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A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY

INSIDE: Letters from our readers, Ex-USSR, Yugoslavia, China, Cuba
Note from the editor:

MIM Theory 4 marks an advance over previous issues in its presentation from people outside the party. Throughout this issue, we will be printing letters from people with varying reactions to MIM’s work building public opinion for a revolution of the oppressed. A lot of the letters we receive border on hate mail. Some might question why we publish our critics’ opinions at all. Yet, at this time in history, these hate letters are representative of common opinion within the U.S. empire. Although the hate mail rarely says anything of substance, refuting the falsehoods and putting forward proletarian values are very important.

In earlier work, MIM has argued against Enver Hoxha (the leader of the Albanian revolution) for attempting to ignore class struggle under socialism by theorizing it out of existence. According to Hoxha it was impossible to have a bourgeoisie in the communist party after revolution unless the party was liberal in its discipline. Others following in the tradition of Stalin might also fail to see that it is not possible to extirpate dictatorship over the bourgeoisie by ignoring it, even under socialism, never mind capitalism.

MIM seeks to engage in a tit-for-tat struggle in every part of the superstructure. Only in that way can we build the independent power of the oppressed and prepare for the all-round dictatorship of the proletariat. MIM’s tit-for-tat struggle depends both on strategic confidence and tactical respect. Strategically, MIM fears no argument that can be put to it. Tactically, MIM goes to painstaking effort to criticize each individual expression of bourgeois consciousness, because the bourgeoisie is capable of winning individual battles in the superstructure and elsewhere.

Rather than leave the “invisible hand” of the bourgeoisie invisible, MIM would like to have it in the open in order to smash it. A bourgeoisie without the ability to build public opinion would be helpless, so we must seek to expose the hand of the bourgeoisie to the light of day.

At the same time that we ruthlessly criticize the bourgeois opinions of anyone, MIM must take care not to damage the material interests of the oppressed. The oppressed will learn that its best friend—the vanguard party—can only serve the oppressed through such a policy.

In MIM Theory 5, MIM will co-sponsor a debate on Stalin with another organization. The issue will be in both French and English. We would like to have Spanish as well.

MIM’s translating efforts place a severe strain on a limited number of multilingual comrades. Yet, this translating effort cannot be withheld—confusion within the communist movement internationally dictates a higher level of collective struggle. The science of revolution with regard to the imperialist nations’ labor and gender aristocracies are just two areas in which MIM believes it must address the communists within the entire imperialist West. Just as scientific advances and exchanges in ideology should know no language barrier, so too it is even more important for the science of revolution advance through international exchange.

Finally, I would like to apologize to all the comrades, friends, and critics who did not see their articles in this issue. We did not expect that by MIM Theory 4 we would be unable to print everyone’s work because of a flood of letters and submitted articles.
MIM Theory Number 4

A Spiral Trajectory:
The Failure and Success of Communist Development
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Introduction to this issue

The collapse of state-capitalist governments in the Soviet Union and its bloc of allies in Eastern Europe has left many people with the conclusion that communism is a failure and capitalism is a success. In this issue of IMT Theory, we examine the "collapse" and the meaning of "success."

The argument that capitalism is the victor in the contest with communism as an economic system finds an especially receptive audience whenever superprofits are distributed by the imperialists. IMT discussed the meaning of this exploitation of the Third World and the benefits received by a powerful minority of the world's population in IMT Theory 1.

In Eastern Europe, the fall of the Berlin Wall in the Western European imperialist countries was hard to resist. This IMT does not deny. It is an economic fact of life in the struggle between communism and capitalism.

IMT also does not deny that the imperialist countries including the United States, England, France, Germany and Japan are all richer than the socialist countries were before they switched to capitalism. Furthermore, IMT does not deny that the enrichment of the peoples of most of the world would be a good thing.

IMT is also aware that Taiwan has been richer than the People's Republic of China; southern Iran has been richer than northern Iran; West Germany was richer than East Germany. There are the kinds of macroeconomic that the pro-capitalist analysts make all the time. IMT does not deny these facts.

It is a characteristic of political and theoretical immaturity to believe that controversy in social analysis amounts to the contrivance of various sources of facts. Like children searching for their parents, many believe the dispute between Marxists and anti-Marxists has to do with finding the correct source of authority—an accurate source of facts.

Yet, IMT does not dispute any of the above essential facts in the Liberal argument against Marxism. The social causes behind these facts are what IMT disputes.

IMT disputes the idea that Eastern Europe was ever socialist— with the exception of Albania until 1990. Furthermore, IMT has also always denied that the Soviet Union was socialist once Gorbachev definitively severed the Soviet Union from the capitalist world in 1985.

Dialectically-speaking, it was actually the material success of socialism in previously poor, starving and war-torn countries like Russia and China that made it conceivable for decisive portions of their populations to seek the goals of Western consumer society and future communist revolution. Hence, the recent "collapse" of the Soviet bloc, was a collapse of capitalism—the revolution and communist having been abandoned decades ago. It was a crisis of capitalism not unlike many others seem this century.

Unlike revisionist Marxists and bourgeois theorists, we have a perfectly good explanation for how change came about in the Soviet bloc— Mao Zedong's theory of the existence of a bourgeoisie in the communist party under socialism. That bourgeoisie brought off the crowning glory of Liberal capitalism in the Soviet bloc through class struggle. Mao had predicted such restorations of capitalism and imagined that the victory of socialism might take hundreds of years with many setbacks along the way.

Ironically, despite winning victory in the Cold War, no Western bourgeois theorist correctly predicted the rapid collapse of the Soviet Union. The West won, but it does not know why. IMT disputes the predominant theories of "totalitarianism" and "state socialism," which told us that rapid change was impossible in the Soviet bloc.

IMT also disputes the method used in comparison of capitalist and socialist countries. Most uncritically, the Liberal analyst rarely applies critical concepts across the board. The Liberal knows that population estimates show that 50 million people might have starved in the aftermath of Mao's Great Leap in China, but did the Liberal attempt to use the same methods of calculation for the millions caused to capitalist starvation? No, the Liberal seeks to avoid the broad patterns of facts surrounding...
international starvation. In fact, MIM will demonstrate that the overall health of peoples has always been served better by socialism than capitalism.

MIM can also show that socialism brings superior economic development rates. We do not dispute the wealth of the United States. There is no need for us to dispute that countries engaged in slavery, genocides and colonizations got richer than other countries.

We do dispute that the Western capitalist countries have grown faster than the socialist countries. Countries like Russia and China started the race far behind the Western capitalist countries and this must be accounted for to know which racing shoe is superior—a capitalist one or socialist one.

Many in the decadent imperialist countries—particularly among the youth—are no longer interested in the race between socialism and capitalism. If they are interested in society at all it might be on account of the problems caused by the rates to development—pollution.

Yet, the world’s vast majority of people still seek development as a matter of life and death. The world’s majority still seek food, clothing and shelter. The issue of which system is better—capitalism or socialism is not irrelevant to the masses in the Third World and it is in the Third World where we continue to see revolutionary communism moving forward. In Third World countries where conditions have not been advanced by socialism, the basic worker-peasant alliance still has great relevance in socialist revolution.

Outside the Third World, these countries in the “collapsed” “socialist” bloc, those that face severe hardship, are again ripe for socialism. In the imperialist countries, MIM has already explained why it does not believe a revolution of evening and intermediate workers will succeed, but we believe it is ensured that imperialist reasserting in the Third World and non-imperialist unity guarantees us always, plenty of opportunities for ultimately successful revolutionary work.
Southern Reader Mostly Agrees with MIM

Dear MIM:

I just want to express my agreement with the MIM (Marxist Internationalist Movement). While I would have reservations about agreeing with all of their statements (such as relatively questioning support for the Gang of Four, who I feel were nonetheless better than Deng and his allies—and I admire Jiang Qing's resolve until the end, in the face of imprisonment for her ideals), I would agree with the perspective that the U.S. has purchased its material advantages, temporarily, from the exploitation of oppressed groups in the U.S., including African-Americans, Asians, Hispanics, and poor whites (such as Appalachian whites), and other countries.

I don't know how many of the readers have read Lenin's Imperialism, but it doesn't take a great deal of effort to change the terminology from monopoly capitalism to multinational corporations, and to see the ripping off of the developing world for raw resources, cheap labor, and so forth—he could be talking about the world today in many respects, and I do think that in the end the international capitalist system, which has struggled so many attempts at constructing socialist societies, who promote absolute lies about the advantages of capitalism through the Voice of America (actually the voice of the ruling class).

I've long considered myself a Marxist, which doesn't mean that I think that Mao was perfect, merely that I agree with many of his ideological perspectives and feel that under him, at least there was movement towards socialism and a classless society. I said a long time—well, I'm 26 now, and have been drawn towards Mao's thought since I was 14, an interest which in turn led me to a deeper interest in China and Asia and to obtaining my B.A. in Asian Studies. I have several Chinese friends, most of whom do not—admittedly—agree completely with me, though many see through the illusions of capitalism and believe that we should come to socialism.

Why did I become a Marxist? Growing up in a working-class Appalachian community, I was able to see the system at work, a system that turned people into virtual slaves who had nothing. I remember my father working two jobs, from 8 AM to 11 or 12 PM at night through the week, and working his second job on the weekend. What else is that but slavery? To spend almost every waking moment working, and still barely able to enjoy time for oneself. His reward is a pittance of a pension and a little social security, and he still doesn't have enough to...
face the costs of living today, as medical bills and
expenses for food rise, many middle-class and even some
poorer families are finding it difficult to make ends meet.

My early experiences with organized Marxism
were through friends I made who turned out to be
Marxist in terms of giving lip service to Mao's
thoughts only, though my first encounter was probably
the most dedicated Marxist, at least in terms of
talking up to their ideals, was not positive either (I
would have to express criticism of their tactics at
that point); my friends, however, tended to label me
an ultra-leftist, which was fine with me.

Finally, I think that Mao's ideals are not dead.
As far as I know, the Chinese are not actively
advocating for socialism, and I think socialists
have a right to question the validity of the Maoist
communism. Several people from other
countries have expressed their sympathy for
socialism and Mao's ideals to me. In China, itself,
who suggests that preceding Tiananmen, many participants in the demonstrations
were in fact communists, and people are moving towards those ideals, at least to some extent.

The lesson seems to be that Tiananmen on socialism
(its similarities to the tendency in Europe are
evident, although the media have given far less
attention to it) was a failure, which China has moved
away from over the past years—moving to an
embrace of capitalism that has led to an explosion
of such activities as kidnapping and selling women
wherein the chapter “Far East” in Chinese Lives
by Zhang Xinmin and Yang Yujing and other
texts that had at least largely disappeared after 1949.

Remember, too, that the Tiananmen Massacre
was not orchestrated by Mao's supporters, but
rather by his opponents, those he labeled capitalist
reformers decades ago. I also find it difficult to accept
that rule in China under Mao was brutal—most
countries, including the United States, would
certainly criticize the actions of the Chinese
authorities, and even China's own authorities,
would see the need to eliminate the existence of
such activities as kidnapping and selling women
wherein the chapter “Far East” in Chinese Lives
by Zhang Xinmin and Yang Yujing and other
texts that had at least largely disappeared after 1949.

I will close this letter with a note that I agree
that there should be an ongoing ideological debate
(not debates, not anger, but discussion). I'm not a
Marxist because I want to see violence and bloody
reforms, because I want power. ... My sympathies for
Mao's ideals come from seeing my father work his
life as a slave to the system, being a cog in the wheel
on my father on one occasion, my brother and
friends because and beaten by cops, seeing on a
daily basis the violence aimed at the people through
the police and other agents of the state and reflected
in the living situations of low income people.

-A MIM sympathizer
May, 1992
MFTI Tells MMT What it Needs

MFTI TELL S MMT WHAT IT NEEDS

I think what is needed is some kind of correspondence course. Do people like to read the minutes? [Korn, Younger, Larkin, Stein and Mac—MSS] They do not show any interest in theory! I don’t think quoting “theory without practice won’t work today” gets at the problem. First of all, define exactly what practice is.

You can’t have certain kinds of practice when there is no mass movement and when you are besieged in and under attack from all quarters? We had nothing in the ‘60s and ‘70s. Second, J. Stalin said that practice existed in the dark unless its path is illuminated by theory, and that theory is meaningless unless connected to practice. First you have to nail down the theory. Then you have to have a program. Therefore practice in the first stage is nailing down the theory. This isn’t easy. Breakfast programs were revolutionary. (From personal experience the EFF was revolutionary from beginning to end. People like Hankon represented the best but they were squashed.)

Finally—I think it’s wrong not to distribute the red books. I use one a lot. You cannot have a personality cult around someone who is dead. It is a good reference book. Besides, why don’t you put together all the quotes concerning the Cultural Revolution and distribute it? Which reminds me—in his [Mac’s—MSS] statement on the murder of Martin Luther King and his statement on the war in Vietnam you will find some good stuff.

SICKENED BY COLD WAR LIBERALS

The following is an excerpt from a letter about all the hate mail MMT got about the Hanoi Path in Peru—some of which is from people citing human rights groups.

Dear SIM:

I have these cold-war liberals. They were the same folks who invaded to support the “terrorists” in the 60s against U.S. imperialism, and claimed they weren’t for the liberation, they weren’t for the North Vietnamese Government, they were for the “pro-democratic forces” in South Vietnam. [snip] Their standard references are Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch, who last year were peddling the tale of Kuwaiti babies ripped...
Reader Tells MIM about Species Oppression

DEAR MIM:

MIM Theory 3/4 correctly identifies class, nation, and gender oppression as connected but non-reducible sources of unequal power relations leading to the injustices and violence in our world. I submit that it is both correct and necessary to add species oppression to this short list.

There are four major types of species oppression in industrialized parts of the world. Humans appropriate non-human animals’ labor for: 1) food, 2) clothing, 3) entertainment, and 4) experimentation.

Directly analogous to the capitalist, imperialist, and patriarchal/male of class, nation, and gender oppressions are the ranchers/dairy farmers/John Ford, furriers/cannery workers/rapists, and pharmaceutical/medical experimenters. Butchers, owners of non-vegetarian restaurants, leather goods stores, machinery owners, and even the makers of A-1 steak sauce are analogous to the labor, national, and gender aristocracies because they have a material interest in maintaining species oppression.

Times of us who consume the flesh of dead animals, wear their skins, and at the same, go to the movies, or use products that have been tested on animals, have no material interest in continuing species oppression, but are influenced by taste, fashion, and other forms of socialization. In fact, because of its inherent wasterliness (2 lbs. of vegetable protein are necessary to produce 1 lb. of animal protein), unhealthiness (rates of heart disease and cancer, the greatest killers in industrialized countries, correlate directly with animal protein consumption), and pollution (50% of all water in industrialized countries is taken by human consumption), the working people of industrialized areas have a material interest in ending species oppression.

It has even been adequately demonstrated that animal experimentation has yielded no material benefits for humans (other than white-coated professionals). For instance, the decline in infectious diseases in industrialized nations at the turn of the century was due to social reforms such as improved sanitation and health care, not vaccinations, as is widely believed. (Sharpe, The Cost of Creation)

Human residents of non-industrialized areas often rely on domesticated animals to bear loads, pull plows, provide fertilizer, or feed humans in times of crop failure. But the global activity of feeding and clothing is also often a material necessity. Industrialization, with its mechanization and large surpluses, will eliminate the material need for species oppression in those parts of the world.

Humans interested in ending species oppression fall generally into two camps. Reformists, such as the ASPCA, believe that eliminating the cruel treatment of the captive or large-brained animals advances the interests of oppressed species. Animal liberationists, while often unimpressed with the related struggles against class, nation, and gender oppression, seek to end all species oppression simultaneously. To this end, they modify their lifestyle by not eating, wearing, or deriving entertainment from animals, and by using “cruelty-free” products. In addition, the grassroots of the Animal Liberation Front have dealt the most spectacular and costly blows of any organized liberation struggle inside America’s borders in recent years, torching buildings and destroying equipment while liberating captive species.

Species oppression is historically linked and intertwined with, but not reducible to, class, nation, and gender oppression. For instance, the domestication of wild animals (which allowed for intensive agriculture) gave rise to the idea of personal property, while the advent of animal husbandry (controlled reproduction) demystified childbearing and signaled a shift from matriarchal to patriarchal social groups. A good modern example can be found in the maximilized populations of the Kalahari desert, where hunter-gatherer society keeps no livestock, has no concept of personal property, and is matriarchal.

The links between national and species oppression, and between gender and species oppression have begun to be explored. Marjorie Spiegel’s The Dreaded Comparison and Carol J.
Adam: The Sexual Politics of Meat: deals with these connections respectively.

In our struggle to build a world where no one has power over another, a world free from oppression and violence, it would be unproductive and inconsistent to continue the violent oppression of non-human animals. I urge all to integrate this reasoning into our political life.

P.S. Since precise thought requires precise language, I urge all revolutionaries to desist from using animal epithets to describe oppressors (i.e. "pig" or "dog" for captors/captors/owners).

—Marx
November, 1993

Nick Replies:

I had not realized before that pigs were involved in the oppression to cops, but it makes sense. It is hard to think of the parallel pig behavior that equals the beating or killing of Black motorists by cops.

This letter raises many subjects I am unaware of and it is the most theoretical treatment of animal liberation that I have seen. I'd like to learn quite a bit on these subjects and well as environmental subjects generally.

Earl Marx did believe that communism would resolve the contradiction between the human species and Nature generally. In the "Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844" from Earl Marx, we learn that stark belief in people would not destroy their own environments if they really controlled their own destinies as they should under communism.

I don’t think we can agree that the most “costly blows” to imperialism were some from the animal liberation struggle in recent years. That would be ignoring the bites that indigenous people’s have delivered in armed struggle and the rebellion in Los Angeles.

Despite the provocative title, the author draws amongst the various contradictions to society, Marx holds that the principal contradiction is between the oppressed nations and the imperialists. That means if we state that contradiction with all our might, we will do the most to advance the cause against oppression generally. That is of course our main concern in treating the subject of animal liberation generally.
MR74: Let's Rip

I do not believe there is such a term as "left ecumenism." The first time I ever saw it was in one of your publications, many years ago. On the back of this page is the definition of "left imperialist ecumenism." (An excerpt from Lenin's "The Present Trend of Imperialist Economics"—MC6)... I never saw anything by Engels on this term. From the definition on the back of this page, you can see that technically you fall into "left imperialist ecumenism."

In my opinion you could put together a ten or twenty point program or platform of positions. At the same time, a case could be made to avoid it at this time.

The main point is that "imperialist ecumenism" from the right of left means a declaration of the right to self-determination. At the same time, Lenin wrote that the colonies did not have political independence. Now the majority of them have been converted into neo-colonies—politically independent, but economically slaves to imperialism. In my opinion a correct position at this present time is to call for the cancellation of the Third World debt and the granting of loans at zero or low interest to the poorest countries first, the repayment of which must be bought by the recipient country. The Chinese put this to the UN in 1974 or so. Definitely, the right to self-determination must be upheld.

Now let's change speeds. I think the most important thing to attack is the economic crisis in the world capitalist system. An analysis of the contradiction amongst the imperialists, and what is leading to. Correct me if I am wrong, but the superstructure is crumbling in every imperialist country. This must lead to world economic depression, world war (nuclear) and fascism (which is actually already in power in the imperialist countries, just different forms.)

Why is there no movement along the lines of Marxist-Leninism-Maoism in the former Soviet Union, China, France, Germany, etc., etc. The major reason must be the tremendous influence of imperialist ideology that pervades everywhere.

Therefore, what is to be done? In the U.S., the only masses capable of following and deducing to Marxism-Leninism-Maoism (MLM) are those who do not speak English. And if you could get to them what would you have them do? In Third World countries like Mexico, the social-democrat, Trotskyist and revisionist dominates. You cannot talk about MLM. The plain fact is you cannot do anything without state articles.

Therefore, the only logical thing that will take place is a protected struggle first in one country to seize power. Then, imperialist intervention. In the U.S. you will not get an anti-war movement like the 60s. Especially if it's Paid.

Nothing can be done until there is a major catastrophe...

All those in "league" with imperialism are the enemy. Who does that leave you with? About 90% of the people in the U.S. We should say the masses are those who hate imperialism. Everybody else is reactionary. Take the labor aristocracy. Let's assume there is a nuclear war or an economic depression. What are they going to do? Go with fascism. Maybe some won't.

On the "masses," Lenin in his "speech in defense of the tactics of the Communist International at the third congress of the Comintern, July 1, 1921" had this to say in synopsis: The concept of the "masses" changes in accordance with the conditions of struggle. At the beginning a few thousand "genuinely revolutionary workers" represented the masses. This is pre-revolutionary. When the revolution has "been sufficiently prepared" several thousand is not enough. The concept undergoes a change so that it includes the majority of the exploited.

I am confused as to why you bothered to send Doug Hawood of the Left Business Observer a request to exchange "revolutionary" information. What is the definition of "revolutionary"? There are many, all kinds. Guys like Doug Hawood do not believe in genuine socialism. Have them define the kind of society they want to replace the present one with...

Some contradictions I would like input on. "Rampant double" are going to increase. This means there will be an increase in unemployment of the labor aristocracy. You say that the labor aristocracy can get service jobs with the same pay. It seems to me that this is the standard of living of the labor aristocracy must go down ending up about 50% of what it is. Plus, factory jobs in the U.S. will be taken
over more and more by immigrants, women, and oppressed nations. This puts the labor aristocracy in a position of being exploited, don't you think. Perhaps I didn't read your stuff carefully enough. Are you defining exploitation by the amount of money the labor aristocracy is being paid? If so, at what wage level is the labor aristocracy being exploited? Also, what about the contradiction between the imperialists? Japan seems to be going down the tubes. Germany seems to be stable.

Another point about the U.S. left. I knew from personal experience—being almost 50 years old—that the positions of the U.S. left today are weak imitations of what they were 25-35 years ago. It makes me sick. For example, it was common for every group to regard the democrats and republicans as "useless, deady and twiddle thum" and the whole U.S. left united for either a third party such as the Peace and Freedom Party or a boycott. How they are all talking about working in the Democratic Party. The overwhelming support for Jesse Jackson four years ago among the U.S. left was sickening.

Everybody used to be anti-imperialist. Then it was anti-interventionist. Now it's the "solidarity movement." If you could examine such positions you will see the degeneration. For example, if you examine Bertrand Russell—who was a pacifist—with these creeps today, you will see that Bertrand Russell was light years ahead of these creeps. I think this point should be made to people. Another example—just about everybody at least had respect for the Cultural Revolution in the '60s. Actually many were inspired. Now they all hate it.

—MA71
April, 1979

MA71 RESPONSE

We can expect that even in Third World countries, opportunist and revisionist forces will have a certain visibility advantage, but it is not true that they can dominate in the Third World, except in those cities where there is a significant labor aristocracy.

It is also not factually true there is no Fascism in China or Germany and the statement that nothing can happen until catastrophe is probably simple provocation by the author; although it does explain why this individual MA71 is not a member of a party. Another obvious provocation is saying we don't uphold the right to self-determination, when we've made a point of supporting that right including in previous rebuttals to this same author.

It is by this provocation in another way of trying to sidestep the existence of oppressed nations within the U.S. context? MA71 goes beyond supporting the right to self-determination; it sees oppressed Black, Latin, indigenous and Asian nations within U.S. borders in need of liberation.

MA71 has pointed out in the past that MIM diverges from Mao Zedong on these points. We believe that we are better qualified to assess the situation in the U.S., just as Mao was better qualified than Stalin to assess the situation in China. Also said in 1955, "The black masses and the masses of white working people in the United States share common interests and have common objectives to struggle for. Therefore, the Afro-American struggle is winning increasing sympathy and support from increasing numbers of white working people and progressives in the United States." (1) In contrast, MIM believes that the white working class has proved itself an enemy of the oppressed nationalities for several decades now.

Of course, it is dialectically absolutely true that the labor aristocracy must fall. However, it is also dialectically true that the human species must come to an end. On this point, Hegel and Marx had no disagreement everything passes.
class demands can only mean cross-class national unity of the oppressors.

As R.W. Edwards points out in his book, right opportunists communists and social democrats have been saying for 70 years that the labor aristocracy is going to take a fall and it never does. It's like crying wolf.

Of course, it is diabolically absolutely true that the labor aristocracy must fall. However, it is also dialectically true that the human species must come to an end. On this point, Hegel and Marx had no disagreement; everything passes.

That is why we must be dialectical materialists. When we examine the conditions of the white working class there is no way to conclude that it is exploited. Hence at this time we must have our actions on the interests of the international proletariat, not the white working class. Whereas the Asian 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 within the white nation or we will perform invaluable services for the international capitalist system known as imperialism. Our working class in the First World must first be made to understand why it owes a debt to the Third World working class or we will not be able to make the first step into socialism.


The Settlers and Surplus-value

DEAR MM:

Regarding MM's use of $177 billion in corporate profits to prove that only Third World workers are exploited—the assumption underlying this is that surplus-value equals ALL revenue over and above NECESARY costs of production.

Thus, all INTEREST payments, RENTAL payments, EXCESS DEPRECIATION (over actual replacement costs), EXCESS EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION (over true labor costs of executives, most of which are ZERO) are included in the FULL MEASURE OF EXPLOITATION.

And thus the income of all UNPRODUCTIVE WORKERS (the entire advertising industry, much government, particularly the military) and you can see that SURPLUS VALUE (the limits of exploitation) is MUCH much larger than "corporate profits." Thus, there's plenty of opportunity for the capitalists of the United States to exploit white workers. That doesn't mean that white workers aren't privileged vis a vis black and third world workers—it just means that there is such a thing as a white proletariat—and if MM insists that they are the enemy, they will remain the enemy—and WE as a WORLD will get nowhere.  

—Critics of MM
June, 1993

MM'S RESPONSE:

Our critics argue that we need to count all interest payments, rental payments, excess depreciation, excess executive compensation and the entire income of all unproductive workers as surplus-value and also equates that with the question of whether or not white nation workers are exploited. The gist of the problem is that our critics have assumed that which has to be proved.

The critics assume that all that surplus-value comes from white workers and is in fact not appropriated by white nation workers. The critics is such a dogmatist it is not possible for him/her to conceive that some categories of surplus-value should not be counted in the question of whether or not the white nation working class is exploited.

We at MM are not questioning the definition of surplus-value. An intelligent radical economist named John Dorsey also remarks something similar about one way to calculate surplus-value generally: "Marxists maintain that the rate of industrial profits after taxes, therefore, is a gross understatement of the amount to which capital exploits labor. In 1974 in the United States, for example, industrial corporate profits after taxes were about $50 billion, but total surplus value (all corporate profits, interest, and rent before taxes) approached $200 billion, or about a
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A quarter of employee compensation (wages and salaries) before taxes.” (1)

Actually, what our critics say is not bad at all, just irrelevant to the issue we raised (for the most part). The size of the surplus-value is only relevant to our question if it is not appropriated by the labor aristocracy. Our calculations in MRT 1 (MRT1) are based on a number of ways of approaching the economy statistically speaking. The whole point of calculation lies in using government statistical categories in application to Marx’s theoretical categories. For example, our figure on corporate profits actually includes bank profits and we examined it before and after taxes in the MRT 1. Yet, for Marx’s purposes, it is dubious that taxes on profits should be counted as surplus-value if taxes really and truly provide government services that are “socially necessary” to workers. Such taxes collected could easily be a redistribution amongst the white nation people of surplus-value taken from the oppressed nations. Later we shall go through the exercise of applying government figures to Marx’s theories along the lines that our critics and Gunley suggest. First we will explain some more mistakes in our critics’ comments.

The point our critics make about unproductive workers is actually great proof of our view. Our critics think that this can point to a larger surplus-value than we mentioned by counting unproductive work as part of surplus-value. The United States is an ascendant, imperialist and parasitic that it can afford a huge military to oppress the international proletariat. It also can afford ridiculous advertising industries.

Now the critic was really thinking about why socialism is good when s/he specified that we use his/her definition of surplus-value instead of our overly narrow one, but his/her definition has nothing to do with the issue we raised about the white nation working class. Socialism will eliminate these waste and misallocation problems it is true. They are waste in the eyes of the Third World masses. Moreover, who does our critic think is getting paid for ads, military contracting, etc.? Third World workers? White nation capitalists? No, it’s predominantly American workers once again. They are doing all this production being at the expense of the rest of the world. In fact, there are so many parasites, over half of the white working class in the United States is white collar according to the U.S. Census. The American nation is a nation of paper-shuffling helping the imperialist realize surplus-value. What our critics would call productive workers are such a small minority of white nation workers and (with some pockets as exceptions like coal-miners) are overpaid, we cannot speak of a white proletariat.

Our answer to Gunley would be the same, if we pretended that we opposed our analysis. MRT 1 goes so far as to count all before-tax income and shows that it would not make a difference to the calculations. In any case, taxes go to transfer payments and government services. Once again in these cases taxes end up in the white-collar class’s pockets. The government sector of workers is largely a safety buffer between the white nation working class and the international proletariat. That is to leave aside the issue of the exact calculation of the extent of the labor aristocracy within oppressed nations which also appropriate surplus-value, an issue we will return to in the future.

We do not dispute that the total surplus-value is greater than the corporate profits. It is only that corporate profits are the most relevant figure relative to any alleged class antagonism within the white nation. We believe that there is a very large surplus-value extracted from the Third World, but it is appropriated in part by the white nation working class.

The figures Gunley is concerned with are not all relevant to whether there is a white proletariat or not. Hence, let us attempt to break down the economy in a way which Gunley and our critic would recognize and see why it is that we can’t answer our question by doing so. First of all, let us recognize that government workers are workers for this purpose. Let us also count the contributions of employees to social insurance as part of labor costs as well. How let’s just count these people who are “employees” by the government definition, which means...
only those people who can be fired by an employer. It does not count "independent contractors," some consultants, family firms—basically the petty-bourgeoisie. Hence, the income of workers calculated in this straightforward way was $2.466 trillion in 1987 out of a figure of $3.76 trillion personal incomes for the year. (2) Divide the first figure by the second and we get 65% of the income explained so far by straightforward payments to U.S. labor.

Next add to transfer payments from the government—the largest part of which is social security. Government employees retirement benefits and "other" categories in this particular statistical breakdown of the economy. At the same time, we will take out the personal payments for social insurance.

Next add to the petty-bourgeoisie, because we realize that the vast majority of capitalists hiring more white workers than themselves are incorporated and not individual business proprietors paying themselves to work. The capitalists would be counted under corporate income. Admittedly, we shall allow this petty-bourgeoisie defined by the "proprietor" category to decide what property is should accumulate and we will not count all of that as a possible source of class antagonism within the white nation.

When that is done, we are left with only three categories in this government survey that can manifest the appropriation of surplus-values—rental income, dividends and interest income. Add these three categories up and we come to a figure of $354 billion, the vast bulk of which is interest payments, apart from bank profits, which are included in corporate profits. Indeed, we can add to the $354 billion another $37.8 billion if we believe that people receiving rent are 105% paying any depreciation that occurred on their property. (In principle, for the calculations we are doing, any income from ordinary property will be counted as surplus-value.)

We probably should not make this assumption because by doing so we confuse second labor from past years with the labor done in one year. We are trying to examine what net new labor is performed in one year and how much of it is surplus-value derived from white nation workers.

For the benefit of our opponents, let's make that dubious assumption and assume that some of the proprietors' incomes is surplus-value as well and round up to $700 billion as a potential indication of surplus-value. That's still less than 10% of the total income, but close to what Gurley says is the surplus-value—30%.

In reality, this government categorization of income leaves vague who is receiving that interest income and also who benefits from capital accumulation. This vagueness benefits our dominant opponent, who can then fantasize that the bourgeoisie receives all the interest income. If the white nation workers are the recipients of this interest income through private pension funds and bank accounts, then the argument that there is a white proletariat is once again ground to dust.

Also, if investment in capital accumulation were beneficial to the entire white nation in order to put it into better position to exploit the Third World, then that part of the surplus-value could not be counted for our purposes here either. However, say that it was actually a bourgeoisie that appropriated all $700 billion entirely as the fantasy-gnome "Lett" is likely to assume. Let's assume that there really are no savings accounts or private pension funds for white workers out there, (like the one for New York City unique which regularly lost the city out when it goes bankrupt), no Individual Retirement Accounts for the white working class that are even partly responsible for gathering that $52 billion in interest income. Let's just assume that the capitalists class appropriates all the interest payments in our society. (The rent from 100% lying property-owners and the dividends combined come to less than the $177 billion we explained already, so we will have to honor the "latentists" that this interest income is totally appropriated by the bourgeoisie if this exercise is to be worth anything at all.)

What we left out of the MMT is the white poor and the Third World workers. With just discrimination against minority workers within the United States we explained the existence of $500 billion in profits a year.

We know that the concept that the United States might be making even more than $300 billion in profits from the Third World is impossible to the American left, so we will assume that the profits from the Third World are exactly same. You see we really have to strain ourselves to come close to ignoring the superprofits from the Third World, but suppose we did all the above—make all the above fantastic assumptions to humor our critics.

Of course, in MMT MMT argue that there are process of exploitation white workers, just not large enough to think of themselves as a class. Well, it turns out that if we make all the above outlandish
assumptions to humor our critic, then if we took one-third of white workers and found them to be exploited at the level of the oppressed nation workers, we would come up with the $700 billion in surplus value. That still leaves two-thirds of the white nation workers not exploited, a majority as H.W. Edwards said, and an overwhelming influence within the white nation on Bahr's said. It would also mean that a majority of the people within U.S. borders are not exploited.

Perhaps in future issues, we can do a better job and tackle down where “not interest income” goes. We are also in need of more precise measures of U.S. exploitation and superexploitation of the Third World. As far as we know, Samir Amin, Alain De Janvry and Arkhim Emmanuel have written precisely

### Clarification:

In MIM Theory #1, MIM said that “if the labor aristocracy is not exploited, then organizing it will only result in white chauvinism and greater strength for imperialism, whatever the intentions of the organizer.” (p. 9)

MIM does not seek to organize the labor aristocracy as a class, that is for its class demands. However, MIM will organize individuals from any class and all parts of society to understand that the U.S.A. owes the international proletariat large reparations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Surplus Value (billion $)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Dept.</td>
<td>105.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>68.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation &amp; public utilities</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale and retail trade</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-industrial</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>251.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Notes:
Chapter 3
Gender and Revolutionary Feminism Debate Continues
Former Rape Crisis Center Volunteer Spills Beans

The following was a response to an ad for MT2/3. The critic had not read MT2/3.

Dear Editor:

"So why do white women accuse Black men at a rate more than 32 times the rate they accuse white men?" [MIM Theory 2/3—MC3] Wrong question (and with terrible math). You left out quite a number of considerations.

Foremost is that the statistics you cite are based on accusations which have gone through the filters of the American justice system, a system rife with sexism and racism. In general, women are discouraged from making accusations about rape every step of the way. This is especially true for acquaintance rape. As a result, acquaintance rape goes unreported far more frequently than rape perpetrated by a stranger. But it's also true for rape perpetrated by a stranger.

Everyone from the police to the courts to the rape survivor's own attorney is going to express doubt that the woman was raped. The fact is, most women just give up.

As you probably know, though, this same law enforcement and "justice" system is extremely racist. There are fewer filters in place if the accused is Black. As a result, more accusations against Black men make it through.

In short, MIM is blaming the victim instead of the actual perpetrators of the situation. MIM Theory is a tactic: "With statistics like these, MIM asks why so many anti-rape groups support the 'get-tough-on-crimes' approach just like George Bush does." In fact, anti-rape groups who have to fight for the survivors' rights in this racist and racist system have been quite adamant about removing both the racist and sexist filters in that system. MIM is misrepresenting their groups.

The rape crisis groups I've worked with were composed mostly of women from the working and middle classes. While the membership of these mostly-volunteer groups were disproportionately short on black women, there was no shortage of what MIM would call "Third World Women." Our clients were of all races, and we worked hard for each and every one of them.

—Former rape crisis center volunteer
June, 1992

MIM REPLY:

We never presented any math, only statistics in our ad. The critic has not taken the time to figure out what s/he is talking about. Less than 1% of white women's sexual interactions are with Black men. Yet, 25% of the rape accusations by white women are against Black men. That means that every 1% of white women's total sexual interactions that are with white men generates less than 1% of the white women's rape accusations. The figures for Black women are also explained in MT2/3. [See MT2/3 for more on all of the above statistics and the support].

Our critic says that if we go through the court system, rape accusations have gone through the filters of the American justice system, rife with sexism and racism. That is proving our point, not refuting it. The rape accusations that do get through are weaker ones that are more likely to prove up the patriarchy than defeat it. That's one reason why MIM advocates the position that all sex is rape.

There are two ways to do that all sex is rape and that patriarchy is systematic coercion by gender. The more common means is to deny the rape in ordinary sex. The other way, to deny the existence of a systematic patriarchy is to assert that only various individuals in particular have been raped—on average, by people of lower educational level and less white natives largely than the accused, as government figures show. Like pseudo-democrat, generally, our critic points that rape is very widespread, especially at the acquaintance level. But conveniently falls short of calling all sex rape while walking at discrimination in the injustice system. It all amounts to a perfectly selectively used dogma constructed for the service of the prosecution in the court system.

Our critic also raises ignorant points about acquittals versus stranger rape. If s/he had read the MIM Theory journal, s/he would know that white women accusers BOTH their Black male acquittals and Black strangers at several times the rate they accuse white men. As for blaming the victim, the victim here is Black man. It's one of the
small contributing factors that enables our system to imprison Black people at a higher rate than the apartheid regime in South Africa does. Our critic is blaming the victim and MIA Theory proves that the pseudo-feminist strategy hasn't done a thing for women in its generation-long existence in the anti-rape and anti-battering centers.

The rape accusations that do get through are racist ones and they are ones that do more to prop up the patriarchy than defeat it. That's one reason why MIA accusations blind the position that all sex is rape.

As for our critic's experience in anti-rape centers, MIA has many formal members of anti-rape and anti-battering centers. Our experiences as individuals in these groups have nothing to do with the overall impact of pseudo-feminist work in America today.

A dogma is an idea repeated in the face of facts. It is like the idea that in China today, XXX is an idea presented in irrelevant context no matter what the original question was. Our critic's responses were a dogma response typical of pseudo-feminist organizations, to which we ourselves often belonged. We raised the point of the disproportionate accusations of white women made against black men and our critic just raised the dogma of anti-rape groups that they are harming black women and they have some token members around. By this reasoning, the Gulf War was OK, because the Army was disproportionately White and Latino. (Actually anti-rape centers are known to be disproportionately white female organizations, probably for exactly the reasons our statistic point to.)

Then there was the talismanic dogma response that the rape of Black women justifies white supremacist courts. However, the apologists of the court system cannot use this justification either. We didn't oppose all courts. We cited the Black Panthers. They were against black control of black courts in their black crime. They were right and the Rodney King case should have proved it to our critics.

The people denying the facts are just like the Rodney King jurors denying what is on videocassette in front of them. This is demonstrated by the leap some other critics make to saying we said rape accusations are fabricated. (Pseudo-feminist response: Surveys show that false reporting of crimes including rape is less than 2%.)

But people can't deal with that either. They can't deal with the fact that patriarchy is a system, not just a matter of individual sexual behavior. They can't deal with the fact that white supremacy is so thoroughly a dogma in this country that people didn't even respond to what we said. Another person asked if we said white women were being raped by black men. But no one did we say that. Where do all these irrational and irrelevant responses come from? The built-in whiteness of this society. It's not enough to assuage your guilt by writing for an anti-rape group. Any anti-rape group that does not repudiate the criminal justice system is just another white supremacist organization. Anti-rape groups have failed in reducing rape which is why we call many of them pseudo-feminists.

Meanwhile, revolutions in China, Algeria, etc. did succeed in reducing rape, only to see it skyrocket when capitalism took power as in China now. The real feminists were the revolutionaries that really changed things, not the people who work on individual sexual practices without changing a thing overall. Anti-rape work can be an exercise in assuaging guilt and satisfying one's own sexual practices in a society where no individual escapes inequality. That rationalization in gender issues is pseudo-feminism. Revolutionary feminism abolishes pornography, recovers the arts, deals with nation and class, reduces society-wide sexual violence and uproots the sources of that sexual practice. Read the facts in MIA Theory 2/3, Send $5 to PO Box 3575, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-3575. Either cash or check made out to ABE P.B. For those readers...
Surprised by “Communist” Homophobia

Thanks for the article on the RCP and homophobia, though I’m not sure that I agree that the RCP is homophobic. Their analysis of gay issues is similar to that of much of the non-Trot and Social Democratic left (if the latter can be called left in a context other than in comparison to Ronald Reagan), and while I don’t agree with it, I don’t think that makes the RCP homophobic. I think that while I don’t agree with their stance, they are on the side of justice. I was a member of the CIO’s Communist Youth Organization when I was a student at the University of X, and the issue came up of whether or not to admit gay and lesbians into the CIO. It had never occurred to me before that masculinity had anything to do with being a communist, and the attitudes of many in the CIO and CIO, surprised me. I wouldn’t argue that homophobia doesn’t exist in the RCP, just that their line is not necessarily homophobic. Note that the bookstores in X use touch with you guys and begins to carry your literature.

Southern
June, 1982

MIM REPLIES:

Compared with the U.S. population as a whole, the RCP is not homophobic. In another article, MIM addressed the overclaim attacks on the RCP in this article of the National Lawyers Guild. Sometimes and others, I really lose sight of what is going on in society overall when they focus on each other.

When it comes to groups that call themselves vanguard parties, however, the standards must be higher. We do not think we can call the RCP “communists” with its current (never mind past) line on homosexuality.

We resist: it is a crime against the international proletariat to divide Marxists based on one’s sexual orientation. The RCP has three dividing lines questions just like MIM—the Cultural Revolution, the ex-Soviet Union, and which sex you sleep with (that’s a joke, but according to RCP members, they really do keep people out based on incorrect sexual orientation). We at MIM believe the latter question raised by the RCP is a dilution of the importance of the first two.

MIM Theory #4, Number 1, Winter, 1982.3, Chapter 3

A Spring Tradition: The Friends and Success of Communist Development

Mimi MacKinnon Mail

DEAR MIM:

“Too bad credit, MacKinnon has developed and promoted a theory of sexuality which describes rape as a sexual act inextricably linked to a continuum of coercive social activities, marking all sex as shades of rape, and all rape as acts of sex.” [See MIM Theory 2/3, p. 179—MO]

“To bad credit?” I think the supposed of such a theory is the mark of a very sick mind indeed. While many feminists deny that rape has any sexual content at all, I do not believe that this is the case. However, in claim that all acts of sex are acts of rape in so obviously wrong as to defy comprehension. Is masturbation a form of rape?

—Reader from the Midwest
June, 1982

MIM REPLIES:

Good point about masturbation. Of course, MIM had defined the subject matter of sex and romance more narrowly in previous articles of its newspaper and theory journal. Our definition would include two or more people involved.

MacKinnon’s position is difficult to comprehend, especially in the individualistic West. However,
it should not be any more difficult than understanding Marx's idea about workers. Marx did not believe individual acts of work by proletarians under the capitalist system were the problem to be addressed through individual struggle. He looked at capitalism as a system.

MacKinnon views gender oppression as systemic and the way Marx views exploitation of labor as systemic. We at HTML only regret that MacKinnon does not seem up to taking her theory to its logical revolutionary conclusions in practice.

QUOTATION

"Sexual pleasure is the experience of power," she [MacKinnon] says. "This would seem to imply that women, lacking power, are incapable of experiencing sexual pleasure. This is so obviously false that it is difficult to see how anyone could make such a mistake.

--A critic of HTML's gender law

August, 1984

MACKINNON: MacKinnon says that women learn to enjoy their own submission. That's one answer. After all, we can only grow up and learn what sexual pleasure is from society.

Another answer is that some people who are biologically female nonetheless could be basically socially constructed males, because they have power to enjoy—female judges, politicians, or capitalists. That's not to mention the gender aristocracy generally, which we discuss in MFT.

Whether there is really something that is intrinsically sexual pleasure that cannot be reduced to love of power socially constructed, we don't know because sex, for so long in human history, has been bound up with power. Get rid of patriarchy and then we'll see if there really is sexual pleasure.

IN CONTEXT

"Discarding male-biased theories of gender as rooted in biological differences." [A partial quote from a HTML article—HC] Biological difference is the basis of gender "by definition." Notes MacKinnon's theory means that a person can change gender by purely social or intellectual processes? This would render the categories of "male" and "female" meaningless, and in doing invalidate the very basis of feminism. I can't accept this—especially when all the evidence contradicts it.

--Critic

August, 1988

SUMMARY

Feminism should be about eliminating sexual oppression. That includes the appropriation of sexuality of biological men by other biological women. If you limit feminism to biology (biology as destiny), then you can raise no feminist objections to things like lesbian battering or rape. We at HTML believe that if you apply MacKinnon globally, then you will find that First World people are all men because they oppress Third World biological women and are sexually. HTML has little use for biological definitions of race or gender. They are sometimes useful shorthand. They don't tell us what is going on or what to do about oppression.

MFT on Gender

DEAR AINE:

On housework etc., first of all, where does money come from? The sale of commodities made by factory workers. The capitalist pays the worker the wage of the socially necessary commodities necessary to maintain the worker and to reproduce them. This wage is included in the wage (this is the real proletariat).

In a book called Problems of the Struggle for the Complete Emancipation of Women, (Tirana, Albania, 1972) in the chapters called "On Certain Anti-Marxist Concepts of the Kurdish State "Revolutionists in Connection with Women's Participation in Social Production Work," it is said: "Second, the Kurdish state revolutionists try to isolate women's preaching that household work merits the same respect as work in production. But these preachings have nothing to common with Marxism-Leinism." (p.114-12)

In Capital, part 4, production of relative surplus value, chapter 14, section 3: "...now the capitalist boys children and young persons under 14."

Previously, the worker said his own labour-power,
which he disposed of nominally as a free agent. Now he sells his wife and child. He has become a slave-dealer.

In part 9, the production of absolute and relative surplus value, chapter 17, changes or magnitudes in the price of labour power and in surplus value: "The value of labour-power is determined by the value of the necessities of life habitually required by the average labourer. The quantity of these necessaries is known at any given point of a given society, and can therefore be treated as a constant magnitude. What changes, is the value of this quantity. There are, besides, two other factors that enter into the determination of the value of labour-power. One, the agencies of developing that power, which determines the mode of production, ever-the natural diversity, the difference between the labour power of man and woman, of children and adults. The employment of these different sorts of labour-power, an employment which is, in turn, made necessary by the mode of production, makes a great difference in the cost of maintaining the family of the labourer, and in the value of the labour-power of the adult male."

Back to household work and prostitution. You have to read The Origins of the Family, Private Property and the State. It's in there. I think. Here is something in chapter 9, barbarism and civilization in the paragraph that starts with "The stage of commodity production, with which civilization... The form of family corresponding to... civilization and under it; becoming the definitive prevailing form in monogamy, the supremacy of the man over the woman, and the individual family as the economic unit of society."

...Going back to MacKinnon. Her book is called something like Toward a Feminist Theory of the State. It therefore must be compared to The Origins of the Family, Private Property and the State. Male domination of women took place when society was "disembodied" into classes, i.e. when primitive society turned into slave society. In primitive society there was equality between the sexes. Therefore, there can only be equality again when classes have abolished. Under socialism the first work in this order is done: Housework and child rearing must be socialized, free and foremost. Women are then drawn into production work. Under socialism there is equal pay for equal work. Another point, there is a big difference in the relations between men and women from class to class. The most exploited and oppressed classes of people also are more equal via a woman and man. Attitudes of male exploting-are tied. This is compared with the labor aristocracy and petty-bourgeoisie and capitalism.

"Since I am going to repeat myself, I might as well repeat myself twice. These definitions should be done in opposition to some textbook, or another. For example, the last time I heard about the household argument, I think the point was to organize housework to get paid by the capitalists. This is exactly..."

That reminds us. If this argument is being used, what about the fact that more and more women are working in factories in the Third World and more and more are not married but have kids. I mean to talk about household without reference to whether you mean housewives from the labor aristocracy or housewives or other women from the Third World in abortion and wrong.

Lenin's party organized around the following demands in the spring of 1917: six weeks off for pregnant women working in factories; before and after delivery of child; these women to have special rooms in the factory to nurse their child every hour; etc. I can't find it, but also the right to abortion.

--MAJ

April 28, 1993

1993 Notes

In his theory of how capitalism works, Marx said that the capitalists would tend to pay wages to ensure the reproduction of the workers (except in cases which we call superexploitation). In that reproduction of the worker, the capitalist would control household, not for any material reasons, but because of social forces according to Marx.

For gender relations between first World men and women resemble the class relations between the labor aristocracy and the "imperialists"—collaboration and negotiation at its finest.

For unemployment reasons, some have called for redefinition of housework. In this we must agree with Allardice commenced Works of 1973. Paying for housework ought or might not affect the total wages paid by capitalist to workers, however, it is certain that paying for housework would reinforce its con-
enge and make it more difficult to eradicate. In practice, as MN71 points out, it might also penalize single women workers who would see their wages reduced. Hence, women . . .

We must also comment on those trends within post-feminist culture which glorify "deviant" motherhood and housework as quintessentially feminine and worthy of society's respect. It is these post-feminists who redefine many or almost all cultural mechanisms that are the cutting edge of "backlash," the term for reaction against gains in women's liberation. There is no obstruction to women's liberation outside of society's entry into production and all spheres of life whose power is to be found in the institutions it witnesses.

It is also interesting to note that MN71 raises the fact that Marx saw the family as embodying pre-capitalistic modes of production. Here he refers to wives and children as "slaves" elsewhere he refers to women in domestic relations. MN71's position in this regard is that the family as an element of the queernad structure continues to serve those pre-capitalist influences, but it is not present in the imperialist countries today in those gender relations to pre-capitalist relations of production. On the contrary, the gender relations between First World men and women resemble the class relations between the labor aristocracy and the imperialism — collaboration and opposition at its finest.

IDENTITY politics: How Subversive is Cultural Subversion?

Identity politics is the name of a political trend which has emerged to gay, lesbian, bisexual, queer, white feminist, and consensual (e.g., punk, alternative-head) communities. Identity politics places 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/socialist queer liberation/rights group) is an example of identity politics. The idea of a queer nation or of national liberation for queers is a manufactured idea with no historical basis. The idea is basically an appropriation of Black Nationalist rhetoric. The question between Black Nationalism and Queer Nationalism is to the issue that a Black Nation exists inside the U.S. borders, 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 between the white American nation and the Black nations of Africa, and between the white nations of the former colonial powers and the newly independent Black African nations. Revolutionary Black Nationalists maintain that the colonial relationship continues to this day, and that the struggle for national liberation for American blacks continues to this day, and that the struggle for national liberation for American blacks is no different from any other revolutionary struggle for national liberation for oppressed colonized.

Queer Nationalism, in 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 its own image and identity of revolution: death and glory, heroes and martyrs. But the identity is all that Queer Nation, a predominantly reformist organization, claims.

Without a revolutionary practice, Queer Nation finds itself in the role of an elite, to the core: One Queer Nationalist 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 lesbian "revolutionary" when the laws are queer — i.e., contrary to the dominant culture's
understanding of what a line is and should be—i.e., in my opinion, an insult to the many real revolutionaries (including queer revolutionaries) who have died in struggle or heaven "busted 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 emphasizes material conditions and the political actions necessary to change these material conditions, while identity politics emphasizes 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, employment, decent housing, honest education,Atom's voice to service in the U.S. military, end to police brutality, freedom for Black prisoners, that by virtue of race or culture. 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 U.S. In the full text of the ten-point, the BPP Program speaks America's Declaration of Independence to explain that the aforementioned demands should be met by the means of national liberation through armed revolution if necessary. (2)

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, galvanized against cultural nationalism, which was and is the New African/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 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 appreciation 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 an need for empty, dishonest, abstract rhetoric about national opposition and revolution. The Panthers used some rhetoric only in the context of explaining their politics, whereas the use of such rhetoric by queer activists and other practitioners of identity politics tends to obfuscate, not to enlighten. Queer blackness is often the word "revolution," for instance, obscures the reality of their deplorable status. Their use of the word "nation" obscures the difference 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.

This calls on all progressive activists to object identity politics in favor of an analysis of material conditions and how to change them.

**Notes**

1. Text of speech given by "Gloria Monsen" from the "Black Panther" vol. 4, no. 11, pp. 22-23. (April 1991)

2. Text of speech given by "Gloria Monsen" from the "Black Panther" vol. 4, no. 9, pp. 22-23. (September 1991)

3. Text of speech given by "Gloria Monsen" from the "Black Panther" vol. 4, no. 10, pp. 22-23. (December 1991)
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This is an interesting contrast of two papers for women in the New England area. The features on...
INTERVIEW WITH CANDIDATE SYLVIA EDWARDS AND A FULL-PAGE AD OF A MODEL IN HER UNDERWEAR ON THE BACK COVER. IN CONTRAST, THE THIRD WAVE HAS THE WORD FEMINIST RIGHT IN THE HEADLINE.

AS ONE WOULD EXPECT, THIRD WAVE IS THE MORE CHALLENGING PAPER. SHE IS FOR WOMEN, BUT IT DOES NOT CLAIM TO BE FEMINIST. FROM OUR PERSPECTIVE THIS IS HONEST BECAUSE SHE IS REALLY A PAPER FOR WOMEN FOCUSING ON FEMINISM. IT IS ENTIRELY AND UNHARMFULLY FOR ADJUSTMENT TO SECURITY RATHER THAN CHALLENGE. ARTICLES ABOUT SYLVIA EDWARDS, THE ART, TAKING A NON-SERIOUS ATTITUDE, PHOTOGRAPHY IN A SECTION CALLED "FOR ART'S SAKE," STARTING EXERCISES, ETC., ARE ALL PROVIDED A WAY FOR WOMEN TO AVOID ISSUES OF POWER AND HIERARCHY. IN THESE ARTICLES WE COME TO UNDERSTAND THE THEME OF "PALITIV." THE PAPER IS ESSENTIALLY A CALL ON WOMEN TO DEVELOP THOSE ASPECTS OF LIFE HAVING TO DO WITH INTELLIGENCE OR EMOTIONAL DEVELOPMENT. "ART FOR ITS OWN SAKE" SHOULD REALLY BE RENAMED "ART FOR ITS OWN ESCAPE." IN THIS PAPER.

RECOMMENDING THE PAPER IS A FAVORABLE REVIEW OF GLORIA STEINEM'S NEW BOOK AT THE O'DAY-THREE AND AN ARTICLE BY A HARVARD PSYCHOLOGY PROFESSOR DIVIDING THE WORLD INTO "LOGICAL" AND "LINEAR" PEOPLE ON THE ONE HAND AND "MENTAL" PEOPLE ON THE OTHER. THE PAPER IS ESSENTIALLY CONSISTING OF ARTICLES ABOUT WOMEN-BOROCHE, WHITENESS, AND FEMINISM—WITH NOT ONE BIT OF CHALLENGE TO THE PATRARCHY. NO WONDER IT SELLS SO MANY COPIES EVERY WEEK.

THE THIRD WAVE, ON THE OTHER HAND, PROCLAIMS ITSELF A PAPER PUBLISHED BY "A NETWORKING SYSTEM AND CLEANSING HOUSE FOR FEMINIST ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS THROUGHOUT RHODE ISLAND. PRU MEMBERS EMBRACE A PHILOSOPHY WHICH INCLUDES, AMONG OTHER THINGS, THE FOLLOWING FIVE CRITICAL ISSUES: REPRODUCTIVE FREEDOM, GAY RIGHTS, AND GAY CIVIL RIGHTS, ENDING ALL FORMS OF VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN, MESSAGE OF AN ALL INCLUSIVE ERA, AND TRUE DIVERSITY IN THE FEMINIST WOMEN'S MOVEMENT."

WITH ONE EXCEPTION, THE ARTICLES ABOUT ART, MUSIC, AND OTHER ESCAPES ALL HAVE AN ASPECT ADDRESSING THE ROLE OF WOMEN IN SOCIETY. FOR EXAMPLE, AN ARTICLE ABOUT CAMFEST AND THE NATIONAL WOMEN'S MUSIC FESTIVAL POINTS OUT THAT AT THESE EVENTS, WOMEN SEE THAT THEY ARE CAPABLE OF ORGANIZING EVERY ASPECT OF THEIR OWN LIVES.

ANOTHER ARTICLE BY THE THIRD WAVE MOURNS HOW MAINSTREAM THE "WOMEN'S CANDIDATES" ARE THIS YEAR—THE ONES MAKING HEADLINES. "IT PROBABLY WILL BE THE YEAR FOR THE CRO-MATHEPOC "WOMEN'S CANDIDATES." CHAINED LIGHTNING,..." "PERMANENT WAVE." A FEW WOMEN WILL SUCCESS IN PACHING THE SEATS OF A FEW MEN RISING IN ON WHAT PASSES FOR RADICAL CHANGE ON A COMMUNITY. TRIM, LIVELY, AND UNHARMFULLY, WOMEN ARE OUT OF ALL NATURAL SHAPES FOR PUBLIC CONSUMPTION. "NEW APPLIANCE," THE LESS DETAILED, THE MORE EMBRACED."

ON THE NEGATIVE SIDE, THE PAPER CELEBRATES "DIVERSITY" INSTEAD OF OPPRESSING NATIONAL OPPOSITION. IT PROVIDES AN AD FOR A "PRO-WAVE," BUT DOES NOTHING IN RELATION TO THE PARTICULAR OPPRESSIONS OF NATIONAL MINORITY OR THIRD WAVE WOMEN. OF COURSE, THE PROGRAM OF PRU DOES NOT REALLY CLAIM TO BE ACCOMPLISHING ANYTHING.

THE THIRD WAVE DOES NOT ASK WHAT IT MEANS TO BE WOMEN OR RELATION TO THE DESTRUCTION OF DEPRESSION: THE SUPERFICIAL NATURE TO BEGIN WITH. HOW DOES IT CALL ON WOMEN TO DEVELOP THOSE ASPECTS OF LIFE HAVING TO DO WITH INTELLIGENCE OR EMOTIONAL DEVELOPMENT. "ART FOR ITS OWN ESCAPE." IN THIS PAPER.

FROM MFM'S PERSPECTIVE, THE THIRD WAVE'S GREATEST WEAKNESS IS ITS LACK OF AN ANTI-IMPERIALIST PERSPECTIVE, A SENSE OF WHO FRIENDS OF WOMEN'S EQUALITY ARE AND WHAT WORKS TO CREATE CHANGE AND WHAT DOESN'T. FOR THIS REASON, THE THIRD WAVE IS NOT ABLE TO EFFECTIVELY CONTRIBUTE TO WOMEN'S LIBERATION DESPITE ITS GOALS.

AN EXAMPLE OF WHERE THE LACK OF "STRATEGIC CONFIDENCE" IN THE THIRD WORLD PRELIMINARIES OF THE VEHICLE OF REVOLUTIONARY CHANGE WOULD BE LEAD TO THE FRONT PAGE ARTICLE TITTLED, "PHOTOANARCH: HOW A TELEPHONE CAN KILL YOU," THIS ARTICLED IS BY THE RHODE ISLAND COALITION AGAINST DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.

AS WE HAVE SHOWN IN OUR MFM THEORY MAGAZINE (ISSUE 2/3), THE AMERICAN MOVEMENT AGAINST VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN HAS FAILED, MISSED AND WOULD BENEFIT FROM A GOOD LOOK AT WHAT THE WORLD IS DOING FOR BETTER STRATEGIES—NAMELY A REVOLUTIONARY STRATEGY IN THE TRADITION OF MARX, LENIN, STALIN AND MAO. READERS SHOULD GET THE MAGAZINE FOR THE DETAILED EVIDENCE SUPPORTING THIS POINT.

IN ANY CASE, THE LEAD STORY FEATURES A VIOLENT GROWTH AND A TELEPHONE. SO HERE IS ONE AGAIN THAT SUPPOSED WOMEN'S LIBERATION FIGHTERS DON'T
women as hopelessly weak, so weak they can be killed by a telephone.

The telephone technology in question, in front of the Rhode Island state legislature, allows consumers to know the phone number of people who call and to dial back the caller automatically. According to The Third Wave, this technology is a grave threat to battered women because batters can "thrive on control" (p. 1).

It boils down to saying that wives should have privacy in the phone-calls they make and that husbands should have no way of knowing who the wife calls or is called by. "Privacy has long been an esteemed American value." (p. 1) In fact, as many women, The Third Wave believes women should have the "right" to deceive their husbands as the solution to battering against women.

The Third Wave does not ask what it means that women are in relations where deception is the unspoken necessity to begin with. Nor does it ask how men might also use privacy to deceive women. In contrast, MIM believes that American women should take a hard look at what they are really saying about relations between men and women— particularly— even if and especially if The Third Wave is correct that deception through using the telephone is a central part of women's lives. We at MIM believe none of these elaborate revisionist moves will ever eradicate the problem: only power-struggle to abolish inequality between men and women will.

Ironically, while expressing the classic American values that MIM has argued against in connection to "antisocial discipline struggle as well (See MIM Theory 2/3), The Third Wave concludes the article attacking the material basis for these privacy values! The Third Wave says that in the end the telephone companies "will profit" from Phonemart technology. How contradictory! On the one hand, The Third Wave criticizes privacy and then, on the other hand, it criticizes the institution of private property in an "un-American" way. We at MIM believe the recession will see the flag waving "privacy." It's time to put women's liberation on an unashamedly anti-American footing— the most secure one there is.

At any rate, The Third Wave's strategy is mistaken on two levels. First, women's liberation does not proceed from championing "privacy rights." Women's liberation needs to be about power struggles of groups, not individual "privacy," of an MIM kind.

...gathers from feminist movements make unsuccessful in world history.

Secondly, the result is, as often is the case in incorrectly organized anti-rapes and anti-battering work—an installation of a new kind of femininity. Women are being told once again to defy technology instead of conquering it. They are told that Phonemart will automatically benefit the batters and not be used by the oppressed. In fact, in the end according to TRW, a mere telephone can kill a woman.

This is an image of women as hopelessly helpless and feminine—something right out of the movies—"The Perils of Pauline" or Poty in the "Dial私营" commercials. For a counterexample of how to organize women, MIM recommends the Panamanian Communist Party (PCF, also known as Sandinista Luminoso). Sandinista women engage in armed struggle, co-edit the newspaper and lead victory struggles. Although the Panamanian women must also fight lumino, the PCF never depicts women as helpless.

Selective Prosecution is Justified in Rape

This was another letter responding to an ad for MIM Theory 2/3.

DEAR MIM

Isn't it obvious why of the REPORTED rapes, there would be a disproportional accusation by white women of black men? BECAUSE THERE ARE THE KIND OF RAPE THAT CAN BE SUCCESSFULLY PROSECUTED. There are a tremendous amount of unreported rapes, most of which are acquaintance rape, which are very hard to prove. It is true that the dynamics of the information reflect the racism of the American justice system but there is a long leap from that to accusing white women as victims in general of fabricating rape charges in order to be part of a conspiracy against the black
null. What are the statistics about black women rape victims?

——Another aside of Villi on gender
June, 1983

null.

This aside raises exactly the same argument as MacKinnon, which is reflected in our theory journal. She says Black rapes of white women are disproportionately because there are the kind of rapes that can be successfully prosecuted. Wow, that disproves our point? That means white people are superwomen in all their other aspects of life, but when it comes to rape charges against Black men it's OK? Or maybe our aside agrees with George Bush and the Willie Horton ads?

As for the bullshit about underreported crimes making it acceptable when the system convicts Black men, we have three points. First, this is accepting the FBI's definition of underreported crimes. The most underreported crimes are actually white collar crimes, the genocide of Third World peoples. It's so underreported the FBI doesn't keep figures on it at all. Whereas we use FBI numbers to argue about the FBI and the courts and their system, our critics have used FBI numbers to make a moral argument. That is called buying into the system, a white supremacist criminal justice system. It's one reason that progressive and radical people and internationalists have a hard time with pseudo-feminist groups. They use FBI reasoning in their politics.

Secondly, if you admit the system shows out a lot of rapes and you admit the system doesn't work to stop rape, then when you say that what rape is done convict, you are giving legitimacy to the system. In fact, given the failure of the system on this subject, a reasonable person should conclude that the rape convictions obtained are only obtained when they prop up the patriarchy.

Finally, this kind of reasoning discredit real feminism. It's one reason rape victims have such a hard time. The reason is that rape as LEGITIMATE defined is often a fabrication by white women. Why? Because in this country's legal system, we supposedly have something called equal protection of the law. Now as a revolutionary group, at a certain level, we don't give a shit about the law; although we all uphold it in our current practices. But the masses are right not to support a hypocritical system that claims to provide equal protection under the law. All rape is rape to our opinion, but we can see that if you use the patriarchy's definition of rape (as is common in this country), then people are going to get missed, because there is clearly no equal protection under the law. That's just another reason we think anti-race groups that are genuine should reguluate the legal system and work like Villi to seize the power to abolish patriarchy, disallow the use of women as objects in movies and ads, etc. and generally support a more liberatory culture.

Corrections:

The following are corrections from MINI THEORY 2/6.

P. 55 The article "No gains for women in Taiwan" started with an incorrect sentence. It should have read: "The masses knew the real answer to the question of where pseudo-feminism led the women of Hong Kong, Taiwan, South Korea, Japan and India." It had read "Chinese pseudo-feminism," instead of just "pseudo-feminism."

P. 103 should read "It could be the way of reactionary imperialist interests..." not "It could..."

P. 116 should read "Catherine MacKinnon not Katherine MacKinnon

What Didn't Work in China

April, 1982
by 1835

The following article was cut off in the middle by accident in MT2/6. We reprint the article in its entirety here.

On the road to liberation in China, many many feminists made the correct choice and joined the Communist Party (CCP) led by Mao Tse-tung. Their decision contributed to the Revolution of 1949 and the advancement of women soon after that.1)

It is important to look at what happened in China before the Maoist revolution and after. The silence left by many pseudo-feminist critics of Mao's CCP is on the question of what happened to the non-Maoist feminists before 1949. The answer is that they said a lot of things that pseudo-femi-
nists today think are new and like the pseudo-feminists of today, they failed in their efforts.

The women's movement in China started at least as early as 1913, with petitions and demonstrations for equal rights, including the right to vote. By 1920 Communist Wang Hu-sun expressed her opposition in written articles for allowing that women's movement to be taken over by radicals. (Women's role was limited, military-same-action-bases before China was unified, as a single country.) Hence from the beginning there was a class struggle within the women's movement.

The communist woman of the 1930s also thought that some of the feminists of the day had a way of destroying social change movements from within. They were equally concerned that the women's rights not dissipated their energies in battles between the sexes when they should be guiding the masses for class war. Some would recall the famous woman who praised the 'late system' which turned women against men on the erroneous assumption that their enemy was the male sex rather than an oppressor class composed of men and women."

One of the problems of the oppressed is that their history gets second of written in inaccessible places. Part of the result is the constant re-invention of the wheel. The idea that men are the only enemy is not a new idea restricted to the United States since the 1930s. This idea was in currency in China in the 1930s as well. Where 1 is in China and the whole anarchist feminist movement takes Chinese women in the 1930s and 1940s elsewhere.

Actually, China today believes that men are an enemy. It is even possible that at some point in history they may become the principal enemy. Right now though, men and women are both still starving by the millions and dying in war; hence targeting men equally as if they were the all-powerful enemy is unrealistic.

One Western pseudo-feminist critic of China's revolution, Susan Leith, describes one of the communist women close to the foundation of the CCP named Haiqiu Chiu-yu who had to forcibly criticize certain kinds of "feminism" at the time. "Haiqiu's sharpest criticisms were for the 'romantic,' young girls who espoused free love and placed highest emphasis on individual liberty and happiness. Haiqiu labeled these girls dangerous and undisciplined."

As for women of today's pseudo-feminists who criticize men for their individual tastes in

romance, political women of the 1930s raised such self-serving behavior to a principle. The Western-educated Chinese women demanded that educated Chinese men discard their traditional virtue and start over by marrying for "love," generally "lots" of educated women. (4) Then as now, the domination for men beneath the surface was continued, but plain enough to the scientist of revolution.

One of the problems of the oppressed is that their history gets second of written in inaccessible places.

A high point of women's liberation for pseudo-feminists Leith came when the Nationalist army (the pre-revolution, pre-U.S. army that composed Mao's People's Liberation Army in the civil war) liberated one woman from her communist husband. Another high point for Leith occurred when a communist husband was killed so that the oppressed woman could manage to escape. (5) Transferring her own decided Western imperialist culture to China, Leith makes a gigantic leap of logic in examining divorce in China: "The enthusiasm with which peasant women sought out divorce indicates that they, like the girl students, perceived themselves as properly sexually rather than economically oppressed, in struggle not with the landlord but with the male."

What matters to Susan Leith, who is preoccupied with the decadent imperialist family, is that women in China were starving by the millions, but that sexual freedom be examined. Ironically, even in the case of the two women, Leith cites as oppressed by communist men, the women in question went on to stay in the Communist Party. They didn't go to the individualistic, sexual politics route.

MIM would like to be able to make a simple case for women's liberation, especially by pointing to accomplishments of Mahle, and avoid having to say that sexual freedom is subordinate to freedom from servitude, barbarism and militarism, but decadent women like Leith make that impossible. They insist that we dot the "i" and cross the "t," so MIM does: sexual oppression is not the principal oppression in the world today, and it hasn't been
in China's history so far this century. The sexual struggle is subordinated to class and national struggle.

It is necessary to prioritize struggles that vary because Leith makes comments that peasant women are not oppressed by landowners and that they lack on the Nationalist (pre-Red) Army as liberation. In the first place that is a lie as demonstrated by tens of millions of peasant women who joined the communist cause. In the second place, it is not even realistic. The proof is in the society that people like Leith turned to—Taiwan. Mao Tse-tung's People's Liberation Army drove the remnants of the Nationalists out of Mainland China and onto Taiwan. Later we will see what the result of efforts of pseudo-feminists like Leith's have achieved for women in Taiwan. We can't leave that job to Leith, because she is so idealistic she no where takes responsibility for the outcomes of her kind of politics.

Leith concludes her study by saying that Hsiung was loyal to the CCP "rather than to her sex." Hsiung concludes that Leith is both loyal to capitalism and feminism, on the one hand, and patriarchy on the other hand, but demonstrates such loyalty while working under the guise of "feminism."

Janet Salaff and Judith Ansaldi are another pair of free-thinking pseudo-feminists. They are sympathetic to the anarchistic causes related to Soviet history, the Emancipist revolt of 1917. They also believe that during Stalin's reign as party leader in the Soviet Union, "the most bizarre aspects of the policy can be attributed to the abnormality of his personality."[7]

Salaff and Ansaldi start with the usual idealist twist on a statement that the revolutionary feminists do not agree with: "The Revolution vastly improved the lot of many Russian women, increasing literacy, education and legal rights. Most Soviet women were not of choice as well as necessary, and child care is available. But these accomplishments fall far short of the hopes of the women revolutionaries or the early promises of the revolution itself."[8]

Without producing any kind of figures which might relate those M/LH in other articles on China, Salaff and Ansaldi come to simply inaccurate formal conclusions that women only made token gains during the Russian and Chinese revolutions.

Nancy Mitrow, who lived in the People's Republic of China gave a personal testimony to both Salaff and Ansaldi in addition to analysis of the situation in Mao's China: "During one of my teaching years in Peking, I worked with a teaching group of about thirty teachers, approximately half men and half women. Within this group, virtually all academic leadership was in the hands of women, not because they were women, but because it happened, in each case of teaching specialization, political leadership or whatever, a woman had superior qualifications of experience, ability, training or knowledge. We were all too surprised and gratified!"[9] Mitrow went on to thoroughly criticize Salaff and Ansaldi for an ahistorical and ethnocentric approach.

One interesting aspect of this is that Salaff and Ansaldi are some of the more recent critics of the real revolutionary feminists. They aren't as far off as some of the more reactionary ones like Leith. All this while calling for free-loves, an increased role of women in armed struggle and probably anarchism, Salaff and Ansaldi make their "ethnocentric" mistakes. It just goes to show how is difficult to escape the trap of one's nationality. We must always insist on comparative research at all times, especially before we set about constructing societies other than our own.

Notes:
1. Jack Balder's, China Shakes the World is a good source of information on the struggle of women unleashed in the communist revolution.
4. Ibid., p. 50.
5. Ibid., p. 53.
6. Ibid.
8. Ibid., p. 156.
EX SOVIET UNION

Notes from Siberia

Siberian Review
The Independent Russian Monthly
No. 1, June 1993, Free

This very informative 32-page newspaper is published by Siberian capitalists with the assistance of the San Francisco Weekly. Siberian Review (SR) is the American edition of the Siberstvye Gazeta, 77a Gorby Street St., Novosibirsk, Russia 630082 (223): 887/245,000 plus copies are currently distributed on the American West Coast.

Siberia Review reflects the class interests of the developing Siberian national bourgeoisie as it strives to attract American capital into an area that is one-third again as large as the continental United States. Siberia is loaded with natural resources ripe for the picking by international capital now that the state-capitalist bubble of the Soviet Union has popped. Left behind are disoriented heads of nations vibrating with bourgeois nationalism as their boundaries shrivel and repel each other in the struggle of capital to rest in as few hands as possible. SIR is full of facts and analysis of interest to Marxists.

A FEW HIGHLIGHTS

• The Russian state-subsidized newspaper, Noyetka,has entered into a joint venture with the Heatcor Corporation. (p. 2)

• The Chair of the Parliamentary Committee on Legislation and Law predicts two million drug addicts in Russia by the year 2000. "The year alone an increase in the addict population of 20 - 25% is predicted. [The Chair] blames unemployment, price inflation and general instability for this year's dramatic increase." (p. 3)

• A "Message From the Editors" quotes Deleuzey, Marx and Robert F. Washburn at it urges Americans to "travel to and do business in Russia." (p. 5)

• SIR/88 devotes a page of photos to the popularly-attended funeral of "one of the most prominent doctors in Barnaul, capital of Siberia's Altai region." (p. 8)

The facing page is dedicated to promoting sales to the U.S. of computer programs for training mathematicians.

CLASS STRUGGLE:
A RUSSIAN LABOR-ARISTOCRACY?

SR's sister publication in Siberia is Moshe Gazeta, the voice of miners in the Kuzbass region who formed the Independent Union of Coal Miners (FMO) and its allied union Workers' Movement in 1988. (p. 6) These unions supported Boris Yeltsin during the August 1991 coup attempt by shutting down 50 mines and marching to Yeltsin's side at the Russian White House. The central strike committee of the FMO/Workers' Movement is "planning to hire professional lobbyists to represent their interests in the oblast capital of Kemerovo and in Moscow...They have also hired a variety of specialists to generate policy alternatives [and have] travelled to consult with academics at the Everet Institute [and spent two weeks] in Palo Alto consulting with leaders of the United Mine Workers' Union."

The goal of the miners' leadership is to "aid the development of an environment friendly to private business while opposing the reactionary initiatives of the Krupen, [Marx's term for the backward class of society]." (p. 6) It seems that the words of Marx, no matter how twisted, still have some credibility among the miners—who's average life expectancy is 43 years. (p. 6) SIR surmises that the union leadership is really in opposition to the interests of the Siberian proletariat. "Last spring [union leadership] won the right to cooperate in international joint ventures and to retain 30% of profits on coal sold for hard currency." (p. 7)

The union leadership is at odds with the old state miners' union and is trying to convince miners to abandon that organization and join the FMO/Workers' Movement and put their lives in the hands of the mining trust, "a governmental agency independent of the old union, which is supposed to take care of all miners' material needs and appeals virtually all the miners' incomes." (p. 7)

"As FMO battles the state union for the confidence of the miners, the parallel contest at the top pits the dogged, determination of reformers Mikhail Kryukov and Workers' Movement leader Slava Gel''dov against the popular trades and introduction of the equally determined Aksen Tuleyev, formerly the First Secretary of the oblast Communist Party and presently the head of the Soviet legislature, and his allies in the Federation of Trade
Unions of Russia, the old state-controlled apparatus... (p. 7)

Tuleyev commented: "In our region, we have 760,000 retired people. In the situation that exists now these people are going to die. The allowances they get are simply not enough." ARIZ comments, "This is obviously populist rhetoric; but the problem for [Tuleyev's] communist opponents is that it is also substantially true." (p. 7)

The miners are paid more than doctors and teachers. ARIZ calls for the miners to develop an "enlightened self-interest" and to unite with petty-bourgeois trade and professional union movements against the transmogrified Communist Party regime. (p. 7)

All this raises some interesting questions. What quantity of the ex-Soviet Union's population formed a parasitical nation/class comparable to the lower aristocracy/medieval class in western imperialist countries? Are these the groups that possess the limited means to transform into national bourgeoisie?

CONFESSED NATIONALS

Siberia holds 14 indigenous groups living in 14 autonomous regions and republics holding 4,554,000 people. The indigenous population numbers 371,000 (nearly 8%) of this very northern region of Siberia. The rest of Siberia holds 18 million mostly Russian people (12% of the USSR/CIS population).

Local political power is still in the hands of the ex-Communist Party apparatus (bureaucracy) which rigged elections in the terminal of the last several years. Separatist movements within the Siberian formation are very strong as various autonomous ruling groups in the newly de-nationalized regions and republics strive to grab ownership of the means of production and to lock-out the indigenous, in particular, from the corridors of power and wealth.

The populace resents the fact that Siberia contributes more to the central Russian government than it receives back in services; and this resentment provides the fuel for separatist movements. "Separation in Siberia does not stem primarily from the frustrated national aspirations of minority groups...the driving force has been the machines of a parasitical eager to retain its power" (p. 19)—and possibly, as well, an educated middle class eager to take-over ownership and command of particular sections of industry, agriculture, commerce and banking—for titre or no capital investment.

SUTURE LINES

"Following the examples of Kravchuk in Ukraine and Sheinazir in Tatarstan, Siberian and Far Eastern ex-Party bosses are looking to nationalism and economic separatism to keep themselves in power." (p. 10)

In the Jewish Autonomous Region (currently composed of only 6.1 percent Jews), "there are strong rich Arab/American representatives who want to develop the region in order to stop immigration to the USSRA occupied territories." (p. 10)

DEMOLITION that ARIZ is accurately representing the political and economic needs of the indigenous groups (or of the multi-national Siberian electorate). This propaganda-eion of free-enterprise frauds is calling for the loosening of state monopoly restrictions upon regional capitalists: "free" development (to be achieved, eventually, at the expense of exploitable "minorities").

The new capitalists are up against some eager Communist Party apparatchiks/officials who are attempting to maintain their individual hold on regional state wealth by firing up nationalism sentiments and using the familiar shell of the old state/police/media apparatus to maintain their grip on the means of production:

Unfortunately for the communists, the lack of central planning (such as it was) has liquidated its ability to keep even a semblance of balance between the production and consumption sectors. Whole enterprises and productive forces are declining from each other. The machinery of production remains in place; but another raw material not replaceable labor-power and markets are guaranteed and monopolized production for profit has ceased because there are no profits to be had in the old way.

On the other hand, this fragmentation releases the forces of production for use by independent and autonomous smaller regional capitalists contest to also cut initially small profit margins by supplying necessary commodities for consumption by the starving masses. In such a way they amass into something which was a hard currency at hand; but by actually using the state-bankruptcy, or under-utilized, forces of production, the small capitalists lay a claim to ownership and are actually accumulating capital in its broadest sense during a time of scarcity and...
economic dis-organization. Possession is nine-tenths of the law.

The new capitalists are not against the opera-
tional movements per se, they just want to control the movement of goods themselves. This is a class struggle between emerging national capitalists and a class of semi-capitalists. The latter are scared about an foreign imperialist capital to invest in their de-colonial price structures and keep themselves semi-colonial-style sufficiencies and positions in political power.

In opposition to this—the nationalist capitalist bourgeoisie do not seem eager to invite the impe-
rialist multi-nationals in to take-over through minority investments and loans—although they also do not seem to be able to utilize smaller injections of for-
eign capital which carry fewer iron strings attached to them than investments by monopoly-capitalist groups. Hence the almost sexual relationship by IMF/GT to individual American investors and small businesses.

SFR directs itself towards individual American entrepreneurs and small companies for essential maintenance of hard cash. It is not appealing to Mobile, Mobile or Washinton. The class interests of the Serbian-national bourgeoisie lie in keeping imperial-
iste capital locked out of whatever share the Serbian nation takes through further spilts and amalgamations. The Communist Party old guard, grasping at the winning power of the SFR/CIS, seems bent on selling off state assets as fast as possible to the multi-nationals. These wealthy “ex-
state” expropriations ensure the economic vigor of rising capitalists and the alienation of a mass social base. They are interested in perpetuating some form of the previous state monopolies; whereas the new capitalists are the only class truly interested in and capable of instituting an uninterfered “free-market” in their areas.

Of course, the establishment of such “free-markets” within the splintering economies will inevitably result in the erosion of trade barriers and the development of monopoly price controls in production and distribution. The end result of this movement will be civil war. It is difficult to see how civil war and/or imperialism investors can be avoided in the “glimmer-house of autisms,” short of communist revolution.

CUMULATIVE SHOCKS

It is interesting to consider how the multi-
nationals have been holding back from investing in
the SFR/CIS until the relative is “stabilized” and the competing political shake-downs pop up legal entities that can accept exorbitant pound-off-deal IMF-type loans and direct investments. Multi-nationals supported Gorbachev & Perestroika because glasnost promised the process of the piece-meal selling off of the people’s assets through joint-ventures and other capitalist tricks.

With the recent uptick and the nationalist fragmented and the certain inability of Yeltsin & Kuch to guarantee political and economic stability—
the monopoly capitalist groups are not eager to make direct infrastructural investments that may eventually be seized by nationalist movements. Nor are they eager to make loans that can be repudiated.

Yet, they form at the mouth in anticipation of the enormous super-profits to be had in the format social-imperialist formation that has shattered into about 100 potentially exploitable nations.

What remains of SFR/CIS military (nuclear) strength is probably sufficient to deter Western imperialist invasion at this time; although we should not discount the possibility of Japan or China hiring off a chunk or two in the east and the EEC/America in the west. Imperialism prefers to rule by proxy and economic control which includes: but nuclear blackmail and the endless repatriation of a few Third World states) may be the wave of the near future. There is an unacceptably amount of potential surplus-value (and raw materials) to be extracted from the 250 million residents of the former SFR/CIS lands, and imperialism is surely plotting to get it all by hook and by crook.

QLTY socialism can (as it did) unite the peo-
ples of the SFR/CIS. The unity brought about by Castro Russia was a product of the feudal mode of production—which has since been superseded. The best that the imperialism can expect is that national and class struggles will form regional groupings to ally with one or another imperialist group. One prob-
lem for them is that when the various national bourgeoisie seize national state power in their areas it is not likely that they will be willing to make themselves into imperialist neo-colonies; thereby trading social-imperialism and semi-compromises for the unprofitable restrictions on capitalist growth and free-trade that will be demanded by the World Bank & Partners.

Humpty Dumpty has really fallen this time and not even imperialism will be able to put him back together again. In fact, imperialism has its hands full in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Perhaps the most
imperialism will be able to obtain from the warring nation-states of the SHG/CIS is a bonanza in profitable arms sales and a dumping ground for over-produced industrial and agricultural commodities.

The institutions loosely controlled by the fragmenting nomenklatura appear to be weak and easily overthrown by nationalist bourgeoisie rallying the masses around social-democratic and capitalist bourgeois-democratic slogans and actual capitalist achievements. In one guise, the nomenklatura is a rotten tooth being pulled out of the people's jaws but still lingeringly attached to it by the forces of tradition and the reluctance of the people to completely let go of the remnants of state-capitalist institutions which did guarantee at least a shabby job and some bread. People without power are reluctant to trade one set of familiar oppressors for yet another set of exploiters.

So the struggle shapes up as between the institutions of decaying state-monopoly capitalism and the armed might of the nationalist bourgeoisie and their ascendent capital to expand. The instruments of rule may still exist, if temporarily, in the hands of the opportunist, nomenklatura class of state-capitalist semi-comrades. It is these instruments that must be forcibly seized by the national bourgeoisie if they are to live and thrive to oppose the working-class and farmers.

It is probable that Yeltsin will be long gone as this occurs. The stronger nations and political units will wipe out the weaker ones and political units, thereby building up controllable nation-state formations and unequal alliances which can guarantee foreign monopoly capitalism a number of shifting, unequal and temporary uneasy trade treaties.

On the other hand, the people of this continent might just take matters into their own hands and re-establish dictatorships of the proletariat (and possibly fascist-type states) in various competing areas. Of course the former will not be done by relying on an already-corrupted "union" leadership which may deceptively appear attractive when weighed against the older state-run associations. This leadership could unite the middle class with experienced semi-comrades to usher in forced-labor and fascistic controls, however.

Ultimately, class war will resolve these issues one way or another over a certain period of time. This continues to be a revolutionary situation and we must not discount the initiative of the proletariat, so far the changes have actually been in the interests of the masses of the world. An imperialist power has collapsed and its cousins cannot be far behind. The situation in the SHG/CIS is ripe for revolutionary class alliances based on material interests and determined Marxist-Leninist-Maoist parties could, once again, demonstrate the universal applicability of proletarian alliances with decaying national bourgeoisie in the working out of the world contradiction between imperialism and the oppressed nations. Fortunately for the people, the situation is too complex and composed of too many variable and acting strengths for Western imperialism to step right in and take over.

THE GRASS

Yeltsin is a false free market god. While paying lip-service to "privatisation" the situation has become too complex for him as well; so he tries to pull off whatever he can and set aside a nest-egg which may only be realisable for him if he, like Gorbachev, sets up an office in sunny San Francisco.

Although Great White Russia is still a force to be reckoned with, it is a sign of its weakness and internal stresses that different currencies are coming into usage throughout the continent. The rouble represents nothing but idle promises. The oppressed nations which Castrist & Khronostat Russia historically dominated may have grown too constant to colonise as in the past. Perhaps, it appears that the SHG/CIS Armed Forces are multinational and no longer in the service of Russia alone.

THE WAGES OF PHYSIC

Konstantin Zatulkin, head of the International Association of Enterprise Managers (based on the framework of the old Soviet Union) and founder of the Moscow Commodity Exchange says, "Only a thief or a madman could start a new business in the present economic situation. Because a thief gains everything for free, and a madman is incapable of understanding the realities of life. There is no credit, there is no unreasonable tax system, there are no conditions conducive to privatisation, no understanding local authorities, no sympathy on the part of the population, no goods or resources—nothing. Political stability is not guaranteed either. Regions do what they like: interrupt deliveries, impose restrictions on the circulation of goods."[4, 12]

The KGB has started a school for businessmen interested in security. "Colonel Novikov, an instructor, explains the need for industrial counterintelligence with the claim that "U.S. intelligence has already made $2 billion stealing Russian industrial
The staff no longer trust their own government either and will offer instructions on how to protect yourself if threatened and how to protect your associates against unlawful actions by state power structures and authorities. The KGB is offering popular courses on how to protect intellectual property. They are catering to "the fear of new Russian businesspeople trying to survive in what has practically become the realization of the communist dream of a stateless society." (p. 11) Of course that is only a joke. There are several states of fragments of states in formation and locked in battles.

Boeing is trying to set up a deal to build an international airport in Novosibirsk, which would change the air travel patterns of the planet. The project is on hold until some form of government is formed to take responsibility for the project.

"Nestor's Democratic Russia Movement has split again. Key elements of the coalition: the Russian Democratic Party, the Constitutional Democratic Party, the Russian Christian Democratic Movement among them, are already in opposition. Of the approximately 600 deputies that made up Democratic Russia's majority in the 1102-member Congress of People's Deputies, just over half have deserted. Yeltsin has also lost the support of the Congress.... Ataman (dis) Vladimir Domashchuk has this to say: "Many of us defended the White House during the coup, but now we ask ourselves - did we take the right side?" (p. 11)

"For the Christian Democrats and their allies, 'historic Russia' includes most of the territory that was previously the Soviet Union: a transcontinental Russian state, independent of the ideology of its changing governments. This was one reason they wanted to write the new constitution without a clause affirming Russia's membership in the USSR. Another reason, more problematic than the claim that Russia is the USSR, is that Yeltsin, Ukrainian President Leonid Kravchuk and Belarusian President Stanislaw Shushkevich voted both the constitution and the will of the people on forming the SNS (CIS), and abrogating the USSR, in a national referendum on March 17, 1991. 75% of the population of the Soviet Union voted to maintain the Union in some form or another. But the new independent republics left the Union on the basis of the constitution's secession clause, they would have been forced to hold referenda, and regions with predominantly Russian populations would have been able to opt out. The system of republics created by Moscow to more easily divide and rule has turned on its creators, assuming a role in the fate of Russia its creators had never intended." (p. 12)

"Of the 24,000 state firms slated for reorganization, only 1,100 have actually been privatized in some form." (p. 13)

"Total tax burdens for companies under the new regulations will range from 45% of profit for the construction and manufacturing sectors, to between 75% and 85% according to some estimates, for trading houses and wholesalers... the bonus will fall on the new entrepreneur, who lacks the steady credit available to the state sector." (p. 13)

YUGOSLAVIA

Class War in Yugoslavia

by Vicles August, 1992

American imperialism has been calling the shots in its ex-Yugoslav dependencies since 1991.
Concentration camps, the forcible relocation of millions of poor people and “ethnic cleansing” follow on the heels of American intervention everywhere in the world. The motivating force behind the Albanian war is not religion, ethnicity, tribal warfare or national liberation: it is greed and simply, profit.

With the retreat of Soviet social-imperialism, American capital’s main competitors in the eighties, artificial “ethnic homeland” of ex-Yugoslavia are Germany, Italy, France, Czechoslovakia and Great Britain.(1) In April, Germany rushed to stake a claim with the Croatian and “recognized” Bosnia & Herzegovina as an independent republic; thereby deliberately inflaming the ongoing imperialist-orchestrated war for regional domination between the Serbian and Croatian ruling class.

Amnesty held out for continued Serbian domination and叹息ed Serbia in the creation of a phony “Bosnian-Yugoslavian” federation on April 17 in order to guarantee American control of its multibillion dollar export-import pipeline in the Balkans. To overseas American interests, Milan Panic, a Belgrade-born American pharmaceutical millionaire was set-up as Prime Minister of the phony Yugoslavia, which is composed of 10 million Serbs and 50,000 Montenegrins. Suddenly, the beloved ruse of “genocide” was put against the Serbsmen by his political rivals in America and Europe. George Bush found himself in the peculiar position of having to condone America’s trusted Serbian ally at the same time America maneuvered to hold the entire eastern Adriatic region in its economic grip.

SHOCK IN THE EYE

Bush knew of the mass-executions long before the media began to报道. Not only can American spy satellites spot a gas from 150 miles up, but The Economist magazine had been casually revealing on the “ethnic cleansing” as early as May 3, 1992.(2) Extermination of humans is pivotal to America’s cruel land-reform plan for the masses of poor peasant farmers in all of ex-Yugoslavia. With the invasion of 14,800 troops in February, America’s United Nations puppet positioned its divisions to oversee the appropriation of more than 2 million poor farmers from their small plots throughout Bosnia & Herzegovina, Serbia and Croatia.

Such well-known that the 500 “killing fields” are run by Croatian, Muslim and Serbian paramilitary forces agreed in part by the American-financed Bosnian weapons industry.(3) The Muslims are not a separate nation. They are either Serbs or Croats and they are also divided by class.

PARTY HACKS

The bureaucratic-compromiser bureaucracies of Croatia, Slovenia and Serbia have run profitable manufacturing industries financed by American capital along the banks of the Danube and Drava rivers over which Tito was kicked out of the international communist movement by Joseph Stalin in 1948, for serving as America’s outpost in the newly liberated Eastern Europe.

The Croatian part of Rijeka and Serbia’s Belgrade are vital shipping facilities serving European and American corporate interests. Without free access to the Adriatic sea, the Danube river and even Yugoslavian maritime “free-trade zones,” European and American corporations would be subject to unreasonable tariffs and increased costs of transportation.(4)

Ex-Yugoslavia is a classic case of a developed capitalist country in bondage to international finance. Despite tremendous manufacturing, mining and agricultural capabilities, the Yugoslavian economy has been historically growth-restricted by conditions imposed upon it via the Western banks who have effectively ruled Yugoslavia through a multinational class of enterprise managers belonging to the mid-levels of American and European service.

These bureaucratic-compromiser states again the old Yugoslavian republics as the post-World War II order crumbled. They broke into nationally privileged bureaucratic factions murdering the masses and stealing means of production and land in proportion to their strength.

The Slovenian, Croatian and Serbian ruling classes moved to consolidate capital over industry and agriculture inside territories they have ruled under one mode of production or another— for 1000 years. Each ruling class operates on concepts with imperialist sponsors who reward these occupied go-betweens with a cut of the surplus value wrung out of the masses. Roman Catholic and Orthodox patriarchal religious leaders of each nation provide moral justification and encouragement in their shared language to resist force under capitalist command.

FUTURE

In the regional population of 28.5 million, the labor force of 2.5 million breaks down into 27% working in mining and manufacturing, 23% in agric-
culture and an incredible 44% in bureaucratic and military/police jobs.\(\text{6}\)

Despite an pre-war annual inflation rate of 2,700% a year (now 3,000%), the $13.1 billion in regional exports during 1990 nearly balanced against $12.5 billion in imports.\(\text{6}\) A more $700 million trade deficit demonstrates that the region is a giant 'sucks' for foreign monopolists as they have shipped value-added goods in and out of the extensive Carpatho and Asiatic markets.

The USA, Germany and America collectively used the area as a huge dumping ground for over-produced commodities, even as they engineered the purchase of these useless wares by contracting high-interest loans with the ex-Yugoslavia government. In return for dumped consumer goods and industrial machines, the monopolists received underpriced raw materials and access to highly exploitable underemployed female labor for piece-assembly of semi-processed monopolist-originating products for regional distribution.\(\text{6}\)

The regional per capita income of $4,444 and the droppings from a Gross National Product (GNP) of $154.1 billion has accrued mainly to the managerial class and the labor aristocracy. The 52.6% of the population comprising the rural poor have principally borne the costs of inflation through constantly decreasing living standards and the channelling of their wages taxes. This region exposes food crops and inedible raw materials to imperialist countries even as it imports subsistence foods from these same poorest countries.\(\text{1}\)\(\text{7}\) Ex-Yugoslavia also serves America as a source of strategic weapons-grade metals and an espionage listening-post.

WAS YUGOSLAVIA A SOCIALIST COUNTRY?

The greatest service that revisionist Yugoslavia provided to finance capital was its abandonment of the socialist road in 1968 after two short years of proletarian dictatorship. Tito's counter-revolutionary political economy actually served as a model for the abortive Khrushchev's economic policies during the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union.

\medskip

In fact, "the Tito regime... set up many fascist prisons and concentration camps, where tens of thousands of revolutionaries were tortured in depth..." The elevated the half (rich peasant) class to powerful political and economic positions in the countryside through the promotion of "fvia competition" and hired labor.\(\text{8}\)

It is sectional of the hard-working classes and the rich farmers that now form the reactionary shock-troops who murder and steal the poor peasants from the land. The assets of millions of poor farmers and urban proletarians have been seized as regional capital is concentrated for arrogation by competing monopolists and their ultra-nationalist capitalists another crop.

Euro-American culture can impose when the technique imperialism uses every day against the Black masses of the world pop up in white on white. One problem for the monopolists is that with the current world war-driven global migration of laboring populations, the major European industrial centers are not willing to absorb more refugees than they can control: hence, the death camps and the immigration quotas.\(\text{3}\)

When the adidas thugs in Slovenia, Croatia, Serbia, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Kosovo, and Vojvodina, the west will have been cleared for the European Economic Community and America to continue dumping massive amounts of cut-rate and de-valued analytical and scientific instruments, electrical power generators, telecommunications equipment and avionics on the region through joint ventures financed by imperialist loans and paid for by the cheap labor of starving refugees.\(\text{1}\)\(\text{0}\)

Notes
2. The Economist, 2/2/92, p. 12.
3. The Economist 5/20/92, p. 59.
4. The Economist 5/2/92, p. 694.
5. Ibid., p. 697.
6. Ibid., p. 697; The Economist 5/2/92, p. 59.
Chapter 5
The Cuba Question
A Brief Summary of MIM's Line on Cuba

MIM's line on Cuba has the following parts: 1) The Cuban Revolution was a blow against U.S. imperialism, which had a chokehold on the Cuban economy. 2) As the Cuban Revolution developed and brought some gains for the Cuban masses, especially relative to other societies oppressed by U.S. imperialism in Latin America, it eventually replaced U.S. imperialism with Soviet social-imperialism. 3) It is important to note that the Cuban military strategy of "Foco" has succeeded nowhere else and has in particular brought tremendous losses in Latin America. 4) Cuba is a state-capitalist country. 5) Currently, Castro is a leech without a master. MIM doubts that he can lead the transition to independent development. 6) Such independent development was possible in Cuba's case. Had it pursued socialism development, Cuba's revolution would have been in a better position than Allende's socialist revolution, which started from an even weaker economic position than Cuba did. 7) Like all Third World countries oppressed by imperialism, Cuba must be defended against imperialist attack. — MCG

Interview With a Member of the July 26 Coalition

by a comrade

MIM interviewed a member of the July 26 Coalition in order to examine the line and practice of the movement, supporting the Cuban revolution. When MIM does interviews, we don't pretend to be objective, we struggle with our interviewees. The following dialogue reflects this struggle.

MIM credits this activist as one of the most well-informed of the people working to support the revolution in Cuba. Too many of those who proclaim the need to support socialism in Cuba have not even bothered to study the history of Cuba. This activist does not fall into many of the typical failures of the pro-Cuba movement, but does well to represent the most significant disagreements MIM has with those who support Cuban "socialism."

WHAT IS THE JULY 26 COALITION?

The July 26 Coalition (J26C) formed about 4 years ago with a number of single-issue organizations, and reformist sectarian coming together. It is an organization not organized around defending socialism in Cuba—there is not unity around this. The one defining principle of the organization is opposition to U.S. intervention in Cuba, explained the activist interviewed.

WHY ATTACK CUBA?

The activist responded that "Cuba has been, from its inception, a threat to U.S. imperialism in Latin America. The other threat was China and it was quickly removed. Cuba is a "developing model of socialism," however imperfect, and there are very few left.... China, North Korea, Vietnam are also left.... I wish there could be an organization to stop U.S. intervention everywhere.

When asked why a single-issue organization as opposed to multi-issue revolutionary organizing. We concluded that "both works are important." MIM refers its readers to its essay on single issue organizing for arguments against this practice (send $1 for a copy).

MIM agrees with anti-imperialist work, and agrees that U.S. intervention in Cuba should be opposed. But if this is the only defining principle of the J26C, MIM asked why just organize around Cuba when U.S. imperialism attempts to attack so many countries world-wide?

SUPPORT FOR CUBA?

MIM pointed out that Cuba is not a socialist country, and while we should oppose U.S. imperialism in any country, we should be honest about what it is that we do and do not support. Cuba's system is not something to support as socialism. Iraq was also a threat for the United States, and opposing the war against Iraq was important, but we can do that without saying we support the system in Iraq.

Activist: "Cuba was founded on the concept of socialism and has not yet privatized... No revolution has developed the way revolution should and needs to develop. The system that has successfully com-
MIM's theory is no longer there, but there are small problems in the way of capitalism.

MIM disagrees with the activist to the extent that we do not call Cuba socialist (see other essays for the economics of this argument) but does agree that Cuba and many other countries are a threat to the system of U.S. imperialism. Some of these threats were socialist, many of them were capitalist or puppet of imperialist competitors. Although the activist concedes the problems in Cuba's past, and is well informed on the political and economic manipulation Cuba submitted to at the hands of Soviet social-imperialism, she ultimately concludes that Cuba is still socialist and finds inspiration in this system.

"It was a tremendous demonstration of the will of the people to maintain the ideas of socialism. However, misguided implementation of these ideas may have been." Cuba is an "inspiration for Latin America because it stood up to U.S. imperialism and is willing to stand on its own."

These comments raise the significant questions of whether or not Cuba really has taken a principled stand and attempted to build socialism. MIM points to many examples in the history of Cuba when its leaders were willing to publicly change their political line to support the revisionism of the Soviet Union when the Soviet Union put on economic pressure.

The activist agreed that, "Cuba could not change its line independently because of contracts made serving the interests of the Soviet Union and this was the easiest path to produce income for Cuba." But she defended these changes by saying "People change lines according to pressures through the years unless they are dogmatic." She did concede that "it worries me the way these decisions were made, they were made from above without discussion with people."

MIM does not believe that Cuba had to follow the Soviet path to development. And while dogmas does keep some from changing their line, political principles are abandoned by others who submit to pressure and change their line. Cuba is a country rich in natural resources and it could have worked towards self-sufficiency rather than taking the easier but, ultimately, more costly path of dependency.

This was one of the significant disagreements between MIM and the activist; a point on which many pro-Cuban activists would side with the activist interviewed. She made an analogy to a powerful person saying to a powerless person, "You will say what I tell you or your house will fall down and you will have no food tomorrow," saying that this is the situation Cuba was in with relation to the Soviet Union. This supports the activist's view that "You can't have socialism in one country."

MIM pointed out that Cuba did not attempt self-sufficiency and had the opportunity to reject Soviet social-imperialism but chose not to. For that matter, Cuba had the choice of accepting unconditional trade and aid from Mao's socialist China and chose not to—unlike Albania, which is even smaller than Cuba. This was the incorrect decision that led to colonial dependency for Cuba. All those who pay it is not possible to build socialism in one country ignore the examples of the Soviet Union, Albania, and China where socialism was built in one country for many years and with much success.

The activist's current analysis of Cuba is that "Cuban leaders and masses are not stupid, but many instances when they acted out of ideology... Cuba has moved forward and now it is moving back..." "They don't break with the SU and it is too late now." But, "They have not given up on their principles. To give up is to say to hell with socialism. They have upheld the need for socialism and continue to do so today... They have not found the correct way to build socialism; no one has."

MIM still points to the economic facts on this question noting that the structure of Cuba is not socialist and has not been socialist since it entered into a dependent relationship with the Soviet Union.

**Why did significant pro-Cuban movement in the U.S?**

The activist had stated at a talk that there is no significant pro-Cuban movement in the United States, so MIM asked further why she thought this was so.

The activist responded that there is "no significant support for any revolutionary struggle in the world, not just around Cuba." She suggested that this is because of an "alienation of the masses... Intellectual work constantly to revitalize ways of alienating people from any concern."

MIM agrees with the activist that there is a lot of miseducation in this country. But many American masses have been exposed to the anti-imperialist movement and education and still do not support it. MIM does not describe this as alienation; we define it as class interest, especially in a period of time spanning over decades and several wars where people in America have an interest in perpetuating the capitalist system and supporting imperialism. This includes the so-called working class in this
country, MIM referred the activist to the first issue of MIM Theory which dealt with this question with economic imperialism.

The activist concluded that, "there is tremendous clarity in the so-called progressive forces because defeat has been overwhelming." He blamed a lot of the left's failure to organise the American masses on "Great divisions among ourselves and an inability to discuss them and find common ground."

MIM agrees with the activist that it is important to find common ground with those fighting imperialism. But people must be careful to ally only with those truly fighting imperialism; many say they are fighting imperialism, but in reality are organizing in the interests of the imperialists.

MIM will ally with the July 26 Coalition in opposition to U.S. imperialism, but draws a strong line of distinction over the question of support for the revolutions in Cuba. MIM hopes to struggle over the issues further with pro-Cuban activists and organisations interested in studying the history and economics of Cuba.

"History Will Absolve Me"

Fidel Castro's courtroom speech in his own defense, October 15, 1953

THE HISTORY

On July 26, 1953 170 young men and women attempted a military action to overthrow the Batista regime in Cuba. Most of the revolutionaries were killed in the uprising; many fighters were murdered as political prisoners. Because the violence against the revolutionaries was so severe, the masses protested and Castro and a few others who had fled to the mountains after being hunted down were given a trial when they were finally captured.

Fidel Castro is a lawyer. He exercised his right to self-defense in this trial. After two days of a public trial, the Batista regime was so humiliated by Castro's defense cross-examination of the witnesses that they removed him under the guise of a medical problem, and held the trial in a hospital closed to the public.

There he gave a six hour speech in his own defense. He later wrote this speech down and it became a major theoretical-ideological document to unite the masses against the Batista dictatorship. Fidel was sentenced to 15 years in prison and then amnestied on May 15, 1955, as a result of popular clamor.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF CASTRO'S SPEECH

This document is important because it gives a good perspective to those who wish to study the character of the Cuban revolution. Castro's speech does not defend socialist revolution, or even nationalist revolution. He defended their military fight as a fight to restore the democratic constitution that had been suspended by the Batista regime.

Castro's speech is moving and captivating. It is an excellent indictment of the murderous Batista regime. But, ultimately, Castro and the fighters in this uprising were narrow nationalists. They had no economic analysis of oppression; it was strictly a fight against a government that did not respect the constitution.

CASTRO'S SPEECH IN HISTORICAL ANALYSIS

Fidel's speech was among Castro's examples of just government: "The right of rebellion against tyranny, Honorable Judges, has been recognized from the most ancient times to the present day by men of all degrees, ideas and doctrines."

"It was so in the democratic monarchies of remote antiquity. In China it was almost a constitutional principle that when a king governed roughly and despotically he should be deposed and replaced by a virtuous prince."

Castro described the anger of the masses at the Batista regime: "There is a limit of toleration. This struggle began against this man who was disregarding the law, who had usurped power by the use of violence against the will of the people, who was guilty of aggression against the established order, tortured, murdered, imprisoned and persecuted those who had taken up the struggle to defend the law and to restore freedom to the people."

Here he clearly shows the belief of the revolutionaries that democracy and freedom existed before the Batista coup on March 10, 1952. He ignores the long history of Cuban oppression by foreign and domestic powers and hopes to unite people around a fight against one particularly corrupt leader rather than a corrupt system that has been oppressing them throughout history. Had Batista not taken power through a coup, Castro assures that the masses would have voted out the Machado regime.
of which he says "the civil government's prestige had dwindled to its lowest ebb." According to him, with a constitution, democratic rights will always be restored in an election year.

THE FAILURE OF MILITARY REVOLT WITHOUT THE POWER OF THE MASSES

Castro's understanding of the power of both the masses and their oppressor was limited in this uprising. Castro explained that he did not want to use the masses: "We decided not to take over any radio station until the Army camp was in our power. Thus, with the few men we could have asked a radio station and called the people to revolt. There is no question of the people's will to fight... But I did not want to use them although our situation was desperate." This ideology of the few initiating the many reflects the general ideology of the movement. They believed that only democracy could be restored and the people would be happy, and this could be done by a few armed people with the correct military planning.

Castro goes so far as to say that the battle would not have been lost if part of his artillery had not gotten lost on their way through the city to meet the rebels at a crucial point in the fighting. While certain military tactics are important, had the masses been involved in the revolution, more mistakes would not impede the many masses overpowering the few rebels.

CONCLUSION

The defeat of this uprising, and the cause of its inevitable failure on revolutionary tactics and ideology lies in its lack of study of history. Not only did the insurgents fail to study the revolutionary history of other countries to find what had and had not worked (to determine whether or not the Chinese really were liberated after the virtuous primes overthrew the despotic lord), they also failed to study the history of their own country. It is unfortunate that this is the same weakness displayed by the Cuban revolution that succeeded in overthrowing Batista and taking power on January 1, 1959—a weakness that led to dependence on the Soviet Union rather than self-sufficient development of socialism.

"The Political Economy of Cuban Dependence"

This is a 40 page essay that analyses many of the important aspects of Cuba's relationship with the Soviet Union that are ignored by champions of Cuba's "socialism." It is the best literature that MMT distributes on Cuba (its footnotes point to more good sources on the subject that readers are encouraged to investigate).

THE HISTORY OF CUBAN DEPENDENCY

Taskhirs' puts his article in historical context by explaining that Cuba was a dependent colony of the United States before its revolution. After its revolution in 1959, Cuba became dependent on the Soviet Union but it had greater autonomy from the Soviet Union than from the United States; hence the improvements seen in many aspects of life for the masses in Cuba. Taskhirs stresses that the Soviet Union, unlike the United States, was not interested in Cuba for economic reasons; the Soviet need for Cuban dependency was political.

The Soviet Union gained this control over Cuba "by encouraging monoculture sugar production and facilitating the failure of economic diversification and industrialization; the manipulation of Cuban economic dependency to obtain the adoption of Soviet approaches to economic management, organization and planning the abandonment of a Cuban road to socialism; growing Cuban indebtedness; the extraction of economic benefits through a division of labor; and finally, the use of economic dominance to cause changes in key policy areas such as revolutionary strategy, to secure diplomatic and ideological support against China, and to gain strategic advantages vis-a-vis America." (p. 321)

Cuba did have a bargaining position of strength in its relationship with the Soviet Union, unlike its pre-revolution relationship with the United States. The Soviet Union needed sugar and it was
higher than the average world price for Cuban sugar, except in 1938. This, combined with Cuba’s failure to deliver the required amount, leads to estimates that the USSR paid Cuba a total of 20,011,600 rubles for the period 1959-1970. According to Soviet statistics, Cuba had a debt of 1,600 million rubles in 1972. (p. 327)

It is difficult to accurately estimate these figures. According to estimates by the National Bank of Cuba, Soviet goods exported to Cuba cost 50% more than similar goods on the non-Soviet bloc market. (p. 327)

GET A GRIP!

Editor’s Note: The time has already arrived to make your subscription to MIM Theory! Only $12 (4 issues) is the price now. This includes postage. (p. 423)
confused by analysts. Many people do not know that Che adopted many ideas of Marxism. Trotsky often referred to situations in which Che opposed the Soviet Union and its supporters in favor of ideological incentives and a Cuban method of accounting. He was also criticizing the monopoly production of sugar encouraged by the Soviet Union.

**Soviet Manipulation of Cuba**

The Soviet Union used Cuba to bargain with the United States without even consulting or informing Cuba during the Cuban missile crisis. The Soviet Union used its position with Cuba to negotiate with the United States about missiles on Cuban soil.

In 1962, without informing Cuba, Khrushchev sent a letter to Kennedy offering removal of Soviet missiles from Cuba in return for removal of U.S. missiles in Turkey. The Soviet official position was that Cuba had requested the missiles to defend against imminent American invasion; however, in 1963, Castro suggested that, far from requesting the missiles, the Soviets had pressured the Cubans into accepting them by informing Cuba that the United States planned to invade and that they must rely on the Soviet Union for defense. (p. 348)

“Castro’s compliance [with the USSR system of economy and government] came after the failure of the 19 million ton cane [projected harvest of sugar cane]. He had played a major role in galvanizing the nation around sugar production harvested to cut the Soviet debt, building the basis for Cuba’s continued
independence and placing her on the verge of socialism. When the target of 10 million tons was not reached, his personal authority was weakened (p. 267).

By 1979, Castro had retreated from criticizing Soviet imperialism in Latin America, to the point of accepting Soviet economic aid and political relations with local oligarchies and dictatorships (p. 263).

**From socialist countries must be given, with no strings attached and with careful survey of the needs of the recipient country so that they are not given unwarranted prestige.**

Castro also retreated from his original position on electoralism and the peaceful transition to socialism. "Those who believe that they are going to win against the imperialists in elections are just plain naive, and those who believe that this is what will come when they will take over through elections, are just as naive." (p. 354)

In 1975, "Right now in Chile I believe that it is possible to arrive at socialism through the ballot, that is, by election victory." (p. 355) Of course, the socialist diet was at the polls only to be crushed later in a U.S.-backed coup which resulted in the killing of at least 25,000 people suspected as leftists. This coup vindicated the earlier Castro on the nature of attempting to gain power for the working classes without military struggle. The Third World masses have two choices: bourgeois elections to vote their conscience and see a bloodbath by the imperialists or accommodate themselves to imperialist-sponsored rule.

A further evolution in Cuban support for the revolutionary strategy was in military contention with U.S. imperialism: Cuban troops were "wagingkokwies' battles in the Third World." (p. 357) They aided the MPLA in Angola and the Mengistu military dictatorship in Ethiopia. Cuban troops in Ethiopia engaged in battles against both the Eritrean Liberation Front and the Somalis.
Chapter 6
China
MIM Gets Anti-Mao Mail

For the articles in the section about China and the "little dragons" MIM went to the Chinese, Taiwanese, Hong Kong and Korean communities in the United States to struggle over issues of Maoism, especially comparisons between Mao's China and the current United States.

DEAR MIM:

Hi there, as a guy from China, I think I know better than you about "Maoism." I didn't believe my eyes when I saw there is a "Maoist Int'l News" in the USA. After a while (and calm down), I realized and appreciated the humor you guys have. I kind of have the same feeling that you guys are doing. Please send us the information you have. We probably will love them, since life here is sometimes kind of boring. Set up an organization like yours is indeed a brilliant idea to have fun. Man, I love you guys! Have a nice life! Ha Ha Ha . . .

—Student from the People's Republic of China. 
June, 1982

[When the critic saw that we were serious, he sent us another letter—M.C.S.

DEAR MIM:

Don't be so naive. How on earth could you believe any government report in the Maoist regime?!!! If you guys really like Mao, go to hell to meet him. Just don't bother us Chinese students here in United States, because we KNOW (you don't, though you think you do) how horrible Mao's regime was.

ONE QUESTION: Any of you Maoists ever left China before Mao was dead??? Come on guys, never be self-righteous like this, and at the meantime, don't think you can impress Americans or Chinese by doing such a "unique" thing, which looks "cool." Get mature, being cool is in your nature, you can never get it by pretending or hypocrisy. Don't be whiny.

—Same Chinese student. 
June, 1982

DEAR MIM:

Hi, sir, it is the most ridiculous thing I have ever heard of since I came here from China. Forget about Mao, he is only a piece of history.

—Another Chinese student critic 
June, 1982

DEAR MIM:

These letters don't say much. We won't use them for anything except to demonstrate a fairly common opinion among the Chinese students in the United States. Later we will see that some students have more to say. These tried.

One thing though is that if we didn't take the line that "ideological and political line is decisive," we might have to defer to the opinions of the Chinese students unless other Chinese were in front of our faces telling us not to. MIM believes it is important to formulate one's analysis or political principles based on just what the individuals who "experience" something say about it. The experience of the masses of China and the world must be much more broadly summed up—and summed up with a semantic method.

Long Live Maoism!!

by a nomad
May, 1982

We are internationalists who happen to live within U.S. borders. Many times we have seen antagonism of Western Maoism, because Western Maoists don't live in China, and therefore supposedly don't know anything about it. But if that is the case, then Chinese people don't know anything about the real history of the United States. Actually, we don't think that is true either. Moreover, to really argue for or against Maoism, we think oppressed people and their allies must address conditions within both China and the United States.

As our first contribution to the U.S.-China dialogue about Maoism, we would like to discuss the Rodney King verdict. Many people speak of the United States as a "free" country, but the text is that...
Black people in the USA have always lived under slavery or quasi-slavery.

In fact, as Marxists who believe in anti-imperialist-struggles, we see black, indigenous and Latin American nations occupied by the white nation called the United States. The occupation of the black nation is apparent in regular police harassment, beatings and shootings. The Rodney King incident is not at all uncommon; although people living in American suburbs like Tidal Valley never know it—except as cops and biased jurors.

Hence our first plea to Chinese students is not to allow U.S. imperialism the dignity of being called a “free” country. It is still a dictatorship of the white nation over its oppressed peoples.

...your country would be such a success too if you cleared the land of millions of its original inhabitants, employed millions of slaves and decimated a continent (Africa) of its population, installed dictators all over the globe to ensure cheap resources and labor supplies and killed and repressed smaller nations within U.S. borders.

At this point, if there is any disagreement, we would like to hear it. We know that most Chinese students are in fact internationalists at heart and we doubt that they will overlook the facts once they are aware of them.

The next point we would like to make is that the situation of Black people and other oppressed nationalities within the United States raises the obvious question very important to Chinese students: “How did the United States become so wealthy and free?” As you can see, the answer to the first question is that white nation people are “free” only at the expense of Third World peoples—two million killed in Vietnam, tens of millions of indigenous peoples killed in settlement of this country and recently several thousand Panamanians killed in the invasion of Panama to remove Gen. Noriega, the man the U.S. imperialists set up in the first place when they wanted a stooge in power there.

So we would like to say to those who think Marxism is a “failure” and the U.S. system is a “success”: your country would be such a success too if you cleared the land of millions of its original inhabitants, employed millions of slaves and decimated a continent (Africa) of its population, installed dictators all over the globe to ensure cheap resources and labor supplies and killed and repressed smaller nations within U.S. borders.

P.S. He we do not support the revisionist Deng Xiaoping regime. We do support Mao and the Gang of Four, so please feel free to hold us accountable for that—but not the June 4, 1989 massacre. We have called the Deng Xiaoping regime fascist and social-imperialist since our foundation in 1983, and we are only following Mao’s theories in so doing.

The following was a reply to an inquiry about our views of Mao and the Cultural Revolution generally as well as a new book out on China.—MC5

MAIL REPLY:

As for the suffering of the Chinese people during the Cultural Revolution, it was real, although the elite of intellectuals were the primary recipients along with other elite classes. According to Deng Xiaoping, the Gang of Four had 35,000 executed during the Cultural Revolution. If you think about it, every society has a certain number of violent deaths. The trick is to compare all types of violence in different societies and see which has the least. When this is done, we find Mao’s China to be a great society indeed.

Another point about the violence is that Mao allowed it to happen by not imposing martial law during the Cultural Revolution, but he did not order the vast majority of the violence. Actually, the U.S. government was ordering a lot more violence in the time. Mao believed it was necessary to let people express themselves and get involved in politics directly, even at the cost of the violence that would occur with people taking control of their lives for the first time. We do not know which book refers to Mao as “peaceful emperor.” However, we don’t know any emperors that admitted they made mistakes (as Mao did in the Great Leap Forward) and who told the masses not to obey authority blindly (as during the Cultural Revolution) and who ordered the execution of
their own personality cults (as Mao did after 1971). Most importantly, we don't know any commanders who led the collectivization of agriculture and liberation of women.

Mao also started a correspondence with an Appalachian coal mine town based on what he had seen of our policies on Mao Zedong. It just goes to show that the most direct road to the person of protestation background is not necessarily through a copy of Sello's book. Our correspondent agreed to pick up a copy of Sello's book and read it.

Dear Reader,

Stay in touch. By the way it is good to hear that someone from Appalachia sympathizes with Maoism. We don't believe white people as a group are exploited, but we know the people in Appalachia are being screwed. It's just that the gravy from the system keeps people even in Appalachia seeking to a piece of the pie. Have you ever read *Settlers: Mythology of the White Protestant* by J. Sello? Sello argues that communist organizing in Appalachia always reaches a dead-end because white native people see that conditions are good for white native people elsewhere and believe their conditions can improve under capitalism too.

Chinese Engineer in Canada Criticizes MMD

Dear Reader,

This article is referring to an article entitled "Long live Maoism!" (later we refer to it as "Maoism").

First let me cite a short paragraph from "Maoism: "Many times we have seen criticism of Western Marxists, because Western Marxists don't live in China, and therefore supposedly don't know anything about China. But if that is the case, then Chinese people don't know anything about the real history of the United States."

I had lived in China for over 20 years and I believe the criticism of Western Marxists is absolutely correct. I believe that the United States is a free and democratic country with the most serious problem of racial and economic discrimination against the black (native Indian) people, the black people and the people from the third world. I have a limited amount of knowledge about the American history. However, from the books which I have read and my 4 years experience in North America, I believe my observation is correct.

I believe that the United States is a free and democratic country with the most serious problem of racial and economic discrimination against the black (native Indian) people, the black people and the people from the third world.

How let me turn to the Maoism. Maoism is actually a strange mixture of Chinese traditional centralism and the Western Marxist, Stalinism. From 1949 to 1976, Mao controlled almost everything in China and destroyed almost anything which he did not like, whether it was good or bad. He did not like the people to have their independent ideas; then he managed to destroy a large number of people, particularly intellectuals, who were smart enough to be able to think independently. He wanted to catch up with the Western world economically but hated the economic discrimination which he suffered in 1920s; then he adopted a Maoist-Stalinist centrally controlled economy and launched a series of strange campaigns, such as the Great Leap and Cultural Revolution, which actually destroyed the Chinese economy and starved millions of people to death. He hated everybody who ever dared to challenge him and he managed to kill his political enemies, such as Mr. Lin Biao, Mr. Peng Dehuai, Mr. Lin Piao, and Mr. Deng Xiaoping. [For the record, Peng and Deng did not die under Mao's order, some are still alive, ruling China.—MCJ; Mr. Mao also did not die some old evils like drug dealers, prostitutes, dealers, etc.]}
etc. and destroyed them. Above all, Maoism is a modern dictatorship which has done much more bad than good to China and the Chinese people in 40 years.

Mr. Deng Xiaoping is more like one of the traditional Asian leaders, such as the former Singapore prime minister Mr. K. L. Lee, the past leaders in South Korea and the Japanese leaders before World-War II. They do not want to give up their political power and do not want to have a democratic government. However, they do want to catch up with the Western economy and do not oppose the Western-style market economy. Mr. Deng's White-Black-Cat theory and his ambition to build up several mini-dragons in China are clear evidence.

Observing the road which Singapore, South Korea, Japan and the former Soviet Union have experienced, it appears to be interesting to raise a question that if China needs a "Mr. K. Lee," the former Singapore prime minister or a "Gorbachev," the former Soviet Union president, or a new "Mr. Mao."

ANOTHER AIM CRITIC:

Chinese Can't Even Express All the Horror of Maoism

May, 1993

DEAR MILA:

I visited Kent University in 1980 with some friends of mine. A local friend brought us to the site where four students were shot to death by the National Guard in 1970. We discussed a lot, comparing that event with what happened in China.

There are surely many "dark sides" in this and any country. However, one thing we all agreed upon is the freedom of expression. Yes, I know there are many restrictions written or unwritten to quash the anti-regime radicals here. However, the point is: You CAN openly express them. For example, the author of this "Maoist Internationalist" article would not be put into prison for distributing the article; in contrast, anyone openly denouncing the government's action on June 4, 1989 will definitely be jailed. The situation would be even worse during Mao's era; anyone openly denouncing Mao would almost surely be executed. The death of 20 to 40 million people during 1958-1961 is still a taboo even now, and so is the genocidal killing in Guangxi during the Cultural Revolution. The era of Deng is, in comparison, much more civilized.

I would assume that even the Maoists would agree that when political systems to choose should be decided by the majority of the people living in that country. However, such a decision cannot be reasonably made if the people are not allowed to discuss and criticize openly. I don't know how many Maoists have read "On the Freedom of Speech" by Ku Ping. I would recommend it highly since the article is a very good counter-critique to Mao's criticism toward "bourgeois liberalism."

As a final point, I think the author of this Maoist's article has some valid points when referring to the phenomenon that many mainland Chinese (AND Eastern Europeans and people from the former USSR) brother off the arguments of left wings simply by saying: "You haven't lived there!," although I hope the Maoists and other left wing people can understand that such an attitude which originates from the sufferings of the people from those regimes are so deep that they themselves could not talk out very clearly even now, many years after they have left the environment.

It would take many years of reflection to fully understand the tragedies like the Great Leap Forward and the Cultural Revolution. It is a sad fact that the generations, including my own, who have such unique experiences have not been able to communicate our experiences with those who do not have the experience, including the younger generations of China. We have been using to "evaluate" our experiences according to certain new or old ideology, rather than just say plainly what were our true feelings and memories of the past. We have much to learn from, for example, Jewish people who have conveyed the horror of the Holocaust to the entire world, and much to work on. Ms. Jim proposed to establish a Museum of Cultural Revolution about ten years ago. This should be the first thing to do whenever it becomes possible.
Long Live Maoism II!
The Need for a Comparative Approach

by a comrade
May 10, 1983

One great thing about having many people from different countries to talk to is that it facilitates a comparative approach. Actually, when students from the PRC (People's Republic of China) condemn Maoism, they do so with an implicit yardstick, unless of course they are committing what we call idealist/religious errors.

By this we mean, there is no society in the world that is perfect yet. We communists believe that a world without violent conflict, classes, national conflict or patriarchy is the ideal. That is our goal, but that says nothing about what is the best system, movement or model in the world today.

Many Chinese students have told me about the pain and confusion from the Great Leap and Cultural Revolution. And to some extent we would not deny that the masses make great sacrifices during revolutionary experiments.

More importantly however, is how does that violence and pain compare with that in other countries? Many people believe 30 million starved to death during the Great Leap, which may be true. (I would just point out that the figures are actually for the aftermath of the Great Leap, 1960-3, not the Leap itself. Furthermore, the figures are based on population estimates not actual counts of dead people. I would suggest that if you lived in a countryside, sound like the Great Leap, you would not be able to live in those habitats. You would conserve your strength, but that does not mean there was mass starvation, only 15 million fewer babies than usual.)

In any case, suppose the 30 million starvation figure propagated widely by the CIA and its backers in academia is true. THE REAL QUESTION IS "HOW DOES THAT COMPARE WITH OTHER IMPERFECT SYSTEMS IN THE WORLD?" Is it fair to compare Mao's China with countries that had been industri-
Newspaper:
The United States wised up and did not reinstall landed interests in Taiwan and southern Korea after class struggle knocked the landlord down a few pegs. Meanwhile, in the rest of the world it backed every petty dictator already in power—whether that dictator represented landlord interests or not. We are talking about the Shah of Iran, Somoza, Marcos, the Salvadoran death squads and the corrupt Vietnamese regime.

It remains true today that the largest obstacle to free speech in the world is the U.S. government, not so much for what it does domestically but because of all the Chiang Kai-shek it still supports globally. "Free speech" is allowed to the bought-off working class of the white nation at the expense of "free speech" in the Third World. The U.S. imperialists give the same working class a break in exchange for peace at home and for support of its foreign and military policies.

Domestically, it is true that I can print this article, but even white nation revolutionaries get arrested for distributing revolutionary papers. They also get framed up for various "crimes" or put away as "mentally ill." America's imprisonment rates and mental illness rates are higher than even Deng Xiaoping's imprisonment and mental illness rates.

Also domestically, the government does not like to be caught often repression-free speech. But cops do routinely kill people on the streets for how they look. The way to go back is to repress people by charging them with many crimes. Someone mentioned Kent State—a massacre in which no state troops of cops were attacked. Yet very few people know of another massacre that same year. Ten days after Kent State police opened fire on a machine gun on a dorm at a Black college. They killed two people. Most people haven't even heard of this because it did not affect middle-class white people. There were 53 demonstrations at mostly Black colleges, but they didn't get media attention.

I would also mention the Black Panther Party which had over 20 people murdered by police, including one in his sleep as is documented in the movie the "Death of Fred Hampton."

Most of the time, white middle-class America has "free speech" and doesn't use it, so it doesn't know about all the face-ups, harassment and killings that people who use their "free speech" face. It's only when you challenge the system that suddenly you face violence.

This is for the ability of the masses of the world's people to have political discussion and debate. We can talk about such "free speech" when the United States is willing to kill two million or more people to stop communism in Vietnam or slaughter 3,000 people just to remove Morley in Panama. What happened to
their free speech? And the free speech of people oppressed by U.S. backed governments? Look at El Salvador, etc. Oppressed people who don’t want to be slaughtered will only use “free speech” the way their U.S. imperialist masters want.

The world is full of Chinese heretics—communists—who dare to say a word when the U.S. imperialists are in power. To get to a society with real free speech we need to get rid of the imperious people who have to kill each other for land or money or resources. Communism is still the only logical goal for those who want real free speech.

Now we must compare what movements have been most successful in making real-world steps toward these goals. The success of Marxism, Maoism did not make China perfect overnight, but it brought more progress in five years than any other movement, ideology or system. That’s what counts, how it compares with other REAL-WORLD EXISTING SYSTEMS. That explains why comparing reality works with Marxism is materialism.

*Note: All credit, World Military and Social Expenditure 1978

**KIM CRITS DEPART WITH "LONG LIVE MARXISM II"

Thea are Inhuman

**Note: All credit, World Military and Social Expenditure 1978

**The fascinating point in the Marxist’s second essay is that although Americans may claim workers’ rights to freedom of speech, but it is accomplished only by imposing restrictions on other people’s freedom.

Actually, this type of "theory of imperialism" has been applied to wider areas than freedom of speech. For example, one may argue that the poor economic situation in the Third World is due to the imperialism.

A few years back I went to a seminar given by a visiting Marxist Lawrence from South America (I don’t remember exactly which country he was from, maybe Peru). Although the widespread anti-U.S. sentiment among Latin American intellectuals were known to me, I was still surprised that the whole seminar became an anti-U.S. chorus. The theory was actually not unfamiliar to me. The U.S. imperialism was at the root of every evil in their countries. Once they could not get rid of U.S. imperialists control, sun would shine and birds would sing and everything would be fine.

I didn’t know how much the Latin American intellectuals were influenced by history, but their mode of thinking was so similar to the "Three Mountain Theory": Once we overthrow the Three Mountains (imperialism, fascism and reactionaries), all the good things will be unveiled.

China is probably the country which had come the closest to the "evil foreign intervention" and the most thorough pentate. However, our experiences tell us that although the "Three Mountain Theory" can be used to make the masses easily believe it (because it is always easy, right?), it is too naive, self-defeating and self-destructive. We face today similar sentiment. Many people believe that the role of Communist Party is the root of every evil, and the only thing we need to do is to overthrow CCP. I hope we wouldn’t be so stupid as to forget the lesson of recent history.

One thing I don’t like about these Marxist articles is the way before it talks about the risk of millions of human beings as a revolutionary experiment. We cannot even talk about sacrificing 10 million people for some experiment.

I am not against social or political experiment. But it should be tested in small numbers and subject to constant monitoring of criticism, so that if anything goes wrong, it can be corrected immediately. Even Mao himself wouldn’t dare to tell the death of 30 million people as an "experiment." I should welcome the humanitarian revolution of Marxism in my Marxist writer’s heart.

According to the revolutionary theory of Marx, Lenin, or Mao, a true revolution must be a people’s revolution, when people have understood their fate and mission. Nor, I am curious about what my Marxist writer or his/her Movement has done in facts (not only in words) to educate the people in Latin America (where there is widespread anti-U.S. imperialism sentiment) in China (where there was the most thorough Marxist education), in other countries of the world, or in this country, the number one evil of the people of the world? You may
enlighten us quite a bit if you could share with us your experience of educating working people.

Unless you think yourself in a god's position, you have to respect people's choices, like what happened in China, Europe, in former USSR, and in any country at this or other historic moment. You may try to persuade people to listen to you, but if people decide otherwise, too bad. (This is applicable not only to listeners, but also to our D-fighters). You can always try. But the less you respect people's choice now, the less people are willing to listen to you.

The people Mao Zedong hated most were not KMT or foreigners, but those communists came back from Soviet Union such as Wang Ming, because they pretended to know more about communist theory and China when they had not done any social investigation. They actually killed more key CCP members than KMT did. However, they had at least the guts to go to Jiangxi Red Region to fight with KMT troops. I hope I would not be disappointed to learn that our Moscow article had done nothing but leasing us what they still think as pretty neat ideas but which we had heard more than 3,000 times.

—a Chinese

May, 1993

MIM ENQUIRY:

We agree that experiments should be tried out in practice in small areas first. In the case of the Great Leap and Cultural Revolution, the whole country gained experiences, usually based on some local models of behavior first.

As for behaving like gods, it is true that we believe there is a science of revolution and we don't simply take people's opinions at face value. What people do in ordinary times is adapt to their oppression. They do not express their true interests, because if they did they would be further repressed. MIM does not respect elections in the context of imperialism and military dictatorship. Those elections only prove that the masses will say what the bourgeoisie wants or be measured for not doing so (as in Chile 1973 when an elected socialist government was overthrown and drowned in blood).

Another MIM Critic Talks about Kent State

DEAR MIM:

I did hear the story together with the story of what happened at Kent from the friend of mine studying there. So it is not as famous as the Kent killing, but it is known, thanks to this SYSTEM of free information exchange. Of course, any system, good or bad, has to be run by people. It is not a surprise that people have this or that prejudice. The question is whether the system is tolerant enough to allow the criticism toward itself.

In contrast, our Moscow writer's knowledge about what happened in Mao's era seems much poorer than I originally thought. He/m she seems to imply that the figure of 20 to 40 million death is "morally" calculated from some statistics, and we all know how statistics is prone to error. Well, my generation, it is not merely a number. I would like to suggest that our Moscow writer and his/her Movement send some people to the countryside to do some social investigation, as Mao advocated. Without social investigation (like Blue Network), one is not qualified to speak. The starvation started the same year as the Great Leap Forward—1959—in at least Guan, Anhu, Heng, and Shandong Prov. and exacerbated quickly and spread to larger areas in the following three years. The severity was gradually reduced only when the policy of Liu Hsiao-chin and Chao Tung were implemented to replace the radical "communization" state, as Mao was disposed to the "second line" after 1966 (meaning he was no longer responsible for the routine work of the Party Center and the government). This policy was similar to the one implemented around 1978 (later development was far beyond this policy's original scope and depth).

Our Moscow writer also didn't respond about the genocidal killing in Guangxi during CR. Maybe he/she has never heard of it, thanks to China's freedom of speech.

I say all those not for the purpose of lambasting our Moscow writer. Whenever I recall these things, I feel like crying in my heart. I already know quite a lot for me to draw the overall picture. But I know that my knowledge is so insignificant compared...
with what happened in those years. I do sincerely hope that our Marxist writers and students will go to China and write a book on the growth of the Chinese Communist Movement. I am now convinced that China is not the most successful of the Chinese states, although this is not due to the “impediments of white nations,” as long as you don’t openly advocate overthrowing the current system of leadership.

—Same author as above

May 1983

MORE REASONS:

You will notice that in our original article, we argued ACCEPTING the figure from the Great Leap as true. Our other printed literature does as well.

It is important to understand how such figures are arrived at for comparative purposes. You will find that when we use similar methods for the United States, the figures for violence are much higher.

When someone makes an accumulation of starvation death, they are the easy hardenized with prior 30 million don’t disappear without a trace. It’s done to raise the population figures as evidence, but we are just pointing out that matters should be used cautiously, and if you do, you will find that China comes out on top and the United States on the bottom. We are not blaming those who say it doesn’t matter 3 million or 10 million, but because either way there was a lot of suffering. In all societies, there is suffering.

Again, with regard to “international” if you read our newspapers, you will see many other examples of censorship and repression. One of our main issues recently concerned off his throne in protest of such censorship.

We consider ourselves advancing progressive, so if there is anything you would like to read, let us know. We have not found any literature that shows that Mao or the Cultural Revolution leaders ordered mass violence. We find many documents to the contrary.

You want to hold Mao responsible for the Cultural Revolution violence. That is fine by us, but we believe that the same standards also apply here as well. Leaders here must be held responsible for the violence that others commit. Just because we live with an “invisible hand,” free market system, doesn’t mean we don’t have people responsible for violence.

We have talked with hundreds of Chinese in China, thousands of Chinese here and some Westerners who have lived in China. Our opinions are unpopular, but not unassailable.

If we had the truth about the well-being of the world’s majority of people and we were prevented from reading that truth, would that prove we are wrong? Again, the standard must be comparative. What is the best system available? What has the best record because none is perfect yet?

Actually, I don’t think it really matters that the world’s majority of people has already spoken against starvation and would rise. Who is opposing their wish by ignoring the issue of which system does a better job of ending violence?

I will receive more replies to this request. However, our authors do not care to explain further or discuss what was being talked about in the Starnet newspapers. We do wish to respond to our critics that there is a difference between now and the way some systems failed. It is a difference no difference morally speaking, but it makes a big difference in
system that is still 70% peasant? In Shanghai under the Gang of Four, according to a Western doctor who went there, the infant mortality rate was lower than it was for blacks or whites in New York City. The doctor got 1,000 infants by age 1 was 12.5 in Shanghai (1970), 18.1 for whites in NYC (1971) and 22.7 for “non-whites” in NYC (1971). This speaks volumes about the superiority of socialism, even when that country starts much poorer than another.

Most people have no free speech and Maoism is still the best plan for the reduction of violence internationally, despite whatever flaws China may have had.


**A New Critic Responds to Long Live Maoism III!**

May 19, 1962

by a critic

In the United States we collect what we know as “suicide death” figures. If you take a black person and a white person and say that because of a difference in medical treatment, we call that an excess death.

The death rate for blacks in 1950 was such that they suffered 73,900 excess deaths from their oppression in the United States. There were 39.8 million blacks in 1950. (See *Statistics* *Abstract of the United States* 1950, p. 74 for mortality figures.) If black people numbered 1 billion, then the excess death figure would be 2.6 million deaths EVERY YEAR. So we are glad people use statistics in talking about the Great Leap, so that people can get an overall sense of comparative violence going on.

The death rate for blacks in 1950 was such that they suffered 73,900 excess deaths from their oppression in the United States.

May 19, 1962

by the same

Now let me ask you a moral question. It doesn’t matter to dead people how they die, whether it be McDonald’s serial murder or June elish murderers. They are victims and every person’s life is as good as every other’s.

But which system do you expect more of, the country with the richest economy in the world or the country that is still 70% peasant? In Shanghai under the Gang of Four, according to a Western doctor who went there, the infant mortality rate was lower than it was for blacks or whites in New York City. The doctor got 1,000 infants by age 1 was 12.5 in Shanghai (1970), 18.1 for whites in NYC (1971) and 22.7 for “non-whites” in NYC (1971). This speaks volumes about the superiority of socialism, even when that country starts much poorer than another.

Most people have no free speech and Maoism is still the best plan for the reduction of violence internationally, despite whatever flaws China may have had.

USA, than unless at least 6 persons dead in China we cannot say China is worse than USA, since China’s population is 5 times of USA’s, more. If count the development level, than 6 should be 50,000. (remember your argument about black people’s death rate) Do you suggest that Chinese lives are cheaper? My friend, when you talk 30 million Chinese starved, please don’t treat it too easily, life is life, no matter whose life. If you think life is nothing compare to your great idea, that kills Maoism too, since in 1957, Mao was willing to sacrifice half of China’s population (335 million) to destroy the ugly American imperialism.

You may say those deaths are statistical error, as you suggested, 15 million lives losses, you can sit there and imagine anything, but to China, those dead ones are our brothers, sisters, parents, grandparents, uncles, aunts, nieces, nephews, etc., our relatives. They are not just numbers!

You cited the death toll starting world war II to show 20 to 30 million death is not unusual in China’s history, so idea should not be singled out. But we know what is the difference between war time and peace time, between natural disaster and man made ones, those are not just statistics.

As for your internationalism, it is nothing but the “great idea”: if one cannot solve the problems in one country, then first solve all the problems in this whole world. How great an idea, but we have heard too many of this kind of claims.

Maoism is a check that may be pushed 150 years later, maybe more, I bet nobody can carry it within 100 years. But will people buy it? The people in the former Soviet Union don’t buy it. The people in Eastern Europe don’t buy it. We Chinese don’t buy it. Do you think American people will buy it? You can try of course, thanks to the freedom of speech in this country. Good luck!

P.S. Please don’t oversimplify things just by development level, since no matter how rich people are, nobody lives over 150 years. From survival to prosperity, there is a long way to go.

When I say people in Shanghai enjoy a lot privileges, I mean really privileges, not just they are richer than other people. To this, you cannot understand until you have lived in China. In America, you are used to convert everything to dollars, but in China, no way!

—Another Chinese critic

May, 1992

Of course, you are right that Shanghai is the wealthiest part of China. It is still poorer than New York. The point is that you can’t blame Mao for the fact that China is poor. The United States was richer than China before Mao ever led the Chinese revolution.

You have to compare systems with similar wealth to see which has superior health care. China is a leader of ten or more poorer than the United States, but it is in every regards superior (under Mao; I know it’s changing now) to the United States.

The United States has been industrializing since the 1800s. If Mao had come to power in the 1800s, China would probably be industrialized completely now. Our comparison between Shanghai and New York shows the most possible to take this unfair aspect into account.

113 ALASKA, JANUARY, 1992

In this sort of dispute, it is always telling that people have such low regard for social welfare or what are at IBM call science. No one would imagine that if there were two new drugs for AIDS—one that will save all but one million patients and one that will save all but 20 million patients—that which drug you pick doesn’t matter because it is “egalitarian” relatives who died and playing not to be an inhuman as to talk just about the numbers? It’s absurd but when effective demagoguery employed by those who wish the oppressed not to think too seriously about their oppression.
Amerikan Writer Chimes in, Prefers "Freedom" to Life

This is yet another inconsistent use of statistics. It is claimed that Marxism is superior to capitalism on the basis of one set of statistics: infant mortality in Shanghai and New York. The fact that infant mortality is lower in Shanghai than in New York does not prove one thing: infants die at a slower rate in Shanghai than New York. It does not tell us any reason, which we would all be interested in. This does not prove the superiority of socialism. In fact, Communist regimes do tend to have a good track record in public health and literacy. This is in large part due to the regimentation of these societies.

I doubt that any rational American (or any other freedom-loving people) would be willing to trade freedom for these two benefits. To make the trade-off more clear, would you be willing to sacrifice your prosperity, your freedom of speech, association, contract, etc. to achieve these two narrow goals? Would it not be better to keep these freedoms and use them to criticize existing policies and recommend new policies? Instead of remaking the whole society, is it not better to examine the cause of infant mortality and address them directly?

The reason the socialist countries have done better on average than similarly wealthy countries in public health is simple. The poor people in socialist countries get adequate preventive and curative health care. Meanwhile, as is no secret, the largest economy in the world allows for homelessness, starvation, and non-existent health care for a minority of poor people in its own country.

At this point MIN also received a query about the RCP. Our response was as follows.

MINI responds to query about RCP in midst of polemical exchanges.

If you want to pick up the line toward the Gang of Four, you are right you are better off with the RCP, because they call Jiang Qing "subjective", and the Gang of Four "maybe not as good as Stalin" in their book Revolution and Counterrevolution. (Some around the RCP now say those statements were a joke, but it would be hard to take the joke on Jiang Qing that way.—MINI)

We think the issues are extremely difficult to follow and we think the RCP casters to ignorance and nihilism on these questions. This party hates criticism for the sake of criticism. When something is the best shot of communist development in the real world it should not be criticized from the standpoint of ideals, only practice. Criticism for its own sake is another form of idealism—the dogmatism of the intellectuals and petty-bourgeoisie.

We have a pack of literature on the RCP. But we have a feeling you should get on board for a subscription to the paper and a literature list. It's also urgent that you read our paper, because we need distributors in your area, people to drop it off where others can pick it up.

Request for Definition of Marxism

We apologize to our readers for losing parts of this letter.

DEAR MINI:

Before you continue the Marxist marathon and cause more confusion, I invite you to clarify the very definition of Marxism. It seems to me that you have failed so far to do this first thing and you would only more suspect if you differentiate your belief from what Mao did in practice.

After all, how much does Marxism differ from the current ideology of CCP? Did Mao follow or even mean what he preached? Was Mao a Marxist?
A Spiral Trajectory: The Failure and Success of Communist Development

You wanted to vindicate Mao from the responsibility for the historical errors of the CCP government since 1949. There are two ways to accomplish this: to alter the interpretation of those errors; what happened during the Cultural Revolution (CR) or the Great Leap Forward (GLF) were not really bad, but good things, and, if they were bad, to change the party responsible for the error: it was Deng and Liu who were the bad guys, Mao was innocent, or even better: a victim of the capitalist-imperialists.

These two simple events alone far exceed the combined casualties of the whole world during the two world wars. To me, defining CR or GLF is worse than defending the atrocities of the two world wars.

It is now not only a tendency to denounce the accomplishments of CCP; it is an offense to Chinese to defend these disasters.

Mao overrode and saved CCP and CCP created Chairman Mao. CCP pronounced Marxism and made Mao its spiritual and political god; the next thing it found was to destroy its own god, who discovered that the machine he had built was no longer of utility, but an impediment, to his personal power.

Mao didn't care a damn about either democracy or intellectuals; he was simply too busy with his dealing with his rivals.

—Chinese student protest
June, 1982

Long Live Manism II!
"A Response to the Question of Definitions"

by a cadre
June, 1982

The following was a response to the above letter:

Manism is a kind of communism, an ideology and theory that supports a movement for the abolition of classes, patriarchy and national conflicts—the power of people over people. We also mean the same thing when we say it is a movement to and socialism.

It's true there isn't much to talk about if people don't like Manism from its very definition, because they don't like communism.

According to Mao himself, he had two main accomplishments—things we believe made him stand out in the communist movement. One was his development of People's War against imperialist and technically superior landlord-comparator regimes. This contribution had wide-reaching impact after 1948 in decolonization and liberation struggles around the world.

The second point, which is even more distinctive, is that Mao believed there was a new bourgeoisie created under socialism. This is what sets Manism apart from the Deng Xiaoping regime today.

In fact, Mao named the leaders of today's regime the capitalist-roaders in the CCP, so Manism is definitely different from what we see today, which is just an elaborate cover for bourgeois rule and its companion corruption.

Mao admitted that the Great Leap tragedy was 30% political mistake and 70% natural disaster and Soviet withdrawal from the industrial economy. We shall have to argue about that further later. As for the Cultural Revolution, you are right, we believe that it was Deng and Liu and later ultraleftists who made the Cultural Revolution an opportunity to commit crimes against the people.

The Right attacked the masses the way the bourgeoisie does, and the ultraleft, attacked the masses for not being politically correct enough. Both the Right (Liu and Deng) and the ultraleft (like the Red Guard factions) attacked the masses in the name of Mao, but neither was Maoist. The Right stirred up attacks on the masses to divert attention from Lin-Deng-Peng Zhaos, etc. The ultraleft was probably just foolish, and often well-intentioned. The ultraleft was manipulated by the Right so well that the GPCR (Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution) was discredited and Deng Xiaoping came back to power.

You say that, "To me, defining CR or GLF is worse than defending the atrocities of the two world wars." This would be an important point if it were true, but you provide no references, unlike our articles. Actually the leading cause of violence in the world is not war, it's starvation. That's why we
work so hard to provide numbers on life expectancy, infant mortality, etc.

We've already said that the GLF and GPCR had their tragedies. But it is one thing to say the GLF was a tragedy and another thing to conclude that Maoism in particular caused that tragedy. One does not follow from the other.

In actuality, we believe YOU are defending those disasters. Why? Because, the GLF was starvation. Yet, Maoism has the best record in the world of stopping starvation in a short period of time. When you attack Maoism, you attack the best chance that Third World peoples have to escape the 14 million child deaths each year from starvation. You are defending the fact that India suffers a Great Leap tragedy every six years in NORMAL times, not to mention bad weather conditions.

--------------------------

Power struggles go on as long as there is power.
Only the communists are even trying to change that.
--------------------------

It's like this: you have a choice between two hospitals: Hospital A takes in 1000 patients and 100 and up dead in a month. Hospital B takes in 1000 similar patients and 60 and up dead in a month. The 60 dead is still a tragedy, but it does not follow that Hospital B is an "offensive" ideology and "defensive" tragedy. We've already demonstrated that in previous articles by using the only method possible to prove our point—comparisons. When you continue with dogmatogic arguments, you let the CAUSES of tragedy slip away. And every time you say that Chinese history is just full of weakness, you allow those tragedies to continue. You must distinguish between Hospital A and Hospital B.

Your argument about communists seeking personal power is typical anti-communism. The reason is that it is easier to see someone who has state power than someone who has market power. Here all you say boils down to saying someone has state power. So what? In capitalism, someone has market power. Then look what you do: you say kia is a god; yet, he lost his power and needed the GPCR. Well, make up your mind. Did kia have absolute power or not? If he had absolute power, why did he need the GPCR? Did he cause the GPCR with his absolute power or did he need it because he had no power?

Overall, there is a lot of thinking to unite with in this article you wrote. It's a very good analysis. Here we bring up remaining disagreements. If by explaining about power struggles, you mean you want to abolish the power of people over people and say you are a communist, good. If by this you mean that it's possible to have power of people over people and not have power struggles, then that's bad. In fact, it would probably be a lie from someone so analytical as you. We never claimed that kia was dead. Power struggles go on as long as there is power. Only the communists are even trying to change that.

Long Live Maoism U!
"The reality of imperialist exploitation: no democracy for the exploited"

Banks in the Western monopoly capitalist countries poured in $235 billion more than they loaned out to the Third World in the 1980s. In 1988 alone, the figure was $58 billion. (1) Fifty billion dollars is a hefty sum, even by American economic standards. It would be over $200 a year for every striving child in the world.

Food policy analysts have already shown that the world already produces the food to feed everyone. The reason it doesn't is the distribution system. The starving people have neither the food nor the means to produce food.

The world's Chiang Kai-shek, (the leader of the Kuomintang; China's reactionary nationalist organization that Mao overthrew and sent packing to Taiwan), conduct a "free trade" in human lives.
They are all too willing to help with the exploitation of Third World people in exchange for U.S. military backing and a share of imperialism’s lifestyle.

Mercy living in the United States and China is not enough to say which economic system works for the world’s majority of people. You have to analyze which economic system does or does not work for the world’s majority of people.

You have to look at how the U.S. wealth was created. You have to look behind the luxury and comfort. When you do, you will see a history of genocide, slavery and imperialist superexploitation.

That is not to say the U.S. economic system does not “work” for the imperialists, the bought-off Western working classes and the middle classes. It does work for those upper classes. But those of us who support “democracy,” should see through U.S.-style democracy and support a vote for the Third World’s people, the world’s vast majority.

We at the Maoist International Movement know that the masses have already spoken against world war, starvation and genocide. They don’t support the Chiang Kai-shek, Marcoses, Monegas, Christianis, etc. The Third World peoples just never get a vote on U.S. imperialism.

The only people who get a vote on U.S. domination of the world are the imperialists, the bought-off working classes of the First World and the middle classes. They supported Reagan/Bush, etc. They supported the invasion of Panama and the killing of millions in Vietnam before the U.S. military was defeated. And we, at MIM, are not surprised because they get the benefit in that $335 billion from one avenue of exploitation alone every ten years. For those interested in more facts and calculations proving that the U.S. economic system does not generate the wealth enjoyed here, send $3 cash (check to “ABS”), to MIM and ask for MIM.

Source: New York Times, 9/12/90

Long Live Maoism U.S.A. is number one!

Previously, we explained why we disagree with Peng Liyi and others who simply say, “China is behind the United States; the United States is expanding its lead; therefore, the U.S. system is better.” The U.S. “lead” is only at the expense of the world’s majority of people.

Some people think we just whitewash anything that happened in Mao’s China. That is not true. We said before that no system in perfect yet until we reach the relative peace of communism. The people dead from starvation and other catastrophes cannot be brought back, but we can look around and determine what is best to do to protect the “human dignity” of all peoples to live without violence—be it military or economic violence which results in death. If you compare things, you will find that despite its wealth, the U.S. system cannot solve some basic problems. Here is a list of dozens of problems showing that the United States is number one in the world.

1. Number one in mean murders (known as serial killings in “street crime”) e.g. the infamous McChord’s killing.
2. Number one in teenage suicide (and please one say that young people kill themselves for any reason other than an imperialist system).
3. Number one in rape rates (recorded and available statistics).
4. Number one in pornography consumption.
5. Number one in processed cocaine consumption.
6. Number one in imprisonment of black people per 100 (even surpassing South Africa in this).
7. Number one in ordinary murder (in rates per 1,000 people compared with all societies for which such figures are collected including Europe, China, the former Soviet Union and Japan).
8. Number one in arms exports.

All Right U.S.A. all the way (with... Whose it up?)

Voice of America (VOA, America’s world-wide propaganda radio station) will never admit this, but
we Americans have a hard time understanding Chinese ideas about violence, so I make self-criticism in advance for this national characteristic of ours.

Many, many Chinese have told us that the Cultural Revolution was bad because some people committed suicide. None of course the VOA propagandists agree with this, because VOA loves to criticize other cultures and political systems. (By the way, we know that many Chinese students do not put much stock in VOA—if they listen to the propagandists news at all. We just use VOA as an example of what Americans stereotypically think.)

But from the MIM perspective, suicide happens in a lot of societies for a lot of different historical reasons. Suicide is of course bad, but the existence of suicide does not prove the Cultural Revolution is bad. Sometimes as a society, America should say to China: "Pardon our insensitivity, but you complain about the Cultural Revolution because you had it so good before the Cultural Revolution. We Americans have much higher rates of violence including suicide." No matter how poignant the suicide story, it can say nothing about which system is better unless there is a comparison made. Here once again, the U.S. system just falls on its face. We think Mao Zedong was very correct to guard vigilantly against becoming a U.S.-type system during the Cultural Revolution. According to Deng Xiaoping, the arch enemy of the Gang of Four, the Gang of Four executed 30,000 people in the Cultural Revolution, their supposed crimes. Yet, we have over 30,000 ordinary murders here every year. That would be 29,000 every year if we had a billion people, given our murder rate. Over ten years that would be 290,000.

Why is it that people like Fang Li bi blame Mao for the 30,000 suicides and other deaths, but they don't blame Bush for the 300,000 would-be suicides every ten years? Sure the historical context is a little different, but it makes the slightest difference to the dead people. A fair comparison between the U.S. system and the system in China under Mao would blame Mao for the Cultural Revolution violence but also credit him for violence avoided relative to the United States. Neither do that or don't blame any violence on the political system, which is the custom here. When someone commits suicide here, it is not thought of as an indictment of an entire age/policy or system. That's another reason we are Number One, number one in psychiatric care. We think everything is an individual problem, so we have psychiatrists and social workers working on individuals, always without result.

MIM does not support individuals who killed each other in the Cultural Revolution or violence against intellectuals without state power. We do no think of the Cultural Revolution as a sum total of all expressions so traumatic to Chinese individuals, because we think of the Cultural Revolution in comparative light. We understand the Cultural Revolution theory put forth that the bourgeoisie does exist right inside the party—hence today's Deng Li Yang abroad and capitalism in the Soviet bloc. It's the top power-holders in the party who can become corrupt and really mess a country up once it is on the socialist road. We do not support any aspect of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution that did not show the differences between the Maniche and the Liu Shaoqi/Lin Biao/Deng Xiaoping.

If someone beats his wife during the Democratic Party presidential nomination convention here, we do not blame that on the Democratic Party convention. That is just something wrong with society as a whole that needs straightening out.

From MIM's perspective, most criticisms of the Cultural Revolution involve standards that would never be applied to the United States. Hence we can understand that people suffered in the Cultural Revolution, but we do not agree with the imputed causes of that suffering. In a democratic capitalist system, it is easy to make political assessments of responsibility. Hence, Chinese blame Mao and the Gang of Four for much violence in the CR. In the U.S. "invisible hand" system, power hides behind "free markets," where no one is accountable—except to shareholders seeking a profit. Ironically, especially concerning the fight for democracy, it was easier to monitor Mao's CP than it is to monitor what goes on in U.S. corporate boardrooms. The violence caused by decisions in corporate boardrooms almost never gets blamed on the people who made those decisions.
Long Live Maoism VII!
"The Right to Talk About China"

Occasionally people tell us that we have no right to talk about China, because we don't live there. (Many incorrectly assume that we never did.) It is indeed a big task just to understand one's own country when you live in a place like the United States or China—really big places. So we can sympathize with the sentiment and we certainly agree that the oppressed people within a nation must liberate themselves and come up with their own leadership and theories for doing so.

What it comes to reality though, many Chinese intellectuals are putting in that America is so great. Hence we cannot always refuse to talk about China.

We have to contend with Fang Lingshi, printed in English by huge publishing houses like Alfred Knopf telling us how great the American system is. These books and newspaper articles get out in the millions within the United States and they make our job harder to fight for the liberation of the oppressed within the United States.

So if Fang Lingshi are going to say how great the U.S. system is in books and articles readily for
In the end, MIM actually agrees a little with Fang Lusheng, too. He is right to try to learn things from other countries. And he knows that it is impossible to do that without making comparisons and talking about both countries.

We don’t think Fang Lusheng has done a very thorough job of really looking at the causes of violence, but we agree with his project and general line of inquiry.

So again, people who disagree with us: what are the causes of violence that happened under Mao and how do they compare with CAUSES of violence in the United States?
Long Live Manism VIII!
“The Cultural Revolution
and Mao: The Real Fighter
for Democracy”

by a comrade
June, 1983

Many Chinese students have asked us how we assess Mao's role in the Cultural Revolution. They cite widespread crimes against the people and ask if these aren't Mao's fault since he initiated the Cultural Revolution.

So far in our articles, we have argued that one person, or even a Gang of Five, could not have committed millions of crimes against the people. You must look at the broad social causes of such crimes.

Here we would like to point out the positive aspects of the Cultural Revolution and assess Mao's responsibility. From the perspective of communists, the Cultural Revolution was the first movement of the masses in a socialist country against a bourgeois right inside the Communist Party—people like Deng Xiaoping.

From the point of view of Chinese history, the Cultural Revolution was also very important. In particular, it was a blow to Confucianism and emperor-worship.

The people saying Mao was a bad emperor who brought calamity to the Chinese people are still stuck in emperor-worship. Those critics who blame Mao for a supposed 20 million violent deaths during the Cultural Revolution are saying that an emperor can cause disaster.

Logically, the same people who think one emperor can do so much bad are the same people who are going to think that one emperor can do so much good, perhaps even by being just a neutral emperor. We at MMM do not buy into any emperor logic and from our reading of Mao we know that he despised emperor logic.

We also know from reading Red Guards opposed to Mao that Mao actually helped them to think without emperors. Ultra-leftist Red Guard Wu

Man had this to say about Mao and the Cultural Revolution: "We must not be misled by the anti-communist propaganda that the people are all ignorant and the Mainland is a hell. In fact, before the Cultural Revolution, China had published a number of works by Western writers...

"The Cultural Revolution is also an important reason why we could read so many books. This might seem unbelievable. The thing that the general public abroad could not forgive China was that the authorities encouraged Red Guards to destroy the four olds' thereby destroying Chinese culture.

"The fervor with which the Red Guards destroyed books had to be seen to be believed. [1]

Wu Man indicates that after raising the "four olds," at least his Red Guard group (a faction which we believe opposed) did not trash the "four olds," but attempted to understand the "four olds." In fact, they tried to understand both what the Central Committee and the Red Guards were trying to say.

We at MMM say, what's wrong with that? Wu Man and others ultra-leftists Red Guards blame Mao for shutting down the Cultural Revolution in 1966 by sending in the PLA. Wu Man had faith in the Chinese people to this extent. Most commentators today take the Rightist view that such a period never should have occurred, that the Cultural Revolution should have been shut down right away. In their minds, it is the emperor's fault that widespread massacre-on-massacre violence took place during the Cultural Revolution.

-------------------------------

Wu of MMM do not buy into
any emperor logic and from
our reading of Mao we
know that Mao hated
emperor logic.

-------------------------------

But what did Mao really say about violence during the Cultural Revolution? 1. "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 the 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....

"When there is a debate, it should be conducted by reasoning, not by force." This above is from the "Sixteen Points" that guides the Cultural Revolution.

We at HM set all those who supposedly uphold "human-rights" what was wrong with them? The real Macs were the ones defending the principle of interaction amongst the masses.

2. "Let the Masses Educate Themselves in the Movement" was one of the Sixteen Points. This point answers why Mao did not send the PLA to help the Cultural Revolution. It was not correct to look to the emperor to figure everything out and make everything right.

Only when clear majorities of workers and students' parents wanted the Cultural Revolution to end did Mao move in with the PLA. At this time, Mao gathered together Red Guard leaders and expressed his disappointment with them for using violence without getting the masses on their side.

The masses rightly wanted the fighting with guns, spears and knives, etc. to end. It was just masses-on-masses violence and the Red Guard factions on campus showed an sign of getting worse. The Ultras left unhappy, but it had blown its chance to really mobilize the masses for change and must Dang Xiping types for good. (We have books on this subject such as William Hinton's One Hundred Day War.)

3. While Mao obviously launched the struggle against Liu Shaoqi/Deng Xiaoping, etc. he also criticized the Ultras left in July, 1966. "Personally, I think we can see the first signs at present of giving up the struggle against the enemy, the struggle against the biggest power holder in the Party who are taking the capitalistic line. At present this contradiction is not conscious, it is widely disapppointed." (2) Mao added that revolutionary cadres must be righteously defended against indiscriminate attack. Mao criticized such reformist attacks in the Shanghai People's Commune of 1967, saying it's instead against what the masses had done and were trying to do by themselves. When those intellectuals raised the unrealistic slogan of "no culture," Mao said, "This is extreme anachronism; it is most reactionary."[3]

4. Mao took a clear line against violence. The masses, even when that violence did not cause any lasting damage, in the winter of 1968 he sent Zhou Enlai a letter that was published. "Recently, many revolutionary teachers and students and revolutionary masses have written to me asking whether it is considered struggle by force (wen-tou) to make those in authority taking the capitalist-road and feudal and monarchist types wear dunce caps, 90 days their faces, and so on, without them in the street. I think it is a form of struggle by force (wen-tou). These things cannot achieve our goal of educating the people. I want to stress here that, when engaging in struggle, we definitely must hold to struggle by reason (yin-wei), being out the facts, emphasize rationality, and use persuasion before we can reach our standard of struggle and before we can achieve our goal of educating people."[4]

We at HM don't know how much clearer Mao could have been about violence amongst the masses. He opposed it. To the extent that it happened, it was prearranged by non-Maoist manipulating in Macao. So some people ask, why didn't Mao end the Cultural Revolution sooner than? But that is just asking the emperor to take care of everything. Mao asked that the "masses must liberate themselves." That's why he did not move in the PLA until the masses very broadly became disgusted with the shallow policies of the Ultras and their manipulations on the Right. It is a tragedy that Red Guard ultra-fascists killed unarmed workers and students rather than end their "lost war." They only brought violence on themselves and let Deng Xiaoping, Piao Chun, Yang Shangkun and other top capitalist-leaders off the
A Spiral Trajectory: The Failure and Success of Communist Development

In 1979, China's infant mortality was 48 per 1,000 live births, compared with 42 for countries averaged in the "middle income" category. It also compared with 134 for India in the "low income" category that China was in.(1) The businessmen who are found that low market satisfaction with China's level of income were vastly different in this regard and China came out on top.

The life expectancy story was the same. It was 66 in China, 68 in the "middle income" countries and 50 in the "low income" capitalist countries averaged together. In earlier articles we showed readers that China started behind India in income and life expectancy and largest oil end under Man, which is not to say that China ever left the "low income" category in War's more 27 years of rule. When it comes to population per Western doctor, population per secondary doctor, life expectancy, secondary education, and population per hospital bed, China could the average of both the "middle income" capitalist countries and "low income" capitalist countries. Only the more advanced free-market capitalist countries did better than China on average which it came to health care issues. These are exceptions in the world, but the majority of capitalist countries or countries with more free market than China.(4) Only by making the unfair comparison of China with very rich countries, countries that were much richer than China even before Marxism took power, only then could you make the distorted conclusion that Marxism was not a good strategy for health care in the Third World.

The same is true when it comes to education. China surpassed the average of "middle income" countries in the world only because it had the market strategy. Adult literacy was 71% in China, 71% in "middle income countries" and 38% in the average of "low income countries." China surpassed...
A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAIRYTALE AND SUCCE$$ OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT

both the middle and low income-country averages in primary school enrollment, secondary school enrollment and pupil-teacher ratios.(5) [It had lower pupil-teacher ratios.]

Even in Maoist China’s weakest area—housing—China surpassed the average of the developing countries in rooms per house, smallest number of people per room, electricity and piped water available.(6)

We realize that all these gains, especially in health care and enrollment, started to erode under Hua Guofeng/Deng Xiaoping capitalist-restoration. We don’t support what happened after the arrest of the Gang of Four.

In conclusion, capitalism is an international racket. A handful of countries that have been exploiting other countries for a long time are rich and getting richer. The vast majority of countries like China in 1949 are poor. If you live in a Third World country, you should definitely support Maoism because Maoism brings better health care, education and housing in a very short period of time. We won’t claim it brings industrialization in a mere 27 years, but no system does, especially in a world where the imperialists take the precious surplus and resources from the poor countries.

Note:
2. Ibid.
4. Ibid., p. 78.

Long Live Maoism XI!
State ownership and Development

by a comrades
July, 1983

We Maoists often hear from Chinese students that the Third World is held back by too much state ownership. A lot of students even tell us that countries like India and most of Africa are socialist.

This belief stems from Western economic “theories” and simplistic textbook descriptions that divide the world into “planned” and “market” economies.

We Maoists do not believe like Deng Xiaoping or the other revisionist “Marxists” that state ownership is the same thing as socialism. Worker and peasant control of the means of production is the key. In China, bureaucrat-capitalist rule just as surely as they did under Chiang K’ai-shek or in Portau today. If a class other than the workers themselves appropriates the workers’ labor, the system is capitalist, not socialist.

The workers certainly do not own production in China today as demonstrated by the many changes allowed to state-capitalist China from the days of Maoist revolution—unemployment, firing, inflation and the end of mass mobilization campaigns in which workers sought to gain administrative and political experience.

As it turns out though, state ownership does not hold back development. According to the bourgeois economists attached to the Harvard Institute for International Development, which is mostly funded by the U.S. government, the state-owned enterprises are responsible for a larger share of production in the industrialized countries than in the developing countries. Hence, there is no evidence that state ownership causes economic development to be retarded.

Below are the facts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>of production from state-owned firms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-3%</td>
<td>Nepal, Philippines, Guatemala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1-5%</td>
<td>Colombia, Thailand, Argentina, Paraguay, Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3-10%</td>
<td>Benin, Botswana, Eswatini, Liberia, Mali, Sierra Leone, Korea, Sri Lanka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.3-16%</td>
<td>Ivory Coast, Tanzania, India, Taiwan, Bolivia, Chile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.1-20%</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.1-30%</td>
<td>Guinea, Tunisia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 30%</td>
<td>Zambia, Guyana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Recalling that Hitler’s Germany, apartheid South Africa and European countries like France have had a state role in the economy exceeding one-half of all investment made, we see that the “com-
"Mao or George Bush: Trade in China"


By a composite
October, 1992

"Lester Thurow is the Dean of MIT’s Sloan School of Management, and is a professor of economics there." This book Head to Head is a frank assessment of the U.S. economy relative to its main competitors done by a Democrat, angling for influence in a new presidential administration.

According to Thurow, “While China will always be important politically and militarily, it will not have a big impact on the world economy in the first half of the twenty-first century, even if it successfully resumes its progress toward a market economy. The reasons flow from the numbers. China has a per capita annual income of $390. Suppose it were to grow 10 percent per year—a rate equal to the very highest rates achieved in Japan or Korea. That would amount to $36 per person. Multiply 1.3 billion Chinese by $36 per person, and China would have $36 billion in annual extra output—most of which would neither be exported nor exported but used to feed and house its people. But even if all of it were to be used to buy goods from the rest of the world, $36 billion is just 0.7 percent of the American GDP. Until China gets to much higher income levels, its economic impact on the rest of the world is going to be small." (p. 210-11)

Thurow also says that the little dragons (Taiwan, Korea, Singapore and Hong Kong) are in for a tough time because the United States cannot continue to serve as a reliable trading partner. Furthermore, neither the European Economic Community (EEC) nor Japan will fill the gap.

How’s that for a twin? The United States is the unreliable trading partner!

The problems the United States is having internally are going to stop it from being a dynamic trade...
partner. It already has a huge trade deficit in addition to a budget deficit, which is going to cause some serious readjustments.

Today we see all the difficulties that Cuba is having because it relied on a Soviet Union-based trading bloc. Now Cuba must spend years just adjusting its economy—its internal division of labor. Thorne cannot be accused of being a Marxist, but according to him, prospects for the little dragons are not good. "Moving from a $150 million deficit to a surplus of $50 billion (the size necessary to make interest payments on America's international debt) would cost the Pacific Rim a minimum of 10 million jobs." (p. 219)

"Between 1981 and 1986, 42 percent of Korea's growth and 74 percent of Taiwan's growth could be traced to exports to the American market. While America represents only 2 percent of world GNP, in 1987, it took 42 percent of the manufactured exports from all of the Third World countries combined. In contrast, the EEC took 28 percent and Japan, 12 percent." (p. 113)

Mao need not take an bleak a view as Thorne does to hold a Marxist position. It is still clear overall that few countries succeed with the capitalist system. Even Thorne admits this. According to him, "Capitalism has its virtues and vices... third World failures far outnumber First World successes." (p. 17)

He also makes a straightforward and devastating admission regarding two continents and capitalism's failures: "Some of the countries of Latin America could be rich; some of them (Argentina and Chile) once were rich. Some of them have from time to time looked very promising (Brazil in the 1960s and 1970s, Chile in the last five years), but what looked promising always turned out to be a mirage and the promise sooner or later vanished. In Africa, little has ever even looked promising. In the 1980s real per capita incomes fall in both regions." (p. 214)

We Maoists understand that Mao was right: The capitalist system has never provided an opening for China. Only real socialism can save China (not Deng Xiaoping's social-fascism). China should return to the socialist road and self-reliance and not adjust to Western economics the way Cuba adjusted to the Soviet Union. China should get out to trade with other Third World and socialist countries (once they are created—as inevitably they will be given the failures of capitalism).

The world capitalist system is like a sweepstakes. There are successes and failures. The fail-
Chapter 7
Four Tigers
Korean Student Studying in USA Writes MIM

I am sorry that there are so many people here that are really “frightened” by what you guys are proposing. It appears to me that this is a typical response from most Koreans, especially the older people (like my parents) that actually lived through the fear of communist infiltration.

The problems that you guys (I am assuming that you guys are actually more than one person) point out about this country and capitalism throughout the world seem to be fairly on the mark. I am not speaking for myself, especially when it comes to huge politics where people are throwing facts and necessity back and forth, but I do know “what time it is.”

The real issue to me it seems is whether people are willing to give up that small chance to try to be on a capitalistic society in order that everyone in society will be able to have a “decent” amount of the necessities that you have listed many times before.

The real problem with what you are proposing is that it requires people to fundamentally change the way they are: that is, selfish. You are calling for an everlasting society that I just don’t think most people would ever agree to be a part of.

To tell you the truth, I guess I might not mind living in such a society; it would be very nice to be rid of such conflicts as those between economic classes and races. But for some reason I don’t really see that happening. Yes, I know, this is quite a statement about humanity (or lack thereof), but what other conclusion could anyone really make??

Still, what you guys are doing is pretty cool. It certainly does not do any harm to be distilling these articles as people very possibly wake up to some of the things that might never occur to them when they least expect it.

—A Korean student in the USA
August, 1955

We would not propose communism if there were no historical basis for setting it aside as possible. It would indeed be a crime to propose an idea that could only cause evil and never got anywhere.

Yet, history has been more generous to the human race than that. If we look carefully at ourselves, we will see a history of cooperative living, sharing and peace amongst many tribes, in North America, the Pacific and Africa. That proves that it is not part of human nature to live with greed and war. The behavior of the human race depends upon its social organization.

The anthropologists would like to observe this history and even write out the peoples and cultures associated with it. Yet, in some work in anthropology we can find the evidence. An interesting book in this vein is *Stone Age Economics* by Marshall Sahlins (NY: Aldine Publishing Co., 1972).

Another way to learn about human nature under different social conditions is to study the current indigenous peoples of the U.S.A. The Mohegan people will tell you that it is not as all human-natures to live with a system like we do now. Many Indians, in fact, believe Marx only stole his best ideas from the indigenous peoples of North America.

It is true that capitalistic society’s human nature is as you say. That is not the same thing as condemning the animal heart sections for all history.

A MUSLIM VIEW OF SUCCESS OF SOUTH KOREA, JAPAN AND TAIWAN

The United States on the Bandwagon of Class Struggle

by a pamphlet, August 5, 1955

Here we will return to the subject of Korea. South Korea is very important because it is an extension in the post-World War II period. It has been a Third World country that has successfully developed people should realize that the “four tigers” or “little
People should realize that the “four tigers” or “little dragons”—Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore are exceptions in the history of development in the dependent capitalist orbit. Even if capitalism “worked” for these four, it would not prove anything about the possibilities for development under imperialism. The reason is that you would have to count all the failures that went with the successes. And as we have already documented in the section on China, those failures account for massive starvation, death, and inadequate health care that amounts to a virtual genocide for “low-income” countries whose most of the human race lives.

As for Korea and Taiwan, the Chinese were underdeveloped and subject to the control of the imperialists. They lacked the industrial base that the West had been building for centuries. Hong Kong and Singapore were British dependencies, always subject to London. In the case of these four, the failures account for massive starvation, death, and inadequate health care that amounts to a virtual genocide for “low-income” countries whose most of the human race lives.

At least 25 capitalist-dominated countries have suffered an actual decline in per capita income in recent years according to the U.S. Statistical Abstract. The capitalists can still exploit most countries mercilessly, so a few exceptions are allowed by the system to develop while other countries decline in the international capitalist sweepstakes. The winners and losers change from time to time, but the system stays the same.

OK, but South Korea is an exception. Why? The reason is that the United States and East Asian capitalists jumped on the bandwagon of class struggle at a crucial point at the conclusion of World War II and the Korean War. Without much favor, these capitalists and the United States had the same to copy what Mao was doing in China wholescale. What did they copy? They copied land reform. Why did they copy it? Because the communists had just kicked capitalism ass in China and were starting to do the same in Korea and Vietnam. The capitalists learned their lesson and then when they got the chance, they kicked their landlord oppressive partners. It is important to note that the dependent bourgeoisie is afraid of unseating the landlord class if it means eliminating peasants that could rise against the bourgeoisie as well. For this reason, the bourgeoisie is unable to carry out successful land reform in the Philippines or El Salvador. The capitalist class is generally only able to take advantage of the chaos of history like the situation created by World War II in East Asia. Requiring a world war to get land reform and development off the ground is nothing to brag about as the “success of capitalism.”

The reason Korea and Taiwan succeeded while the rest of the Third World also worked hard at development, without succeeding, is that communist class struggle gave the capitalists the chance to get rid of the tenant influence of the landlord class, an influence which continued in India, El Salvador, the Philippines and the Third World generally which still desperately needed the destruction of the landlord class power—the destruction of semi-feudalism.

JAPAN

One reason that land-reform was acceptable even in bourgeois circles pressed by the communists is that the landlords in East Asia were on the wrong side of the war. In China they lined up with the Japanese, often serving as Japanese occupation government officials.

Of course, Japan was already quite developed earlier in this century—as Japan is not relevant to our development discussion here, but Japan is relevant in regard to its role in the war and class struggle. Again in Japan, we see the United States copy the communists, although no one would insist it was based on how little attention the issue of land reform gets. The Japanese land reform that followed World War II was different in important respects from the Chinese experience. Land reform
In Japan was carried out by the U.S. Occupation forces. The Occupation government believed that the tenant class had been an important support of the forces in Japanese society that brought about World War II. Since the Americans had won the war, Japanese landlords were not in a position to offer resistance to reform, and a thoroughgoing reform was carried out. Compensation for landlords was provided for in legislation, but initially this had the effect of sharply reducing the real value of the amounts offered. As a result, Japanese landlord reform also amounted to confiscation of landlord land with little compensation. 23 Notice that the significant difference with the Chinese communist land reform was that U.S. Occupation forces carried it "out instead of a communist army." 24

In contrast, land reforms in places like India failed. The political mechanism was not there. 25 Exile by the militant communists was the best thing for those ex-landlords. Having had their tie to the land cut, these people could now take up a new life. In their new home, the Guomindang, again with U.S. backing, learned their lessons. They did not allow the old patterns of landlord domination to occur in Taiwan and, in fact, they saw to a very high level of income equality generally. The Gini coefficient in Taiwan is one of the lowest in the Third World. 32

THE U.S. ROLE IN MAKING LANDLORD-DEPENDENT

The U.S. foreign policy is basically opportunistic but consistently promotes U.S. interests. When the United States needs stable allies, it aligns with landlord-dominated regimes—like El Salvador's...
Christian or Maoist/Aquino in the Philippines. When the United States and its ruling class friends got their comeuppance, then the United States gave on the land-reform at the first available opportunity.

It is important to note that the dependent bourgeois is afraid of unseating the landlord class if it means mobilizing peasants that could rise against the bourgeoisie as well.

In El Salvador and the Philippines, the United States links both the will and power to force real land reform without risking the overthrow of capitalisms as well as semi- CAPITALISMS. In East Asia though, the balance of power was basically set by the communists, so the United States could choose to do without the landlords in some cases. In both East Asia and the rest of the world, narrow geopolitical (imperialist) interests prevailed but with different results reflecting differing balances of power.

The United States will never act as a real agent for modernization in the Third World. It chooses not to rock the boat, because it might land- lord-dominated regimes are allies. The U.S. imperialists have an inherent interest in land reform like communists do. If landlord and bureaucrat-capitalist Korea can get the job done (building the United States, assuming resources, etc.) then Korea will get U.S. aid. It is in U.S. interest to land owners and capitalist-bureaucrats in the Third World, who Man dubbed “compromised,” that makes the United States the number one supplier of “order” and the number one public health menace.

LATIN-AMERICAN CASES.

One remaining question is why did Taiwan and south Korea diversify and industrialize more successfully than China and north Korea? We will have our answers like south Korea in consequence to the United States and the mass starvation that didn’t happen in the north, but did happen in the south. What about the economy? Part of the answers is found in our review of the book by Lunar Thorne.

People will recall that we Maoists have had some success in south Korea. We don’t believe it is socialism and few people have much real information about it. Still, it is clear that north Korea did not have the option of export-led development to the world’s largest economy — the United States. The same is true of China. China, Taiwan, and Korea were predominately agricultural societies, but the United States and the ruling class copied the communists on agricultural issues. Hence south Korea and Taiwan gained the benefits of intensive class struggle led by communists. What north Korea and Taiwan had that China and north Korea did not have is the world’s largest industrial market available. Indeed, China and north Korea had to devote large resources to defending themselves against U.S. imperialism.

Here the United States began a socialist country, the story would have been different. Thus China and north Korea would have had the same chances as Taiwan and south Korea. This points to the sacred duty of U.S. residents to bring down U.S. imperialism, so that all countries can be brought together in a cooperative world economy, not just the ones favored by U.S. imperialist circles.

What south Korea and Taiwan had that China and north Korea did not have is the world’s largest industrial market available.

In conclusion: 1. Where there is no land reform (the breaking of the landlord class), there is no development. 2. The communists have been the single most important force for land reform. The success of the “little dragons” is due to socialism. 3. The rest of the world can develop quickly if we can break the alliance between the imperialists and landlords and open the Western economy to cooperation with the Third World.

Notes:
2. Ibid., p. 4979.
3. Ibid., p. 498.
4. Ibid., p. 76.
Taiwanese Criticizes MIM View of Export-led Development.

TEXT MIM

"The communists have been the single most important force for land reform. The success of the 'little dragons' is due to socialism." —MIM

He argument on the first sentence. But the second sentence is very questionable. It depends on what the exact definition of "socialism" is.

The success of the little dragons are mostly due to the capitalist incentives to the owners and employees of numerous privately owned businesses, big or small, who work extremely hard trying to get a better living. China's economy had been stagnant under Mao, mainly due to lack of incentives to work hard until Deng's reform. The access to the U.S. market and the high regards to the education helped four little dragons, too. Also had nothing to do with their success. On the contrary, Taiwan and S. Korea had to devote much of their resources (around 43% of their GDP) into military due to Mao's China. Their success would have been closer to Japan's, if they had not been impacted by the comunists.

"The rest of the world can develop quickly if we can break the alliance between the imperialists and landlords and open the Western economy to cooperation with the Third World." —MIM

This is very too simplistic. The innovation of the people to work hard and an environment/system conducive to development are the most important.

—Taiwanese critic
August, 1992

MIM REPLIES

Other countries in the world have a similar capitalist incentive system as Taiwan, but most of them do not develop. We must recall that Taiwan and South Korea are the exceptions. In fact, if you are a hard-core, pro-capitalist thinker, then you should believe that the higher the inequality, the more incentives to work hard. The goal coefficient in Taiwan was close to the FDC's than the vast majority of developing countries. That is why it doesn't have much to do with the incentive structure in this highly political regime. Lenin was also for "the regime of work, neither shall be got," when the Soviet Union was just in its initial phases of development. As I argued, Taiwan's development had to do with getting the break that most developing countries don't get to work with a pre-capitalist landlord class. Then having gotten that break, the next break was a cooperative relationship with a new progressive West, made possible by super-exploitation of Korean and Taiwanese workers for export-led development. Other export-led developing countries fail relative to Taiwan and South Korea, because they didn't get the break on the landlord class.

It is necessary to recognize that it is the United States that is backing landlord-dominated regimes around the world. For every Taiwan and Korea where the United States did the right thing because of communist pressure and the opportunity created by war, there were 25 countries where the United States helped the landlords stay in power.

Other export-led developing countries fail relative to Taiwan and South Korea, because they didn't get the break on the landlord class.

I believe Taiwanese and Koreans have a special duty given their newly emerging economies, a duty you will only agree with if you agree with internationalism. That duty is to speak out against U.S. and other imperialism backing landlord-dominated governments squelching the peoples around the planet.

The next duty is to rearrange wealth trades and investments so capital is left out of corporation. Economic development should not be a matter of countries ganging up on each other to form "trade blocs" and the like. Already we've seen that World War I was caused by precisely such blocs and that World War II was
Manism on International Trade Relations

by a concrete

A lot of people are questioning our Marxist credentials, especially when we say export-led development in Taiwan and Korea was possible. Below we reproduce a quote from the political economy textbook published by the Gang of Four in Shanghai, but first I would like to clarify some issues.

1. The bourgeoisie mindset simplifies Manist view on trade, saying Manists simply favored autarchy (totally independent economic development). That is basically correct, but only under conditions where imperialism dominates. Those of us who are in the United States now should realize that foreign nationals have different responsibilities than they did in their original countries. If we move to another U.S. imperialism, then it will be the biggest surprise to Third World peoples that we could render. Then autarchy would not be required because there would be no imperials making war and superexploiting the Third World nations.

The examples of Korea and Taiwan prove a very simple point: there is a benefit to economic specialization, where terms can be rendered more fairly. Korean and Taiwanese workers were superexploited by U.S. imperialism, but the U.S. imperialism was under tremendous pressure since World War II to put East Asia on a sound economic footing. That is, the U.S. imperialism needed deeper state to let a minority of countries develop successfully while the majority stagnated or regressed.

U.S. aid to Japan is famous, as we mentioned earlier. We think the exceptions of U.S.-hosted class struggle prove the rule that class struggle moves history forward. Theory exceptions are Taiwan, Korea and Japan where the U.S. supported thorough land reform.

2. People who say China had new landlords after 1949 were wrong can not explain why China outperformed all countries in its income category in public health and education. (See previous articles.) The “low-income” countries averaged a life expectancy of 50, while China garnered a life expectancy of 50 and surpassed the average of 50 for “middle-income” countries. These middle-income and low-income countries are the world’s majority and should be studied as capitalist failures.

Basically people who say Mao was just another landlord miss an how China did much better than India, Bangladesh, Philippines, etc. If Mao were a landlord, his term of landlordism was unique and beneficial.

The “low-income” countries averaged a life expectancy of 50, while China garnered a life expectancy of 60 and surpassed the average of 60 for “middle-income” countries.

Meanwhile, our theory explains this perfectly because we say that China got a boost from land reform, but not so much as Taiwan because Taiwan benefited from export-led development and its stagnant economic specialization, something possible ONLY in a minority of countries because of imperialist global strategies and the fact that the imperialist system grouped up on the vast majority of countries to keep them under control for resource exploitation.

3. The situation of newly emerging capitalist successess is not happening for the first time with Japan, Korea and Taiwan. It also happened with Germany in the late 1800s and early 1900s. Germany rocked the Anglo-French boat and World War I was
the result of economic alliances. This magazine is not about World War I, but the same thing is happening now, as XYPN supports people to read a book like Richard Pipes’s Arms and Empire for more information on the subject.

From Chapter 22, “Mutual Aid and Exchange” Fundamentals of Political Economy, PRC, 1974

ON AID—

“Whatever the form of economic aid, the sovereignty of the recipient countries must be strictly respected. No strings should be attached.” (p. 474)

ON AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT—

“The socialist country first of all does its best to help these develop a diversified agriculture which aims at satisfying domestic needs, gradually altering their dependence on imports of major agricultural products and making their national economies develop basically on the basis of gradually strengthening agriculture.” (p. 475)

ON PRINCIPLES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AID, 1974:

1. …Beyond aid as capital assistance, [our] help! They are right. When friendly and cooperative countries develop other cooperative countries benefit because of the advantages of economic specialization and the expansion of peace. (2) See above. 3. Avert economic aid without interest… 4. The purpose of aid is not to create the recipient country’s dependence… 5. Projects chosen for aid in the recipient country should require low investment and quick generation… 6. Provide the best possible conditions and raw materials are positive and necessary goods according to international market conditions…” (p. 475)

Student Challenges UN Political Economy on “Four Tigers” and International Trade

The places which are doing badly economically are the ones that have not been “underemployed.” Look at your typical American house, half the things there are marked “Made in Taiwan” or “Made in China.” Almost nothing there is marked “Made in El Salvador” or “Made in India.” You make
It sounds like the United States is running everything. A lot of the problems of the third world are not due to the United States, but rather are due to poor decision making in the third world. The United States did not develop India or Africa's economic policies. India and Africa developed those policies. It's successful dependent capitalist development—MCs possible in Mainland China today. Latin America is also taking advantage of this. Asia is trying to.

-Joseph Wang
August, 1982

More recently, Joseph Wang added that "Mainland China doesn't need charity from the United States or anyone else in the world. It needs investment," and that the history of international trade in the last ten years proves that it is possible to have cooperative economic relations under capitalism.

He also does not mention the import of coffee beans from El Salvador into the United States and appears unaware of the vicious class struggles regarding the coffee beans that have taken at least 100,000 lives this century—with U.S. blessings and military aid.

With regard to his comments on El Salvador and Latin America, the main problem that we Marxist have in understanding the social conditions of the "aristocrats" with the socialist states are the best propaganda that money could buy. Our critics advocate for the protection of capitalism without being willing to admit those classes whose capitalist has failed—unlike the case of someone like business professor Lester C. Thurow of the Sloan School of Management at MIT.

Typically, our East Asian critics base their arguments on countries that are almost identical to Taiwan's economy. Almost all of them are commodities that have made

and China's 1 billion. He also does not mention the import of coffee beans from El Salvador into the United States and appears unaware of the workers class struggles regarding the coffee bean that have taken at least 100,000 lives this century—with U.S. blessings and military aid.

Thanks to Mao who told China to "stand up," all of East Asia has had some leverage against the U.S. imperialism, who have since trembled at the thought of driving any one of East Asia into revolutionary communism. Joseph Wang and others: Suborned with East Asia take that leverage for granted. He does not seem aware of the fact that for most countries in the world, the entire IMF is smaller than the revenues of one U.S. multinational corporation.

When the economy succeeds, the self-conscious East Asian intellectuals see the success of capitalism. When the economy fails, we see only "policy" mistakes. It's impossible for capitalism to be wrong this way.

Yes, let's look at those policy "mistakes." Wang refers to. Mao Zedong was influential throughout the Third World for leading an independent struggle through military means. He taught the world that the "comparator" class was a bourgeoisie that would bring about policies that benefitted the capitalists and not the people. How right Mao was about comparadors!

In 1981, GM had sales twice as big as the entire national income of Thailand. Furthermore, Thailand had the 16th largest economy among the developing countries. The vast majority of the world's countries are in even weaker position vis-à-vis U.S. imperialism.

When U.S. imperialists want to set up puppet political and BUSINESS leaders in the Third World, they have both economic and military power at their disposal—be it military force. It is simultaneously meant to think that vicious and unpalatable bourgeois classes will arise in the Third World and led to development instead of simply stealing in superspecialization. Those that do see independent capitalist development, also called the national bourgeoisie, but this class is generally too weak to stand up to giant monopoly capitalism—like GM alone. About Third World countries need the type of struggle Mao led to have the leverage sufficient to run their own economies in their own interests. Hence, we at least don't think it is an accident or generalized variability
when Third World “policies” do not contribute to
development.

Our critics also mention India. From our per-
spective, India’s situation is what happens when you
adopt Western-style democracy in the Third World—
not much in terms of economic development. The
comparison with Mao’s China could not be more
striking and we must remember that India and
China alone compose the bulk of the Third World
experience since they have the largest populations.

Moses Malachi Gills, Dwight Parker, Michael Rosener and Donald
Henderson, Economics of Development, New York: W.W. Norton, 1992,
p. 233.

Taiwanese Points Out
Taiwanese Difference

NEAR AMERICA

Taiwan’s model is very different from S.
Korea’s model and Latin America and China are not
following exactly what Taiwan and S. Korea have
done. First of all, Taiwan only allows small-scale
business for private, and government controls the
large industries, such as power plant, phone compa-
nies, gasoline, steel industry, etc. While S. Korea
allows giant industries to be operated privately, S.
Korea has about 13 companies ranked among the
largest 500 companies in the world, but Taiwan
has none. S. Korea is more like another Japan, but Taiwan is
far from another Japan. The model of Latin
American and China is that government controls
almost everything before, and now it is learning up a
little bit for tiny private companies. This situation is
not even close to Taiwan or S. Korea’s case. Besides,
China’s currency is valued the highest among all
these countries, this will cause China lots of effort to
develop its economy than the other three countries.

— Taiwanese rural of both Wang and Hiwi
August, 1992

NOTE: 
As usual, our East Asian critics seem to think
that the state (equating “socialist” sector in their
Chapter 8
Sectarian Reviews
Workers World: Inconsistent Socialists or Consistent Opportunists?

by MC49

September, 1993

The Howard Institution, a right-wing think-tank, calls Workers World Party's (WWP) political line a "bizarre mixture of Trotskyism and Maoism."(4) MLI thinks that's pretty accurate. However, Trotskyism plus Maoism equals opportunism, so perhaps the blend of contradictory views is more appealing than bizarre. MLI hopes that is not the case, and encourages WWP and its members to drop Trotskyism in order to advance socialism.

WWP's politics are more muddled than consistently bad. The 7/19/93 Workers World newspaper (WW) played Fero's distortion of open letter on page 3, HOW's pseudo-feminist march on Washington on page 1, and white worker-class wage struggles on pages 1, 2, and 3. Doing this seemed to show that WWP was more interested in first-world reform than in Fero's real-world revolution. The next week, however, WWP put Fero on page 1. WW's schizophrenic manifests itself not only in their support for rational liberation and the American labor movement, but in their stance, or lack thereof, on the Nicaraguan revolution, in Peru, "Revolutionary groups like Shining Path and Tupac Amaru have rallied support in the countryside and urban areas. Although their programs differ, these groups challenge the legitimacy of a system that keeps the people in dire conditions. They call for the unity of the world's oppressed from Peru, and the overthrow of imperialist politicians who do the bidding of the rich against the poor."(5)

Not only does WWP not take sides between the competing factions, ignoring their usual lack of concern about finding the correct line to lead revolution, they refuse to tell their readers HOW Tupac Amaru's revolutionary program "differs" from the best way forward. Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, principal by MLI. Furthermore, WW does not bother to mention that "the armed organization Sendero Luminoso (Shining Path)" (SLP) is Maoist.(3)

Perhaps WWP is embarrassed that the PCP has found the best way forward, while WWP still can't--or won't--make up its mind.

Furthermore, while south Korea (SKK)'s government is and has been providing the Peruvian regime with weapons and assistance in training its counterinsurgency forces, WWP has been urging support for both north Korea's government and the PCP. "The Peruvian army...can rely on advice, logistical and military support from the US, Soviet Union, Germany, France, Israel, North Korea, Argentina, and other countries."(4) With "friends" like Workers World, the PCP doesn't need enemies.

WWP reports on "mass public celebrations of the 80th birthday of President Kim II Song, the leader of the Korean Revolution." At this celebration, "Kim Jong II, chairman of Workers World Party, led the highest-level delegation from the United States...In addition to Mao, other participants from the U.S. included Scott Marshall of the Communist Party [and] James Warren and Satellite Debate of the Socialist Workers Party...Socialism is alive in People's Korea."(5) Unlike WW, the WWP and CWP are consistent. Both condemn the Marxist revolution in Peru and support its enemies in North Korea and the ex-USRAR.(6)

Again, Workers World tries to have it both ways.

WWP supports "the Peruvian revolutionary movement" because it is "a national liberation struggle...an important battle for the workers and oppressed peoples of the world, just as the revolutions in Vietnam and Cuba were."(7) WWP's analysis fails to recognize how Maoism makes the Peruvian revolution an improvement over the other two. Capitalism was restored without a fight in both Vietnam and Cuba. The Maoist PCP knows that class struggle will continue after it gains state power. Despite this important oversight, WWP correctly supports the PCP. WWP challenges other leftists to do the same: "In the worldwide struggle for liberation and self-determination, there is a wide spectrum of viewpoints and strategies among the hundreds of organizations. The question, though, always invariable boils down to: which side are you on?"(7)

MLI challenges the Workers World Party to answer their own question. Which side are you on, Workers World? Are you on the side of the American labor movement, or are you on the side of the Third World proletariat? Are you on the side of Peruvian or the Guatemalan Tupac Amaru, which fail to liberate people and which instead stifle struggles for revolution, or are you for...
A-Spiral Trajectory: The Failure and Success of Communist Development

Notes:
5. WW, "Worldwide support for People's Vote," 3/30/92, p. 11.
6. The People's Weekly World, 11/30/91, "Pani and Sandra Lumino charged with terrorism," and WW, Millied, 4/23/92, "Pani's Shining Path was terror to impose reactionary policies on working people."

Slingshot

Summer 1992
Fres
Published by a collective at University of California, Berkeley
700 Rahteman Hall, Berkeley, CA 94720

reviewer by MCRB

Slingshot is published by a collective of DCR students and others on an irregular basis. It is usually thoughtful and informative. Like many anarchist-dominated times it does some excellent exposure of imperialism and patriarchy. Unfortunately, the collective generally remains stuck in the fantasyland of anarchism and has difficulty putting forth a working revolutionary solution to the stale of capitalism and the culture of decadence.

Slingshot's real strength lies in its alliances with the oppressed nations. The 16-page Summer 1992 issue featured numerous articles in solidarity with the Los Angeles uprising. Other pieces expose police brutality by the Oakland Police Department and the history of the American genocides against the oppressed nations. A two-page essay on homosexuality, heterosexism, the patriarchy and Bay Area demonstrations round out this revolutionary read...

Much of Slingshot's analysis is summed up in this quote: "The civil liberties that liberals whine about losing today-freedom of speech, assembly, the press, free expression-have never existed for entire sectors of this society." (p. 4) Putting its newspaper where its mouth is, Slingshot gives space to articles by the New African People's Organization (a revolutionary nationalist party). Mumia Abu Jamal (a political prisoner framed up on death row in Pennsylvania) and other Third World representatives. Slingshot is anti-American and anti-imperialist and provides a service to the people. Unfortunately, it has no viable revolutionary method to entail.

Slingshot does not fall into the revisionist trap of reducing revolutionary movements to solely the class struggle. It is very much on the side of national liberation and gender liberation movements and the collective endeavor is deeply involved in street politics.

Unfortunately, Slingshot is anti-Maoist and hence anti-progressive. Past issues have glorified Maria Elena Moyano (the Peruvian counter-revolutionary executed by the Communist Party) and dismissed the revolution in Peru—which is the heart and soul of the revolutionaries' armed struggle in the world today—with the same lying criticisms of the Communist Party of Peru as are leveled by the reactionary New York Times. To its credit, Slingshot is also anti-revisionist and has no truck with Trotskyism, organized religion, homophobia and other pro-imperialist trends.

The problem with Slingshot's philosophy is that it fails to think big. This is the historical contradiction of the anarchist ideology. How do we overthrow the state and use the lessons of the most effective revolutionary experience to date—of which the Chinese Cultural Revolution remains the peak—and truly dismantle monopoly-capitalism and patriarchy? Slingshot contains resistance, but fails to find an operational focus in the present.

Overall, Slingshot tries to take the point of view of the international proletariat and oppressed nations; but by its reliance on small individual actions, and belittling of the efficacy of disciplined vanguard people's parties, Slingshot dooms itself to
remain a lonely voice in the wilderness of the current world war.

Faced is anarchism-comrades, human society is composed of productive forces in antagonism—with relations of production; anarchy of production; classes, nations and genders in antagonism with each other; and billions of oppressed masses who yearn to organize society and to eliminate the suspect privileges of the very suspect individual "right" to rule and exploit divided groups of people. Revolutionary communists look forward to a world in which objective motions are understood and wielded for the well-being of the masses—who are like one large organism divided into five billion similar cells.

Under communism this organism will assume forms and undertakes tasks unsurpassed to us. And future beings will recognize that the organized revolutionary were that destroyed capitalism and its not actually becomes possible with the advent of scientific, man-based insights—brought forward first by the practice of the vanguard organizations of whom Marx, Lenin, Stalin, and Mao were elected leaders. Revolutionary communists do not glorify these men; we simply recognize that the vast organization groups that successfully fought fascism and capitalism and died under the red flag—while constructing real socialist societies—chose to utilize democratic-centralism as the most effective method of doing all that their million have done.

Marxist-Leninist-Maoists have made mistakes. This is not surprising considering that the universe moves in permanent imbalance. But anarchists have never been in a position from which to make mistakes; nor have the anarchists ever systematically described what they would have done better in the Soviet Union prior to 1953 or China prior to 1976—or in Fara today.

As a philosophy, anarchism is rooted in Europe’s “Enlightenment.” During this period in the 18th century, bourgeois characters such as John Locke, John Stuart Mill, David Hume, David Ricardo and Voltaire developed the theory of “enlightened self-interest”—which denied that capitalists actually exploited surplus value from workers. The promulgation of Enlightenment theories helped the European bourgeoisie topple the “dark” feudal religious philosophies of the landed aristocracies and their monarchal institutions of rule. The patriarchy of the King gave way to the oppressive patriarchy of the husband. The “divine rights” of Kings were supplaned by individual “freedoms” for industrial capitalists, merchants and their ruling functionaries.

Revolutionary communists understand that all individuals are mere drops in the ocean. From the ocean of the masses emerge all individual droplets and all tidal events. By maintaining the so-called “rigid” of the individual as the highest expression of freedom, bourgeois philosophers and anarchists egregiously gross over the fact that all production in the world today is already socialized and all value is generated by the vast mass—not by individual production or action.

The task of international mass revolutionary communists is to socialize the legal, cultural and political expressions of human activity which are already based upon mass labor and to further eliminate anarchy—except when society chooses to experience anarchy. The task of the dictatorship of the proletariat is to replace production for exchange (profit) with production and distribution for use. The task of the socialist state is to eliminate the basis for exploitation and the scarcity of production for profit. Without this dictatorial state full the bourgeoisie will hang onto power forever. The bourgeoisie is organized.

Anything less than seizure of state power has proved simply to perpetuate the anarchy of capitalism. Witness the reappearance of the scarcity of production and capitalism in the ex-socialist states of the Soviet Union and China. These states have been traded for with blood. Responsible revolutionaries study these pragmatic, useful and real lessons.

MIM applauds Singletar for not glorifying the false “revolutionary potential” of the American working class; as many anarchists and revolutionaries do. The practice of the Singletar collective is indeed more politically “advanced” than the practice of all the phony Marxists in the world. Individuals in the collective (and the collective as a whole) are urged to struggle with MIM around the questions raised here. You have nothing to fear but the loss of your individuality.

In conclusion, MIM notes that Singletar calls for a society “free of hierarchy, domination, and all forms of exploitive social relations.” Singletar states that, “Reality can destroy the dream; why shouldn’t the dream destroy reality?” Continuous mass revolutions will destroy hierarchy, domination and coercion. MIM shares this dream with the anarchists; but MIM is no dreamer. MIM is a materialist force for organizing the oppressed to build independent power and to seize and use state power and to edu-
Socialist Workers Party Sells It's Secrets to Imperialism

by MCB6
July, 1962

The Socialist Workers Party (SWP) recently sold to Stanford University's reactionary Hoover Institution, for an undisclosed sum, "300 boxes of the SWP's internal records documenting its international relations and links to other Trotskyist parties around the world, as well as what is believed to be the most complete collection of the annotated speeches of Cuban dictator Fidel Castro, long a hero of the far left in the United States, and a massive collection of the notes and manuscripts of Leon Trotsky."

"The shipment also included the papers of Peng Shuhui, a founding member of the Chinese Communist Party and later the leader of Chinese Trotskyism. His works are regarded as the only reliable scholarly source on the early history of Chinese communism."

William Radliff, Hoover senior research fellow, comments that, "Trotskyist ideologues must have an IQ at least 50 points above the typical communist. They're usually very smart people."(1)

MINI INTELLIGENCE TEST:
1. The smartest communists believe
   a) that Mao Zedong was a secret admirer of Trotsky.
   b) that Fidel Castro is and was a communist.

   c) that Leon Trotsky secretly led the Chinese Revolution after escaping his own assassins by replacing himself with a dummy.
   d) that after gaining the Masses victory in China, Trotsky assumed the pseudonym "Lin Shao-ch'i" and was assuring Third World countries to build up their productive forces until he was unjustly slandered by the fanatic and infantile Chinese masses before, during and after the Cultural Revolution.
   e) that it serves the world revolution to give your internal party documents to a think-tank run by imperialist enemies of the proletariat.

2. Typical Trotskyists are so smart because
   a) they were born that way.
   b) they become smart after reading the writings of Trotsky.
   c) they become really, really smart after reading the 75,000 hours of annotated speeches by Fidel Castro.
   d) the workers are deformed.
   e) the masses are dumb.
   f) capitalism is really a type of deformed communism and it is better to join the enemy than to beat the enemy.
   g) mighty brains at work in the bowels of the Hoover Institution will help to establish the Fourth International.
   h) the Hoover Institution has offered Stalin Trotsky a job annotating the annotations of Fidel's speeches and now that the SWP no longer has to support Stalin (who shares an eight-bedroom walk-up with fellow-Trotskyite Abe Aschan in the Champs Elysees) SWP can afford to free-drop the Militant in Pentagonal vendetta.
   i) rather than organizing the oppressed and exploited to seize power, they sit back and make anarchist-criticism of those who do so successfully.
   j) Bill Clinton just adopted the SWP programma loud, stock and barrel.

NOTES:
San Francisco Chronicle 7/16/92, p. A20.
MM polemicizes with *The Truth Hurts*

**The Truth Hurts**

P.O. Box 3111
Amherst, MA 01004

October, 1992

TO THE TRUTH HURTS: "The Militant Internazionlist Movement (MIM) is sending you the following criticisms of your newspaper in the hopes of entering into a struggle and dialogue with your organization. Enclosed is a copy of our paper.

You take an impressive anti-imperialist stand in most of your articles, and clearly have done much research. If you would like national distribution of your writings at a lower price than you could get paying to print the paper by yourself, MIM suggests you consider printing your paper inside our line. MIM will print your paper on a printing press and mail out by other organizations in our line (clearly marked as unfettered with MIM). This is distributed with our paper, and you can get as many copies as you need for your own distribution work, including copies that are not part of our paper. If you are interested in this idea, let us know and we will send you more information including an example of how this was done with another publication.

The first article in *The Truth Hurts*, "Baby and Me: and Big Brother Makes Three," is a good anti-imperialist story about population control and the oppression of Third World women. This is what real feminism is about. Unfortunately, too often the First World "feminist" movement ignores Third World people as it spins over itself to make deals with the government to get a better deal for white women. "Feast and Famine" is also a good anti-imperialist piece.

"The Economics of Education: Classism Perpetuated" points out the important inequalities between inner city and suburban schools and the reasons for this structure as a part of capitalism. But this article fails to provide a real solution.

"It is unlikely that the educational system will ever be more than a grim affirmation of class and racial structure unless we overcome this servile attitude.... For true change to occur, upper and middle class white parents will have to acknowledge that it is time to stop hoarding resources and start thinking in a more communal manner."

This conclusion says that if people can just stop being selfish, education will improve for the oppressed in this country. This is in striking contrast to the harsh reality presented in other articles in your paper that clearly explain the connections between the government and corporations and the control these powers have over the way this country is structured.

You are telling people to go out and try to convince the wealthy (white nation) they should give up their privileges because it is the right thing to do. You don't really believe this would work do you? People have been trying strategies like this for hundreds of years with no success. The only significant blows against inequality that have been struck anywhere worldwide are the result of revolutionary struggle. Look at the advances in educational equality in China, Nicaragua, Africa, the Soviet Union, or even Peru in the liberated zones where the Peruvian Communist Party is in control. Nothing achieved under capitalism or colonialism even comes close to these advances.

The article "12 Years, Death to Good People" does a good job pointing out the links between big business/corporations and the government. And it is correct to say that there is something people can do to fight this. In fact, the example of a successful action such as the one you are advocating (the boycott of Nestle) is an important point to raise when supporting a strategy. But unfortunately a successful boycott of Nestle is quite a minor point and this example has to raise the question of what you are really trying to accomplish.

If you just want to hurt one company, it is possible that a boycott will have the effect of changing the policies of that company if the boycott is large enough. But so what? This country is not made up of just one company, and it plays right into the government's hands for people to target one "evil company" at a time while all the others are free to go on with their exploitative and oppressive practices.

Advocating a boycott of GM as an effective way to fight the production of nuclear weapons and corporate influence over government decisions is deceiving. This says to people that only one company is bad. Surely you recognize that it is not just one bad apple that causes oppression and militarism.

This is a product of the imperialist system we live
Why mislead people into thinking that boycotting a small part of this system will significantly change the system?

Again MMT points to the historically most effective method of ending militarism and oppression: revolution. There is no better example of an effective practice to fight all the evils of the American system that you correctly oppose.

"Raging Righteous, But Burning Blind": This article provides a good argument in support of the existence of a black nation in the United States that is oppressed by the white nation through a structure of society supported by government CONRIPRO operations. MMT sees a lot to agree with in the article, but would go further to call the oppression of blacks not just economic, but national oppression.

Back page: "What's your share of the wealth?"
The implication on this page that 10% of the American population are wealthy while the other 90% are poor and oppressed is unfortunately a common myth among lifters, even anti-imperialists such as yourselves. MMT devoted the first issue of its theory journal to the question of the white working class—the issue underlying your statistics here. The following is a brief explanation of why your logic is incorrect. If you are interested in pursuing this further, the real economic arguments of where the wealth comes from are developed in our theory journal which we encourage you to check out.

Your statistics are likely correct that 10% of the population owns more wealth than all the rest of the population combined, in fact more than 90% of the wealth. But the question that needs to be raised is whether or not the other 90% of the population is getting such a bad deal.

MMT says that some pigs are bigger than others, meaning that there are the big imperialist pigs who get the largest share of the wealth, and then there are the smaller pigs who get a smaller share of the imperialist wealth. But they are both pigs, and MMT does not organize in the interests of those benefiting from the exploitation of the Third World. MMT sees the bottom fifth (or less) of the population in America as those who really are oppressed: as other animal in your paper seemed to agree, this fifth is mostly the Black, Latino, and indigenous nations, many of whom live in the inner cities.

In reality, while Amerikka has an interest in seeing the current political system in the United States perpetuated, sure, the majority of the white masses don't get the millions that some Americans do, but they get plenty of profit from the exploitation and oppression of the Third World. Their wages are so high because of the state's extraction. This is why the poor-class whites voted for David Duke in dozens—he offered them the least imperialist deal: a bigger share of profits from imperialism.

The white nation is not being exploited by the rich capitalists; they are getting profits from the exploitation of the Third World. It can easily be shown that the capitalists' profits do not come from the white nation.

After the profits in 1980 amounted to $73.6 billion(1), this means that 3.3% of GNP is profit. These profits can easily be explained by the exploitation of national minority workers within U.S. borders. These workers get about 70% of what white workers get, and that's only if they're documented. About 30% of the GNP is accounted for by national minority workers within U.S. borders. Giving 70% of that amount to minority workers leaves 33% of GNP as the difference in pay between white and national minority workers generated by discrimination alone. Six percent of GNP is nearly all the profits before taxes. That leaves the labor surplus (the white nation) to get paid for all its hard labor while receiving all the superprofits from exploitation of the Third World outside U.S. borders. (See MMT Theory for more specifics on this argument and these calculations).

Organizing in the interests of the middle-class in America will only result in greater oppression for the majority of the world's people and support for the imperialist status-quo. Forming groups like these on the back of your paper supports the unresearched claim that middle-class Amerikka is oppressed and exploited and should be getting a bigger share of the American imperialist wealth—a claim that works counter to the interests of the oppressed of the world.

You are welcome to print all or part of this letter in your paper if you wish to publicly respond to our criticisms. Regardless, we encourage you to reply to us and defend your positions.

MMT does have a lot of basis agreement with your organization and hopes to work and struggle with you in the future as we both learn and advance our theory and practice.

Comment on the “Call to form Organizing Committee to establish an organization to educate, organize, and finally lead the masses in the inevitable transformation of our society.”

For a copy of the “Call,” write
People’s Tribune,
PO Box 3524, Chicago, IL
60654 or call 312-866-3551

A friend of mine sent me the “Call,” so this response is the letter sent to our friend.

by a comrade
January, 1963

Thank you for the page from the People’s Tribune with the “Call to form Organizing Committee.” The party printing this call is the Communist Labor Party (CLP).

CLP is not there doing a lot of work on police brutality and the conditions of the poor. The story on the Detroit case is a case in point. The “Call” seems very much in the spirit of CLP work.

Our comrades at the Organization for Revolutionary Unity (ORU) also gave up Marxism because of their belief that the domestic situation is principal. They joined the Jesse Jackson campaign.

From the language of the “Call,” it sounds like a call to build a vanguard party, but it neither states that phrase, nor this word “communism.” Given the context, this is symptomatic from the beginning.

We also don’t see that the CLP has renounced its book on the Soviet Union which said that capitalism-restoration is impossible. The Communist Labor Party took on Marxist errors at one time, before Lenin Silver and crew demanded the communist movement back in the early 1980s. Line of March, CWP and CLP were all saying get rid of Marxism. Of course, Line of March and CWP are dead. History quickly vindicated the Marxists in the 20th century.

The “Call” you sent us asks the driving line questions as principally domestic. There is no mention of the international situation in the call. Our comrades at the Organization for Revolutionary Unity (ORU) also gave up Marxism because of their belief that the domestic situation is principal. They joined the Jesse Jackson campaign.

The “Call” says the new organization should “not itself among the oppressed, the exploited, the homeless and the hungry of all colors and nationalities.” That pretty much sums up the essence of the clarity of the “Call.” How does this differ from the Rainbow Coalition? Those who share our view on the failure of the Jesse Jackson strategy have things to say about that strategy historically. In particular, we believe the greatest advances have been made where there have been rank-and-file parties. However, we can’t say that with any study of the international history of the communist movement.

The tone for struggles over the interpretation of history is at the beginning of organizing drives, one where they are already sputtering or failing outright. This is not going to create the same sense of urgency or movement that does not explicitly recognize why it is that the white nation creating class is not an ally. How can you cast yourself in the “exploited,” if you don’t define “exploited”? And where is the “Call” in the call for reparations to the Third World from Apartheid?”

We agree with a lot of what is said in the “Call,” but there is no class basis to organizability. The tough issues require a struggle. If we can’t recognize the history of this century, when advance has been made and when history, broadly-speaking, went backward, we can’t be able to move move in practice, since we won’t have the benefits of hindsight so we carry out our practices now. If we can’t recognize what happened when history went back-ward in the Soviet Union and China, and if we can’t recognize the historical lessons of attempting to break the encyclopedic to the capitalist hampering... then we’ll have an even harder time recognizing opportunities, victories and losses in the current context.
Guardian bites the dust

by MCS

In September, 1972 the Guardian: Radical group apparently published its last issue. According to a brochure that used to carry the paper, the Guardian made a press release or explanation for its dissolution.

The Guardian had made large fundraising appeals earlier this year claiming it would go defunct if the appeals were not met. Even if the Guardian eventually comes back in some newly reorganized form, MML would say the Guardian has been politically dead for years.

At the beginning of its existence, MML took out year-long ads in the Guardian and printed many valuable readers that way. From MML’s perspective, the principal reason the Guardian fell to an unsustainable circulation has to do with its losing its revolutionary roots.

In the late 1960s, the Marxist-Leninist radicals labeled the Guardian, which carried favorable articles about socialist China. At this time it seemed the largest circulation of any newspaper on the “left;” although, the Black Panther papers and the Progressive Labor paper (circ. 90,000 in 1970) were also very large. (1)

The Panthers were smashed; and PL carassed into Trotskyist oblivion, but the Guardian chose a different route. As such, the Guardian is an excellent example of what MML calls the problem of “stalinism” and “Trotskyism” — bourgeois influence that any modernizing movement has to be repressed. This must be done to save the revolution and to maintain its revolutionary integrity.

The Guardian was a product of the movement, and the Guardian is an example of how the movement can go wrong if it loses its revolutionary direction. The Guardian was a product of the movement, and the Guardian is an example of how the movement can go wrong if it loses its revolutionary direction.

In 1973, the Guardian had “sponsored a series of forums... What Road to Building a New Communist Party?” At that time, MML influence, and eventual triumvirate, Irwin Silber, said, "Today, Marxist-Leninist forces in the U.S. are moving inexorably towards the creation of a new communist party."

One thousand people attended one meeting of these conferences on building an anti-imperialist, non-Trotskyist, non-anarchist party. It appeared that Marxism was going to lead the “movement” inside U.S. borders forward; however, as we have detailed elsewhere, a lack of political development and narrow nationalism and individualism opportunism caused the Marxist forces who were trying to regroup after the state smashed the Panthers.

At this time, the Guardian had quite a press, including co-opted newspapers whose staffs were professional and political. Eventually the Guardian gave up its “Marxist-Leninist” pretensions and simply adopted the word “radical” in its masthead.

Eventually the Guardian gave up its “Marxist-Leninist” pretensions and simply adopted the word “radical” in its masthead. Many former-influenced, individual and opportunists have asked MML to do the same thing — incorrectly viewing the legacy of
Mao, Lenin and Mao as an abstruse that must be tossed aside.

Time and again we revolutionary set forth we isolate ourselves by taking definitive stands on the large historical questions of our time. Yet, while the Guardian was watered down its line and taking an eclectic stance—attempting to hail pseudo-radicalism, revisionism and anything that moved—Adlai Stevenson was growing with a tiny fraction of the budget that the Guardian had. The more it watered down its line and confused its readers, the more the Guardian itself went down the drain. Despite the support of some key wealthy backers, the Guardian's eclecticism only encouraged the lack of political commitment and confusion that ended its existence.

It is not likely that racist and pro-white working class social-democracy will die. Not well ideologically in the forms of Trotskyism and Maoism will die. These ideologies have solid material bases. However, the niche of the far left claiming to be eclectic, anti-capitalist, "radical" and "effective" is sustained only when the bourgeoisie seeks to undermine successful and genuine communist movements.

One factor in the Guardian's demise was a decline of the international communist movement, and the second factor was the Guardian's own political death—which preceded its actual death.

"Where there is a vibrant communist movement and a party-conscious vacillating in response, a paper like the Guardian can thrive for a time on eclecticism, opportunism and any politics just short of real commitment. Since the Guardian did not base itself in the revolutionary vanguard of Mao Zedong Thought, it did not have a base in the revolutionary class, the most desperate and determined fighters for anti-imperialism, anti-militarism, anti-capitalism—the international proletariat.

Like the CP of the 1930s, and the Black nationalist movements, the Guardian found that the more a strayed from its revolutionary roots, the more able it was to attract occasional large financial backers, but the less able it was to sustain large movements—a supreme irony considering that political opportunism is almost always advocated as a matter of attracting support.

With the collapse of the Guardian and a number of other radical organizations, our own commitment to building Adlai Notes is underscored. The instant slide of the ex-Soviet Union into pro-Western capitalism is winnowing the field of "radical" organizations. Adlai welcomes aboard ex-Guardian people and others who have analyzed the relative success of genuine communist movements compared with mostly opportunistic movements.

"The problem of the day is not whether or not a world conspiracy can cause a world conflagration and that a world war must necessarily be a thermonuclear war which means the annihilation of mankind..." (In contradiction to this theory, it must be noted that) large scale and small scale revolutionary wars against the imperialists and their lackeys, which have never paused, have hit hard at the imperialist forces of war, strengthened the forces defending world peace and effectively prevented the imperialists from realizing their plan of launching world war..." (In short, according to the leaders of the CPSU, with the emergence of nuclear weapons, the contradiction between the socialist and imperialist camps, the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the capitalist countries, and the contradiction between the oppressed nations and imperialism have all disappeared. The world no longer has any class contradictions.) (Communist Party of China, Politburo, 1963, p. 197, 244.)

"Revolution in the 80's: Go, For It!" (RCP slogan)
The heart of Revolutionary Communist Party theorist's Lenin's `Siege of the Third World' and the `Marxist' theory is summed up in the following quote from his book:

"In this world, there are two major classes, the oppressors and the oppressed. The oppressor class, the imperialist class, includes the ruling classes of the so-called 'developed' countries, and the oppressed class includes the working classes of the so-called 'underdeveloped' countries. The oppression of the latter by the former is the root cause of all contradictions in the world."

A Spiral Trajectory: The Failure and Success of Communist Development

For Engels, anarchy in production was simply one aspect of a contradiction which includes its opposite aspect, the organization of the capitalist workplace. This is the historic struggle between the ruling classes and the producers of value. In AIP, Lenin never states that anarchy is principal over organization. He simply assumes it and carries on from there. By focusing on intra-class conflicts between men or races within the same class, he neglects to consider the broader struggle between classes.

For Engels, anarchy in production was simply one aspect of a contradiction which includes its opposite aspect, the organization of the capitalist workplace. This is an error since the Peasants must consider the inter-imperialist contradiction to be of the same weight as the others — except as how its development might influence the global process of war and revolution. The CFC states it's overall argument concerning the dangers of nuclear war to the peacefulness of a socialist camp. Neither the CFC, Lenin, Stalin, nor Mao Zedong stress the inter-imperialist contradiction. Rather, they methodically stress the primacy of class struggles and the domination of the oppressed nations by monopoly capitalist groups. They stress that imperialism means conquest, not penetration by revolutions.

In the period leading up to 1962 the CFC's Polisario identified four basic contradictions in the global process of that time:
- between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp
- between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the capitalist countries
- between the oppressed nations and imperialism
- among imperialist countries and among monopoly capitalist groups.

The CFC also reiterated that, "Nobody can deliberate any of these fundamental contradictions, or subjectively substitute one for all the rest."
They stated that, "While the U.S. imperialists are actually preparations mak- a world war (against the socialist camp), they also use this propaganda as a smokescreen for their aggression of the American people and for the extension of their aggression against the rest of the capitalist world."

(Plenum, p. 12)

While the Plenum understands that the majority of Americans are not very opposed to this theft, China agrees with the Plenum that:

"It is impossible for the working class in the European and American capitalist countries to liberate itself unless it unites with the oppressed nations and, unless these nations are liberated, unless all the states that are not united ... oppose monopoly capitalism, defend democratic rights, oppose the menace of fascism, improve living conditions, oppose imperialist arms expansion and war preparations, defend world peace and actively support the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed nations."

(Plenum, p. 14-15)

Obviously, the CPC is in direct contradiction with CCP political economy. Following the counter-revolution in China the principle contradiction in the world has been between imperialism and the nationally delineated populations of surplus-value producers, it exploits and oppresses.

By elevating the anti-imperialist contradiction to a central and determining position, the Plenum attempts to elaborate the contradictions between imperialism and the Third World oppressed nations in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Along the way, the Plenum attempts to liquidate the theoretical basis for material support of revolutionary nationalist struggles.

If one accepts Atayal's infamous statement from his "Conquer the World..." that "Maoism without Leninism is nationalism..." ("6TP," p. 29) then one must be prepared to demonstrate that "Leninism" is somehow separate from revolutionary nationalism. Since Lenin is fond of regimes -- let's examine his use of advocacy.

**MONOPOLY-CAPITALISM & NATIONAL OPPOSITION**

Finance capital concentrates global capital and strives to replace free competition with monopoly restrictions. Monopoly capitalism has certain features which are best summed up in Lenin's "Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism."

...) and its operations, change the world... in proportion to capital, in proportion to strength, (which) varies according with the degree of economic and political development. In order to understand what happens, it is necessary to know what combinations are utilized by the changes in factors. The question as to whether these changes are "purely" economic or political (e.g., military) is a secondary one, which does not affect the fundamental issue of the weight of capitalism.

To subscribe to the concept of the struggle and overthrow of capitalism which combines the tactics of the struggle for socialism, and agreements (today peaceful, tomorrow war-like, the next day war-like again) is to sink to the role of a capitalist."

(Lenin, Imperialism, p. 76)

The Third World is the primary source of surplus value for the monopoly group today. The one hundred-thousandths since the annihilation of Hiroshima and Nagasaki have simply exacerbated the ongoing daily world war against the people in which, on a good day, only 10,000 children die of starvation; World War II has never ceased since it began for the "political purposes of imperialism are reaction all along the line, and increased national oppression, resulting from the expression of the financial oligarchy and the elimination of free competition." (Lenin, Imperialism, p. 150)

The international imperialism social order and exposed to the masses of the whole world as entirely. To obliterate their identity as a group is to abandon the revolutionary potential of national liberation struggles and Lenin's practice of the united front against imperialism. Abandoning national liberation struggles is to make impossible the two-stage anti-capitalist revolution which is the principal form of struggle available to the masses trapped in the oppressed nations and internal colonies.

Lenin is not the first symposium theorist to do this.

"Having failed to understand that, lively because of the central question... namely, how will we Social-Democrats abolish national oppression? He abounds the question aside with phrases about the world being "demoralized in blood," etc. (though this has no bearing on the masses under discussion). This leaves only one simple argument: the socialist revolution will solve everything." (Lenin, The Recent Trend of Imperialist Expansion, p. 68-69)

**CONCLUSION**

Imperialist societies are united not only by their common struggle against the masses but also by competition, which must not be considered alone in
it's anarchic aspect, but must also be considered as
a form of organization, i.e., capitalist competition is
an objective motion by which surplus value is pro-
duced and distributed to the class of capitalists.
Monopolies compete, contend and collude with
such zeal for the cause of the social wealth. This
motion is as anarchic and organizational.
Without competition between capitalists, cap-
tal movement would not exist at all and capital
would not be centralized, concentrated - or short-
circuited. Engels' anarchic/organizational paradigm is
two-sided and contains two opposite movements:
regulation, which is anarchic and expressed in the
anarchy of production based on profit, and attrac-
tion, which is organizational and expressed through
the specialization of production and concentration of
capital. It is not this contradiction, however, that
creates surplus value. Surplus value only arises
from the antagonism between the exploiters and the
exploited.

Historically, the internal contradictions and
struggles leading to imperialist wars have perma-
nanced and organized imperialist capital; even as exter-
nal conditions favorable to communitarian revolu-
tions have been created inside oppressed national
nations. Overall, imperialist class collaboration
before, during, and after their wars can easily be
seen in the annals of their "armistices," "treaties,
" and secret agreements. Recently, the monopoly
groups carved out sections of the Middle East before
the first Gulf War took place.

Objectively, war, like competition, organizes
the monopolists and distributes surplus-value, capital,
among them according to their strength, accord-
ing to the size of the capital they already command.
Imperialist war has been driven by the necessity of
multi-national corporations and social-imperialist
entities to super-exploit the Third World, and not
ly by the requirements of nationally-based capital
units to remain intact, as the RFC would have us
believe.

The competitive fusion of the capitalist world
market reveals the tendency of capitals to organize
themselves into larger capitals even as they split
and divide in order to do so. This movement appears
as anarchic and reflects Marx's statement in Wage,
Labor and Capital that:

"The anarchical movement, in which time is
compensated by fall and rise, is regulated by
them (the bourgeois economists - ed.) as chance.
With just as much right one could regard the fluctua-
tions as the law ... The total movement of this dis-
corder is its order, in the cause of this industrial
anarchy, in this movement in a circle, competition
compensating, as it so to speak, for one excess by
means of another." (EWC, p. 38)

For the RFC anarchical movement is not com-
partimentalized by competition and the resulting
monopoly-capitalism (and their capital are "rooted" not at the
site of production in the Third World but at the
site of consumption inside imperialist countries. In
reality, the opposite is true. The monopolists consti-
tuently shift from government to government and from
one form of monetary exchange to another. The RFC
targets to consider the real object of the struggle
between the monopoly-groups as it falsifies "anarch-
ic.

"International cartels show to what point capi-
talist monopolies have developed, and they reveal
the object of the struggle between the various capi-
talist groups. This last circumstance is the most
important; it alone shows us the historic-economic
significance of events; for the forms of struggle vary
and constantly change in accordance with varying,
relatively permanent, and temporary causes, but the
essence of the struggle, its class content, cannot
change while classes exist." (Lenin, Imperialism, p.
74-75)

As a group the capitalists, alike assessed by
the populations of imperialist countries, tend to
unite as an international class against the
capitalist masses who are their sole source of
wealth. Consider the record of armament sales to
"freedom" and "freedom" allies by the multi-nationals in
this century of war. Consider the inter-locking bank-
ing system.

MONOPOLY VERSUS FREE COMPETITION

(For the class-conscious economic formation of imperialism is monopoly ... which has grown
out of capitalism and exists in the general environ-
ment of capitalism, commodity production and com-
petition, and remains in perennial and insoluble contradiction to this general environment." (Lenin;
Imperialism, p. 38)

"But the division of the world between two
powerful trusts does not remove the possibility
of redissolution, if the relation of forces changes as a
result of new development, war, bankruptcy, etc." (Lenin; Imperialism, p. 70)

The contradiction between finance capital and
free capitalist competition is the contradiction
between imperialism and the oppressed nations.
Imperialism is not only eternal to the oppressed
nations; it also exists materially within them as it restricts the ability of national bourgeoisie to engage in capitalist competition.

By focusing on the contradictions between the political alliances of governments the ICP pictures a world revolution conditioned only by external forces and not by the internal laws of uneven capitalist development.

Lenin’s “trusts” are today’s multinational. Imperialism not only means capitalists of war, it also means that war is an violent economic phenomena experienced hourly by the exploited and oppressed. But, for the ICP, war is not limited to economics.

“War, however, is not an economic phenomenon…” (AID, p. 159)

Lenin recognized that finance capital exists in opposition to the industrial/merchant capital struggling to expand within the oppressed nations. Lenin saw that the world contradiction of imperialism is between the oppressors and the oppressed. Lotte attempts to reduce Lenin’s analysis to a contradiction between isolated empires.

“Says Lotte, “Imperialist” rivalry, Lenin stressed, and to ultimately devolves into the struggle for a new political division of the world, which subsumes the struggle over economic division.” (AID, p. 153)

Here Lotte addresses the political features of imperialism, regarding, as we can see, the relationship between politics and economics. Politics springs from and is a continuation of the economic struggle, not the reverse. After trying to teach certain trends in political economy that emphasize the Third World’s and challenge AID’s fetishism, Lotte states that, despite uneven development, “the political situation reflects the state of the economy.” (AID, p. 153). This “whole,” the several thousand million exploited masses are the “oppressed periphery.”

Should the reader question Lotte’s Leninism, Lotte reminds us, “However, as Lenin himself recognized, imperialism was only an outline.” (AID, p. 153)

Lotte observes the very economic base upon which imperialism thrives. He observes the source of the loot over which imperialism fights each other and the masses. It is not the actual extraction of surplus value at the rate of labor (and revolution) that concerns Lotte. He is interested only in what proportion surplus-value is distributed among imperialist nations. For Lotte the imperialist class is irreversibly fragmented into national units cohering only in political “kiosks.”

Lenin recognized that the international monopolists are diametrically opposed to the exploited workers and peasants, as well as to the lesser capitalists who function as the instruments of these exploitation and are registered in their development capabilities by monopolized ownership of the world’s means of production.

“Monopoly is exactly the opposite of free competition…” (Lenin, Imperialism, p. 49.)

Says Lotte, “The composition to which Lenin refers is not merely within the non-monopoly sector or between monopoly and non-monopoly but among these enormous imperialized blocks of capital.” (AID, p. 65)

Note that it is fundamental for Lotte that composition for ownership of surplus-value exist only between imperialists and not between the imperialists and the rest of the world.

DEFENDING LENIN

It is now necessary to examine Lotte’s conclusions from Lenin’s political economy in the context from which they are lifted.

To substantiate his own arguments Lotte quotes selectively from Lenin’s thesis examining the antagonism relationship of imperialism to non-monopoly capital. AID’s quotes appear in plain text. Lenin’s context is added in bold text.

“Imperialism emerged as the development and direct continuation of the fundamental characteristics of capitalism in general. But capitalism only became capitalist imperialism at a very definite and very high stage of its development when instead of its fundamental characteristics began to change into their opposites, when the features of the epoch of transition from capitalism to a higher mode and economic system had taken shape and revealed themselves all along the line. Economically, the main thing in this process is the subjugation of capitalist monopolies by imperialist monopolies. Free competition is the fundamental characteristic of capitalism, and of competitiveness production. Monopoly is exactly the opposite of free competition… (2) does not abolish the latter, but exists over it and alongside of it, and therefore gives rise to a number of very acute, intense antagonisms, friction and conflicts. Monopoly is the transition from capitalism to a higher system.” (AID, p. 25; Imperialism, p. 95)

From the get-go Lotte ignores and deletes the dialectical essence of Lenin’s analysis. He does not
attempt to refute Lenin; he simply mutates him. This is his standard procedure throughout AID. Whenever Lenin mentions concentration, monopoly, or ownership, in such a way that might illustrate Lenin's "anarchy of competition = inter-imperialist rivalry = World War Three" theory, Lotta simply deletes, slaps over, or omits the elements of Lenin's analysis that do, in actuality, contradict Lotta.

In the following Lenin quote, with Lotta's deletions restored, we see how Lotta tries to set up an authoritative ground for his denial of the real role of the financial oligarchy and his assertion of the "proletarian national", nation of international capital, which, if true, would preclude heavy concentration between, say, English-speaking and Russian-speaking monopolistic groups.

"Capitalism in its imperialist stage leads right up to the most comprehensive socialization of production; it, so to speak, strips the capitalists, against their will and consciousness, into some sort of a new social order, a transitional one from complete free competition to complete socialization." (AID, p. 26; Impossibilism, p. 25)

Not only does this above demonstrate that Lotta recognized the existence of an international financial oligarchy that is rooted in global production and transcends national economic boundaries; it contains thoughts, detailed by Lotta, that are antithetical to the political economy of the RFC which typically rests on theories of the productive forces as determinate. These Trotskyite theories ignore the revolutionary role played by masses composing the oppressed nations. For Lotta the possibilities for revolution are dependent upon "revolutionary communist internationalists" existing inside "declining" capitalist countries. No peasants need apply.

Says Lotta, "This chapter ... is, of necessity, a defense and extension of Lenin's analysis of imperialism." (AID, p. 26)

Here follows the reversionism.

Another obfuscatory technique employed by Lotta is the incredible reappearance Technology. Here is an early example from a quantity limited only by the number of pages in the book.

"Independently organized labor processes are dominated by the pursuit of profit ... The law of value unites these fragments into a social whole." (AID, p. 37)

The pursuit of profit is absolutely the result of the existence of the law of value; as are all labor processes existing within the capitalist mode of production. On the one hand, Lotta seems to be stating the obvious. On the other hand, he reimagines to artificially separate the "law of value" from "the pursuit of profit," and the "social whole" from "the independently organized labor processes." These separations are vital to his theory of "anarchy as the driving force."

Including the ellipses, Lotta's statement actually says: the contradiction of the law of value is to be discerned in the workings of the law of value: Unlike Marx, Lotta does not consider capital to be a social relation that can only exist in relation to the whole of capital. He is compelled to fragment it in order to prove that the imperialists must frighten themselves to grab pieces of capital. For Lotta capital is not as much a universal social relation as it is a series of salable things.

Lotta sets up a falsely weighted dichotomy between organization in the workplace and industry in social production by claiming the law of value, ultimately, as a law only applicable to one aspect of the production relations: reproduce competition.

... (While the relations of capital force their way through the process of accumulation, including, for instance, the tendencies to profitability of international capital, it is the anarchy of a single global reproductive process which drives imperialism into crisis. Anarchy becomes accumulation depends on a qualitatively new and greater way on the functioning of independent and non-monetary relationships which are drawn more tightly by finance capital. (AID, p. 101)

Beneath the verbiage this sentence actually says, while the tendency of the rate of profit to fall exists, it is the tendency of the rate of profit to fall which drives imperialism into crisis, exactly because
accumulation depends on a new system in which there is a tendency for the rate of profit to fall.

Along the way the means disappear from the equation and the economies of the oppressed nations/societies are condemned to extinction by a "global repressive complex" which is really only the development of productive forces somehow divorced from the producers. In this sense the actual existing tendency of the rate of profit to fall is ideologically represented as a real accomplishment.

But the case is yet to come.

"Building on Lenin's schematisation of the political economy of the epoch, Bob Avakian has given a more precise meaning to this change in world relations and, in particular, to its significance for the international class struggle..." (AID, p. 91.)

"It is the antagonistic relations among capitalist producers, and not the mere existence of propertyless producers or the class contradiction as such, which divide these producers to exploit the working class on an ever more intensive and extensive scale. Were we capitalist commodity producers separated from each other and yet linked by the operation of the law of value, they would not face the same competition to make widely and deeply exploit the proletariat internationally - the class contradiction between bourgeoisie and proletariat could thus be mitigated. Movement compelled by struggle is the principal form of motion of the contradiction between stateless production and private appropriation." (AID, p. 51; quoted from Avakian's "Fundamental and Principal Contradictions On A World Scale," 1982.)

"Aside from the fact that it is not capitalists, but proletarians, who produce capital and that both classes are defined by their mutual relation to commodity production; the paragraph above, in logical verbatim, reads:

It is competition between capitalists, and not the class struggle, which forces the capitalists to exploit the working class. Were the capitalists forced to compete, they would not be forced to exploit the working class and there would be no class struggle, i.e., class struggle exists not because capital attempts to dominate labor-power but because the capitalists come from among themselves over ownership of the stolen surplus value. These struggles are more important to the world revolution than the class struggle which would go away if the capitalists didn’t have to waste so much time exploiting the workers.

Lenin says from the grave:

"A detailed examination of the scope and the author of the 1914 thesis commends...is impossible, for every line is wrong," (Lenin, Masses and Trends, p. 8.)

"We have analyzed only a fraction of F. Nevelsky’s arguments. To analyze all of them would require an article five times the length of this one, for there is not a single correct view in the whole of what Nevelsky has to say. What is correct - if there are no mistakes in the figures - is the footnote on banks. All the rest is an impossible tangle of confusion compared with phrases like "driving a stake into the quivering body", "we shall not only judge the competing homes, but condemn them to death and elimination", "the new world will be born in agonizing convulsions"... These phrases are, at one and the same time, the core and expression of two things: first, their underlying "idea" is imperialist Romanism, which is just as ugly a caricature of Marxism, and just as complete a misrepresentation of the relationship between revolution and democracy, as was the late and unilingual "Economic of 1844-1852." (Lenin, Masses and Trends, p. 67.)

No in Capital sacred. The following passage, quoted in AID, is from Capital Volume One, the chapter entitled "Division Of Labor And Manufacture." What Lenin leaves out is in bold.

"The different spheres of production. It is true, commodity used to an equilibrium but, in the one hand, while each producer of a commodity is bound to produce a use-value, to satisfy a particular social want, and while the excess of these wants differs quantitatively, all these exist an inner relation which on the division of its prevention into a regular system, and that system can as well produce a surplus, and on the other hand, the law of exchange of commodities ultimately depends on how much of it’s disposable working time society can expend on each particular class of commodities. But this constant tendency to equilibrium, of the various spheres of production, is associated, only in the shape of a resistance against the constant upsetting of this equilibrium. The social system on which the division of labor, within the workshop, is specifically worked out, becomes in the division of labor within the society, as a particular, nature imposed necessity, neutralizing the absence causes of the producers, and pernicious in the hierarchical Institution of the market-prime." (AID, p. 28; Capital, Vol.1, p. 339)

Lenin is trying to prove that competition is "an intermediate stage... (and not) comprehensible on
the basis of some immanent equilibrium."

(All, p. 26) So be singles out one aspect in the operation of
the law of value in order to prove that there is no
"immanent equilibrium" in the notion of capital and
he gives us a quote from a passage which, in its
"totality, demonstrates that there does exist an
immanent equilibrium in the notion of capital. (1)

To paraphrase Marx: there is no balance with-
out imbalance.

But the CCP gives us a theory of imbalance
without balance, namely without organization,
monopoly without free competition, rival nation-bloc
imperialism without functioning international imperial-
ism class interests, and, finally, since the basis for
revolutionary nationalism class struggle is liquidated,
revolution without the Third World. (2)

WHERE DID THE WP'S GO?

"The attitude of a political party towards its
own mistakes is one of the most important and
accurate ways of judging how earnest the party is and
how it in practice fulfills its obligations towards its
class and the overall masses. Frankly admitting a
mistake, justifying the reasons for it, analyzing the
circumstances which gave rise to it, and thor-
oughly discussing the means of correcting it - that is
the mark of a serious party; that is the way it
should fulfill its duties, that is the way it should
educate and train the class, and then the masses." 

(Lenin, Left-Wing Communism, An Infantile
Disease, p. 50-51)

In the "RM" and "Revolution," since 1965,
Avakian & Co. have indicated that the principal con-
tradiction, as they defined it in America in December
may have "shifted," although they continue to
"uphold" the political economy of All. Such staff-
ing is not surprising coming from the author of
"Conquer The World..." who perennially dismisses
Lenin's incredibly clear warnings regarding imperial-
ism economics as "bourgeois logic" and "opposi-
tional!" ("CTW," p. 11)

The authors of All and the leadership of the
RCP have constructed a superficial economist analy-
lysis of world political economy to conform to their a
political agenda for making revolution in an imperial-
ism country. "Working from the revolution back" they
forget that the revolution is a Third World revolu-
tion that will surround and substantiate imperialism one
country at a time if need be. Did they learn from this
message?

"An important ideological question is involved
here. The majority in this society, let alone world-
wide, have no interest in this decadent, embattled
imperialist system. This certainly applies to the
overwhelming number of workers in this country.
We have no need for some "lonely voice in the
wider world" mentality, or some ultimately per-
usable, ruined (nationalist) line." ("Sharing the
Uncharted Course," CCP, USA, April 3, 1965)

"When you have a period when things begin
getting sharper, when there is more turmoil, when
people's eyes are beginning to some themselves
more toward the reality that we say, then there is
more of a role for being out there on the streets and
in sort of a spirit of mass action... there's no other way
to describe it." (Avakian, "Revolution," Fall/Winter,
1969)

The really weird thing about all of this is that if
modern capital was "predominantly national," then it
would still make sense to support revolutionary
national liberation struggles.
Third World by the Big Three automakers, the manipulation of large units of commodities (and real) capital controlled by OPEC & Ford. Robert Maxwell, the ex-Soviet monopoly entity, as well as the unification of Germany and the EEC into a formidable imperialist force--to name but a few examples.

After decades of exporting capital into the Third World (and reaping unorthodox profits on interest alone) the multi-national industrial, marketing and financial corporations are seizing direct control of the newly-developed industrial infrastructures and the working/consumer markets that increasingly offer vast urban areas for surplus-value production and realization. At the same time the contradiction between "town and country" is becoming even more acute as agricultural production decreases, peasants from their land and allow these surplus-populations to enter into wage-labor only sporadically— if at all.

In other words, finance capital seems to have moved from concentrating its activities in the circuit of money (investment) capital (through which it seemed but did not directly run developing industries) into the circuit of productive capital (where they try to cut out the commodity-middlemen) and, as before, maintain tight control over the movement of the commodity capital circuit (Valley).

Again, as Lenin said, "...the division of the world between two powerful states does not remove the possibility of revolution, if the relation of forces changes as a result of uneven development, war, banking, etc." (Lenin, Imperialism, p. 70)

It would not surprise us if Marxism eventually equalled its corporate headquarters from Chicago to Hong Kong to Singapore. Although the Chicago headquarters is still directing the global allocation of its exchangeable products into the still profitable imperialist consumer societies, Marxists have obviously recognized that the increasing volume of production, sale and trade in the newly-developed "Third-World" can alleviate, for a while, the tendency of the rate of profit to fall and allow it to escape the semi-productive and stagnant waters of a capitally-stricken economy where it can no longer even technically exploit the majority of industrial (or "servant") workers.

This is a profoundly inter-nationalist perspective on longer "views" in a national formation— but de-centralizing and expanding away from it to concentrate on higher levels. Here is the evidence of artistic movement as principal, in fact, it is the economy of production that competes the imperialists to roam the planet in search of exploitable labor and value-heavy markets and that demonstrates just how profoundly international finance capital has become as it re-structures to always draw even more on the oppressed countries. This does not demonstrate that finance capital remains locked into national formations or that competitive capitalism is always primarily antagonistic against the unity of exploitations.

In even if we were to accept Lenin's "privacy" concept—we see how the contradictions he describes do not accord with reality. However, IMF should not to elevate Engels' anomaly/organization contradiction to such hallucinogenic determinate length. Nor continue to look to this class struggle as only.

In coming to an understanding of the political incursion it is not enough to simply state, as the IMF does in its recent literature, that the "imperialism" found areas "competing room" and "temporarily avoided" nuclear holocaust: Re-orientation is now.

Notes
1. Serious students of the internal crisis are recommended to stall with the chapter "Simple Reproduction" in Lenin's "Capital". Volume 2, in which Marx emphasizes alienation is shown to be inherent in reproduction of capital and its capital should only be the production of surplus value itself and in which the "concealment" of reproduction—which is often presented as "competition"—is described as a balancing mechanism to prevent depression of capital. As the aggregate volume of production will normally increase and decrease in value over a period of time, "This can manifest only by a continual relative reproduction. ...The state of reproduction is tantamount to competitive rivalry over the market means of its own reproduction. But unlike capital which it is an element of surplus... Such survival is not so well in itself, but on competition, however it is on such capital to produce.

2. Lenin, Imperialism, p. 55, 57, 179

Lott's work is equal to the study done by the economic scientists in which it actually does operate. He doesn't only work under political terms, but also the creative social science economists within capitalist reproduction and production in which society is also a socially organizing form of action, i.e., Engels' "definite plan of an evolving social order." (Lenin, p. 52)

Communist economics, however, that his "intention" can only be developed by creative social planning, based on all but social and unit for the "increase" by "developing the productive forces" and the organization work in the base that can only be done after existing goals in the superstructure—where society is essentially being into the superstructure.

3. The apparent "three worlds" theory underlines the profound multinational contradictions of our time and also sees the end game in world imperialism states and multinational groups. By running the fundamental method of the contradictions, he's emphasized people and nations of the world in the imperialism which supplies them, and against internal contradictions on which it relies for its domination... (Lenin, Imperialism) reduces it to the contradiction between the two superpowers and their respective
military and economic blocs, reordering the priorities and the people in the inter-imperialist competition. 

... (State) intentionally devises the role of the class struggle as the primacy issue of history; it changes the world in a mechanical and annulled way and with an academic rhetoric... 

"United Declaration of Socialist-Minded Parties of Latin America," September, p. 21-23

Weather Guzman
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Twisted Socialism or the Capitalist System
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If you missed MIM Theory No. 1, or Nos. 2 & 3—a special double issue on revolutionary feminism—it's not too late.

MIM Theory 1, “A White Proletariat?,” explains why the North Amerikan white working class isn't on the side of Third World revolution. For 32 pages the Party lays down the line with statistical studies and polemics with those who disagree.

MIM Theory 2&3, a special double issue, tackles gender and revolution, an area where MIM significantly differs from all other communist and radical groups. This issue takes on first world feminism and imperialist patriarchy. This issue also deals with the Black Panther Party on gender and gay liberation, and takes a stand on how class, nation and gender oppression intersect in the United States today.

If you're serious about wanting a revolution for the world's most oppressed people then it's time to subscribe to MIM Theory. Struggle with MIM over the best way forward.
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