order in the short run; they have looked with disdain at the democratic demands they considered as banalities. This reductionist conception of revolutionary practice has not favored a permanent contact between the revolutionaries and the masses of workers and peasants. The masses of the people have thus remained under the influence of the neocolonial Right.

Others have used Marxist literature without distinguishing the general conclusions of social experiences from where they originate. A confusion follows when they equally take these experiences for an applicable theory in their daily work. Yet, it is difficult to make a revolution in a given region without a specific revolutionary thought.

In natural sciences as in social science, the infinitely small and the infinitely big are always in the field of scientific research, that is to say, susceptible to theorization. For us, the great thinkers of Marxism-Leninism have showed, in general, the way towards the infinitely grand, the march towards communism: the class party, the revolution and socialism. However, the infinitely small, naturally linked to a given time

and space, always demands from revolutionaries a continuous and complex theoretical work, which decides the making of revolution and the big leap forward towards the construction of a new society.

The African revolutionary movement has been more marginalized by the fact that more African Marxists systematically use materials written about other experiences in their everyday work. This practice has become more pronounced in the Absence of a writing tradition and by the lack of printing industry in Africa.

In the last fifty years, we have the impression that the communist parties who are ideologically / materially strong are trying to impose policies from their theories on organizations seen as "weak". The interest of the discussion on the experience of building socialism in the USSR and in CHINA can in no way justify the fact that the debate on the resistance of African people is not one of the priorities of the international communist movement. After all, should not communists be present where the distress of humankind is the greatest? The breakdown of Humanity by the imperialist forces and the damage caused must also be included in their agenda.

Some elements for the construction of a powerful democratic movement in Africa.

1. The reinforcement of Marxist-Leninist parties and organizations in Africa.
2. The construction of currents that fight against the misery, plunder and bloody crimes. The agitation around immediate demands always remains a necessary practice linked to the masses by the revolutionary movement.
3. The consequent struggle against colonization. The latter has always justified the attacks on the democratic rights of African people by the imperialist forces.
4. The struggle against the ideology of the extreme Right. This ideology undermines the unity of the people by raising apparent contradictions such as ethnic differences for the sole objective of isolating the revolutionaries.
5. Encouragement the production of written documents for propaganda mainly in languages spoken by the great majority of the people.

In the case of Zaire, the CPL has defined two major tasks that allow the building of a democratic movement. The first is the execution of "Plan Catastrophe". The plan must show the priorities for the survival of the population. Whatever the situation, we can ensure a minimum of medical care, educational

program, etc. The second is the building up of a great current against the crimes committed by the neocolonial state. Since those who kill or steal not only continue to live with impunity, but also retain their leading positions in the state, it will be difficult to counter to counter the degradation of the material conditions of life of our people.

CONCLUSION

Our position explained above does not exclude the general theoretical debate on the construction of socialism in the world. Of course, the experiences of the struggles at the international level are of undeniable contribution to the understanding of new problems associated with the development of Marxism-Leninism.

We want to insist on the necessity of building a democratic movement in Africa that is lacking at the present time. The imperialist forces profit from the extension of their structures of domination built on crime.

The question of the liberation of the African people has not always taken its place within the international communist movement. During the time of the Comintern, the representatives of the Black liberation movement left the International, because they said that "white" communists seemed to lack

interest in the question of their liberation. We do not support this initiative, because adherence to the communist movement should be done not on the basis of recognition of one party by another party, but by the ideal which aims at liberating humankind from modern slavery. Indeed, had they ever remained there, they could have, on one hand, waged the struggle inside the International in order to change its attitude towards the liberation movement that is closely linked to the particularity of Africa's colonization (massive expulsion of its population and systematic destruction of traditional socio-economic structure). On the other hand, by sharing with other communists, they could have benefited from the experience in ideological struggle necessary for building a party of the revolution, the lack of which has been one of the major weaknesses of the Black liberation movement. Also, we do not agree with those who think that a socialist revolution must first happen around the world before taking into consideration our struggle for national liberation. It must nevertheless help its expansion. The rise of the revolutionary consciousness of the working class around the world requires that its political education must not be limited to its own class environment, but also becomes sensitive to the whole problems that compromise the future of humanity.

Reparations for the Oppressed Nations!

The history of Amerika is one of theft and genocide. Amerika owes the people of the oppressed nations for labor stolen over the last 500 years.

The existing Amerikan state defends the interests of the imperialists, so it cannot consistently carry out reparations. It reneged on its treaties with the First Nations and its promise to the Black nation of "40 Acres and a Mule."

**There are no rights,
only power struggles!**

Find out more. Read MIM Theory 7, "Proletarian Feminist Revolutionary Nationalism on the Communist Road." Send \$6 to:

MIM Distributors
PO Box 3576
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-3576
<http://www.etext.org/Politics/MIM>

Liberation for the Internal Colonies!

National liberation struggles with communist leadership have done more to help the most oppressed people on Earth than any other form of organization.

In Amerika today, national oppression of the internal colonies is the foremost issue for revolutionaries.

**There is no time for
failed strategies.**

*Struggle with, work with,
and join MIM, the
Maoist Internationalist
Movement.*

Find out more. Read MIM Theory 7, "Proletarian Feminist Revolutionary Nationalism on the Communist Road." Send \$6 to:

MIM Distributors
PO Box 3576
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-3576
<http://www.etext.org/Politics/MIM>

Get A Grip!

The International Communist Movement has to understand that the workers of imperialist nations — the white workers, by and large — benefit from imperialism in a thousand ways. If you don't agree, prove us wrong.

Find out more... Read MIM Theory 10: "Coming to Grips with the Labor Aristocracy."

Struggle with, work with, finance and join the Maoist Internationalist Movement.

Send \$6, cash or check made out to: "MIM Distributors"

PO Box 3576

Ann Arbor, MI 48106-3576

<http://www.etext.org/Politics/MIM>

Who Are They Kidding?

Some people think the white working class and the other labor aristocrat workers of the imperialist nations are exploited. Instead of demanding reparations for oppressed nations, these 'socialists' think the white working class needs a raise. MIM wants to know: Who's going to pay for the raise? We think the Third World has paid enough.

**Find out more...
Read MIM Theory 10:
"Coming to Grips with the Labor Aristocracy."**

Struggle with, work with, finance and join the Maoist Internationalist Movement.

Send \$6, cash or check made out to: "MIM Distributors"

PO Box 3576

Ann Arbor, MI 48106-3576

<http://www.etext.org/Politics/MIM>

Anarchists!

Don't give up on ending oppression to maintain the purity of your ideals! Communist revolution isn't perfect. But it's done more than anything else to defeat imperialism and end oppression.

Find our more... Read MIM Theory 8: "The Anarchist Ideal & Communist Revolution."

Struggle with, work with, finance and join the Maoist Internationalist Movement.

Send \$6, cash or check made out to:
"MIM Distributors"

PO Box 3576

Ann Arbor, MI 48106-3576

<http://www.etext.org/Politics/MIM>

Anarchists!

The Maoist Internationalist Movement works for communist revolution — beginning with national liberation struggles — as the best course for a society free from the scourge of imperialist patriarchy.

What do you suggest?

Don't make up a lot of pretty ideas that don't work — and then hold real-world actions to your idealist standards.

Show us something that works better.

We want nothing more than to get out of this hell-hole. Where will anarchist strategies takes us? So far, they've gone nowhere.

Find our more... Read MIM Theory 8: "The Anarchist Ideal & Communist Revolution."

Struggle with, work with, finance and join the Maoist Internationalist Movement.

Send \$6, cash or check made out to:
"MIM Distributors"

PO Box 3576

Ann Arbor, MI 48106-3576

<http://www.etext.org/Politics/MIM>

Think Globally Act Globally!

Myth: Thinking globally but acting locally is an effective way to fight imperialism and save the environment.

Fact: That is exactly what the imperialists want us to do: keep acting locally, attacking local symptoms instead of global causes.

You can't save the environment without ending imperialism. There is no environmentalism that isn't revolutionary environmentalism. Don't agree?

Want to know more? Get:

**MIM Theory 12, "Environment,
Society, Revolution,"**

from the Maoist Internationalist Movement
and join the struggle for the best way
forward — globally.

*Struggle with, work with, finance and join
the Maoist Internationalist Movement.*

Send \$6, cash or check made out to:
"MIM Distributors"

PO Box 3576

Ann Arbor, MI 48106-3576

<http://www.etext.org/Politics/MIM>

Think Globally Act Globally!

Myth: Thinking globally but acting locally is an effective way to fight imperialism and save the environment.

Fact: That is exactly what the imperialists want us to do: keep acting locally, attacking local symptoms instead of global causes.

You can't save the environment without ending imperialism. There is no environmentalism that isn't revolutionary environmentalism. Don't agree?

Want to know more? Get:

**MIM Theory 12, "Environment,
Society, Revolution,"**

from the Maoist Internationalist Movement
and join the struggle for the best way
forward — globally.

*Struggle with, work with, finance and join
the Maoist Internationalist Movement.*

Send \$6, cash or check made out to:
"MIM Distributors"


PO Box 3576

Ann Arbor, MI 48106-3576

<http://www.etext.org/Politics/MIM>

There is only one reasonable verdict for the Amerikan injustice system. For the crime of oppression and genocide, the people find this imeperialist system:

GUILTY!



How much further will you let them go?

Get: MIM Theory 11, "Amerikkkan Prisons on Trial" and get the tools you need to turn the tables.

Struggle with, work with, finance and join the Maoist Internationalist Movement.

Send \$6, cash or check made out to:

"MIM Distributors"


PO Box 3576

Ann Arbor, MI 48106-3576

<http://www.etext.org/Politics/MIM>

There is only one reasonable verdict for the Amerikan injustice system. For the crime of oppression and genocide, the people find this imeperialist system:

GUILTY!



How much further will you let them go?

Get: MIM Theory 11, "Amerikkkan Prisons on Trial" and get the tools you need to turn the tables.

Struggle with, work with, finance and join the Maoist Internationalist Movement.

Send \$6, cash or check made out to:

"MIM Distributors"

PO Box 3576

Ann Arbor, MI 48106-3576

<http://www.etext.org/Politics/MIM>

We're Looking for a few good radicals!



• The Maoist Internationalist Movement and the Revolutionary Anti-Imperialist League are organizing progressive people for campaigns against prisons and the Amerikan Injustice system. • We need activists to research, agitate, and struggle against the oppression and imprisonment of the poor, members of oppressed nations, and revolutionary activists. •

Get involved!

Send \$6 for a copy of MIM Theory 11, 'Amerikkkan Prisons on Trial,' or \$1 for a RAIL anti-prisons pamphlet.

Send \$6, cash or check made out to:
"MIM Distributors"
PO Box 3576
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-3576
<http://www.etext.org/Politics/MIM>

We're Looking for a few good radicals!



• The Maoist Internationalist Movement and the Revolutionary Anti-Imperialist League are organizing progressive people for campaigns against prisons and the Amerikan Injustice system. • We need activists to research, agitate, and struggle against the oppression and imprisonment of the poor, members of oppressed nations, and revolutionary activists. •

Get involved!

Send \$6 for a copy of MIM Theory 11, 'Amerikkkan Prisons on Trial,' or \$1 for a RAIL anti-prisons pamphlet.

Send \$6, cash or check made out to:
"MIM Distributors"
PO Box 3576
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-3576
<http://www.etext.org/Politics/MIM>

Do Culture?

***We need culture
criticism — and
creation.***

Imperialist patriarchy does its best
to keep culture under its command.
But we can disrupt their version —
and offer revolutionary alternatives.

- Review: Movies, Books, Music, Zines,
Web sites, Culture Events
- Contribute: Drawings, Cartoons,
Portraits, Music, Poetry, Photographs

This is the revolutionary demand of
MIM Theory 13, from the
Maoist Internationalist Movement

ART IN REVOLUTION

Get your copy now, and get involved!

Send \$8, cash or check made out to:
"MIM Distributors"

PO Box 3576

Ann Arbor, MI 48106-3576

<http://www.etext.org/Politics/MIM>

Do Culture?

***We need culture
criticism — and
creation.***

Imperialist patriarchy does its best
to keep culture under its command.
But we can disrupt their version —
and offer revolutionary alternatives.

- Review: Movies, Books, Music, Zines,
Web sites, Culture Events
- Contribute: Drawings, Cartoons,
Portraits, Music, Poetry, Photographs

This is the revolutionary demand of
MIM Theory 13, from the
Maoist Internationalist Movement

ART IN REVOLUTION

Get your copy now, and get involved!

Send \$8, cash or check made out to:
"MIM Distributors"

PO Box 3576

Ann Arbor, MI 48106-3576

<http://www.etext.org/Politics/MIM>



THE CHAINS OF OPPRESSION



THE MANIFESTATION OF A REVOLUTION



MIM Theory

MUST-HAVE BACK ISSUES!

MIM Theory A White Proletariat?



MIM Theory No. 1 A White Proletariat?

Explains why the North American white working class isn't on the side of Third World Revolution. The Party lays down the line with statistical studies and polemics with those who disagree. \$4

MIM THEORY



MIM Theory No. 4 A Spiral Trajectory

Discusses the collapse of state capitalism in the former USSR and former Eastern Bloc allies. MIM examines what success really means by analyzing socialist economic development. \$6




MIM Theory No. 6 THE STALIN ISSUE

Bombards revisionist & reactionary Stalin biographers, and explains the necessity of making a materialist analysis of Stalin's advances as well as his mistakes. \$6



**MIM Theory No. 8
The Anarchist Ideal & Communist Revolution**
From Kronstadt to Spain to France in 1968, reviews of the failure of Anarchism's best efforts and theory. Also MIM's own anarchist wind, reviews, and more on national questions. \$6.



MIM Theory No. 2 & 3 Gender & Revolutionary Feminism

Double issue on gender, 1st world feminism and patriarchy. Includes the Black Panthers on gender and the intersections of class, nation and gender. \$5



MIM Theory No. 5 Diet for a Small Red Planet

Line, strategy and tactics, focoism, feminism, Maoism in the Philippines, the revolution in Peru and continuation of the gender debate. \$6



**MIM Theory No. 7
Proletarian Feminist Revolutionary Nationalism**
on the Communist Road
MIM's take on national liberation past, present & future for North America. Specific national struggles & theory. Reviews major groups. \$6

Send stamps, cash, check
or money order to:


MIM Distributors
PO Box 3576
Ann Arbor MI
48106-3576

OK, MIM Theory — You're On!


Get a two-issue/one-year subscription now, & get one of these recent back issues for \$2.



MIM Theory 9
Psychology & Imperialism
The tyranny of psychology, psychology & gender, psych in practice, reviews of "radical" psych, mental health in socialist China, & the testimonial of a formerly suicidal revolutionary. The Bell Curve, anarchism, & sectarian reviews. 92 pp.



MIM Theory 10
Coming to Grips with the Labor Aristocracy
MIM's most in-depth treatment of this cardinal issue since MIM Theory I. Revives Lenin's Comintern, adds new evidence on parasitism and reviews. Plus the Black Panthers' Maoist years, DuBois, and much more. 96 pp.



MIM Theory 11
Amerikkkan Prisons on Trial
Packed with information and analysis on the Amerikan prison system, plus more on the labor aristocracy, history, review, and more. An essential tool for anti-prisons activism. 100 pp.



MIM Theory 12
Environment, Society, Revolution
MIM's answer to reformist, revisionist, and plain old reactionary approaches to environmentalism; reviews and photos. Also, Perumovement polemics and "What's Your Line?" 96 pp.

- Get me a **two-issue subscription**, and gimme a **free copy** of issue _____. Here's \$18. (Subscription alone: \$16.)
- Plus \$6 each for these **back issues** _____.
- Come to think of it, I'll have **all 12 previous issues** for just \$49.
- OK, MIM Theory is worth it: here's \$100 to make me a **lifetime subscriber**.

Name: _____

Address: _____

City, State & Zip _____

Send cash, stamps, check or m.o. to
MIM • PO Box 3576
Ann Arbor, MI • 48106-3576.

Libraries \$72 per year. Overseas subs \$32. Ask about being a distributor. Send \$2 for "What is MIM?" with a complete list.