

DRAFT: A consideration of Christianity and psycho-analysis: Kristeva's *Intimate Revolt*

[Second draft. If you have comments to append or if you wish to change the MIM line, send copies to mim3@mim.org and mim@mim.org
Get them in by the end of September, 2006.]

- I. Ward Churchill and the punishment of post-modernism
- II. Christianity
- III. St. Thomas Aquinas's racket & hypocrisy
- IV. Kristeva's suspect atheism as a poor choice of tactics and a tactics-to-theory pragmatist misdirection
- V. The father
- VI. Sado-masochism
- VII. Anti-authoritarianism as the new Christianity
- VIII. Kristeva, Liberalism and internationalism
- IX. An aside on Soviet wimmin
- X. Individuation as prerequisite for pornography
- XI. Imagining Kristeva as a MIM comrade

I. Ward Churchill and the punishment of post-modernism

This was going to be a dismissive review of Julia Kristeva for MIM's web page. After all, she has admitted in an almost self-satirical way that she joined the Communist Party of France as a career move, abandoned Marxism after her visit to Mao's China and and took up libertarianism.¹ With all her talk about Eros and Freud, she makes great material for a pot-smokers' discussion league.

This Kristeva review was a finished item on the list of things to-do when the University of Colorado's report on Ward Churchill appeared. Now I find myself embarrassed, because I have flip-flopped thanks to Amerika's experiment with democracy that has enabled the White Trash Counter-Revolution. Defending itself with the tools of Christianity, the heartland Euro-Amerikan nation has risen up to oppose cosmopolitan elitists (where have we heard all this before?) that are supposedly squelching earnest and straight-forward intellectual inquiry everywhere. On this point, where MIM sees a labor aristocracy (bought-off ex-workers) uprising, Kristeva might see a certain sexuality at work, one of people who have a need to correct the relationship to their fathers—a very common thing right now according to Kristeva.

Kristeva is a follower of Freud, and this reviewer could not help

a Freudian interpretation of a certain history Ph.D. who would come out with a statement on the Dawes Act as false as the one the University of Colorado's kangaroo court came up with:

The requirement of Indian blood did not originate with either express or implied requirements of the General Allotment Act of 1887 [also called the Dawes Act--MIM ed.], as Professor Churchill claims.

The topic is how eugenics-type language came to be common in discussion of indigenous peoples captive of Uncle Sam. The University of Colorado bureaucracy found it worthwhile investigating this topic in order to consider firing Ward Churchill.

I'm going to repress my pseudo-Freudian interpretation of the kind of people that would come up with a statement like that, a false yet high-flying banner-type of statement. MIM does not approve of Freud, not even Freudian interpretations of fascism in the 1930s.

The problem is where do we start with such a loaded statement about the origins of eugenics discourse for First Nations. The public discussion of Churchill as it exists proves a dialectical truism, that language is infinitely divisible.

From reading Kristeva (and we will just refer to that interpretation of Kristeva as "Kristeva" contrary to the University of Colorado report's disciplinary admonitions concerning such widespread practices), what comes to mind is where the drive for infinitely dividing language comes from. Here we do not mean divisive by class and gender, though the division is that too. Where does the drive of a nit-picker come from is the question.

In this particular case, the University of Colorado disciplinary committee decided that the Dawes Act was not what Ward Churchill made it out. The scholar, presumably the history Ph.D. on the committee went back to find mentions of blood quantum in law cases prior to the Dawes Act and called that a potential "origin." Then echoing some critics with persynal axes to grind against Churchill, the committee says the words "blood quantum" and such do not appear in the Dawes Act.

Churchill is right about this in a sweeping way, because what is important is not that this or that mention of a phrase appeared in this or that individual legal case, but what provided sweeping economic motivation for eugenics language regarding indigenous people. As a result of the Dawes Act and not at all loosely in regard to facts, census-taking referred to indigenous people in North America and their proportion of indigenous blood—full-blooded if both

parents were full-blooded "Indians" and quarter-blooded if only one grandparent was and so on. The Dawes Act was systematic in influence from sea to shining sea, not in one case or another.

Some of Churchill's critics have long-standing axes to grind personally with Churchill, based on in-fighting in First Nation organizations. The rest have axes to grind at least since Churchill's famous public statement regarding 9/11 about how the World Trade Center victims were like little cogs in a Nazi machine. Together these critics have discovered that anything connected to history involves language and is therefore infinitely divisible. We at MIM are not saying there actually were multiple histories. In objection to post-modernism, MIM says there is only one history, as surely as we can fantasize a science-fiction story with video cameras in the sky recording every movement of every individual on the planet below. If there were such a camera capable of doing that, we would see that there is only one video, to put it in the language of today. Yet discussion of the perfect video of Earthlings from space is infinitely divisible.

There is not much intellectual payoff for these infinite divisions and hair-splittings regarding the origins of discussion and record-keeping concerning the bloodlines of indigenous peoples. The critics should have left it alone, left it at what Churchill wrote. In any case, Churchill needed only to prove that the idea came from white people for reasons of oppression and his critics have done nothing to dispute that. There have been essentially nihilist papers saying the words referring to eugenics do not appear in the Dawes Act and there have been feeble dead-ends by the University of Colorado that refer to individual legal cases in court discussions prior to the Dawes Act, and prior to any systematic law on the question. It would be like finding court records discussing the idea of rape in marriage before there was a law saying wives had the right to refuse. The concept might be vaguely floating around out there, but there comes a moment where it gets a sweeping push.

Churchill answered the great question of what it was that gave indigenous peoples the incentive to participate in a form of organization not unlike what we still have today for indigenous peoples. No one has said that indigenous peoples sat around writing out lists of themselves and keeping records on bloodlines before the white man, but after the white man's appearance, at some point the First Nation people themselves became involved in their own bloodlines record-keeping for tribal membership purposes.

In the face of such a great question to ask and answer that Churchill answered, our nit-pickers exhibited sufficient drive to be able to divide the question further. It is rather like someone who swept out his room two hours ago, but finds that there is a fraction of the fraction of dirt still left there, not removed from the last four sweepings in the past eight hours, and so sweeps it again two hours later. In today's language, we say someone has to know "when to relax," when to "chill" and when to settle for what one did and then

go onto other things. The question of interest to Kristeva is what motivates this persyn to keep sweeping the room. Our obsessive sweeper is the object of a Freudian inquiry.

Now, these are thoughts that would not occur to MIM without Kristeva. Exactly opposite of what the University of Colorado says regarding Churchill's Thornton footnotes, if MIM does not attribute the broad theoretical idea to Kristeva or Freud behind her, we are closer to plagiarizing than the other way around, which would be if we left her name out of it. This is not even just a matter of persynal integrity, which is the lesser issue. It is actually a matter of intellectual clarity, because as followers of Lenin, we are opposed to Freud, so if did not say "Kristeva says" or "according to Kristeva" we would be failing to credit the broad outlines of her thought—even though it is possible we might report it incorrectly in some details. In the broadest sense, MIM is anti-Freudian and Kristeva is not, so when we say "Kristeva," it could be we have reported her work incorrectly or that she or her followers could nit-pick something. Yet it would remain broadly true that MIM opposes Freud's and Kristeva's work, and that is what we need to be careful of in general in explanations and discussion.

Kristeva suggests a variety of points about the anal stage of sexual development, the question of cleanliness and holes.

The fascist realizes that division down to a "clean spot" is a powerful motivator for order. It's not an accident genocide is called "ethnic cleansing." So one might think that persynality-wise, this is tied up with learning potty-training or other early childhood experiences regarding cleanliness and bodily control. If dirt is an absolute disaster at all times, we might suspect a tragic childhood trauma at work.

What Kristeva also made MIM realize is that what we at MIM call the Liberal "oasis of the individual" also boils down to pursuit of a clean spot. Earlier in life, Kristeva claimed to want to surpass both the fascists and the Liberals. Today she is saying we have such problems of psycho-sexual development rampant that she is going to settle for Liberalism.

Anglo-Saxon historical empiricism attracts and rewards the nit-picking persynality and the axe-grinder. They are in business because of the infinite divisibility of language and their political tendency is to destroy the work of those who see broad trends in history. One persyn sweeps out the room once and declares it clean, but the nitpicker comes along and says it is not. It only seems that the more important the question, and the more important the sweeping historical trend, the more difficult it is to formulate an accurate factual statement by the habits of Anglo-Saxon subjectivist empiricism, so it would be better to start from the side of theory as the French are apt.

Kristeva is someone profoundly a product of French intellectual circles (and MIM wrote that before reading her comments in

response to Americans that acknowledge how Americans view her).² The little quote above on the Dawes Act among others is an example of something the high-brow French elite have pooh-poohed for a long time now. Whether it is attempted Marxist Louis Althusser seeing history as ideologically contaminated and unworthy of a pivotal role in theory production or whether it is any of a number of now intimidating post-modernist theorists, this dispute where the writer does a CTRL-F to find "blood quantum" in the Dawes Act is exactly the sort of thing that earns Americans every last post-modernist punishment--and Kristeva is talking about sadism too, as stemming from the same underlying common but inadequate psycho-sexuality, so unfortunately we have to wonder about Amerikan academia's sado-masochism in connection to mud-throwing battles like the one over the Dawes Act.

The controversy over Ward Churchill has now retreated into Ward Churchill's footnotes, and the above statement is actually supposed to be an example of a more cautious and sensible way to state the facts of U.S. history regarding the genocide of First Nation peoples. Of course, as a statement that is ridiculous, the above University of Coloradoism is destined rather to become part of intellectual history or archaeology as an example of why Althusser should not have caved into Anglo-American pragmatism or why Kristeva should not have to produce anymore empirical evidence for her work than "it's probably no surprise to say that psycho-analysis is a rare thing."³

So while Freud is not a good reason to be running to Kristeva, there is no doubting that one reaction to the Great Oppressor Cultural Counterrevolution (GOCC) will be a conscious and unconscious passion for post-modernism, with also a good market for anything philosophical or theoretical, such as what Kristeva provides.

Now I have to retreat some and flip-flop from what I had planned, because the anti-Churchill report is indeed an example of stupidity's defense of itself, where we have to say if the facts contradict the theory, "so much the worse for the 'facts.'" Consideration of a chapter of Kristeva is much more enlightening than the whole anti-Churchill movement. In the anti-Churchill movement, we have nourishment for white nationalism, the democracy of sado-masochists and anti-intellectuals. In Kristeva we have a unique combination of larger concepts, including a theory of sado-masochism.

What greater source of sado-masochistic joy could there be in academia than firing a powerful voice on the genocide against First Nation people. All the added and thousands of questions

that have appeared since Churchill's statements on 9/11 only heighten the ecstasy. Are they firing him because he is pro-terrorist, because he is white, because he is not white, because First Nation people plagiarize him or he plagiarizes them or because there are only two documented cases of u.\$. military use of biological warfare against First Nations and not three--these are all the questions in the media with no consensus answer and hence a source of ecstasy. But with all the discord surely there must be a sinner in there somewhere? One thing for sure, whether it is denial of a military involvement in smallpox warfare against indigenous people, the 9/11 controversy over "little Eichmanns," controversy over whether Churchill himself has enough "blood" to teach "Ethnic Studies" or the question of how whites take back their permissions--we are talking about white solidarity.

So here is where we have to be right now. It's no fault of MIM's that we are left contemplating which is worse--facts for the sake of ideological dispute (or psycho-sexual satisfaction) or theory for its own sake. When we consider that Kristeva and others succeed in opening and re-opening discussion of method--philosophy--it seems that the Europeans have the heftier side of truth, while the Anglo-Amerikans are left with just the fireworks of a maddeningly narrow sort of empiricism. In this atmosphere, those with intelligence unfortunately will flee to Europe rather than stand and fight.

Kristeva pointing to Barthes nicely anticipated the Ward Churchill furor in respect to similar white trash movements called Poujadist spurred on by fear of the critical gaze of intellectuals.⁴ Her explanation is psycho-sexual while ours is generally economic.

II. Christianity

The theory versus fact duality that the University of Colorado is having trouble with is not the most important one underlying Kristeva's work or lying on its conscious surface, though she consciously mentions it in some appended attempt to relate to the united States.⁵ Though born in Bulgaria, Kristeva is in fact nicely reproducing the central cultural tension in U.\$. politics, one that appears to be between Christianity (a.k.a. "old values") and secular Freudianism, as MIM has discussed before, and before reading recent Kristeva works.

Indeed, Kristeva is quick to defend Freud regarding his dualism.⁶ To Kristeva, Freud can be a genuine road to rebellion and a substitute for religion and spirituality. (By the

way, anti-Churchill trash, when I say "Freud" there I refer to his body of work, however inconvenient that might be for your ideology of footnotes and what certain authorities "suggest.") By the end of the book, she finally says straight-out that political revolution strangles revolt and the militant is a dogmatist opposed to thought work for reasons of identity.⁷ As is typical for the psychologist, left open is the question: "even if true, perhaps revolt should be strangled for the benefit of society and it matters not what the motivation of the political revolutionary is."

To Kristeva, it seems that each individual can have a different biological persona that expresses itself in ways that are not directly language, but an interface with language--tone, drive etc. Even style seems to come from the unconscious and timeless "soul" of the individual's unique body according to Kristeva.

Why she bothers to speak of a soul at all is part of the question. In her work we step from talking about the Almighty Father as the source of forgiveness and mercy against the guilty to the actual father and maybe the mother and our relationship to them. Here again, the analogy is deliberate, opportunist and yet materialist. In one case, there is no real forgiveness or mercy, only an imagined one that preserves judgment against evil. In another case, we can have real forgiveness and mercy with actual people but perhaps at the expense of judgment--how typically post-modern. At least Kristeva does stand for judgment.

It is worth saying here for MIM's concern with gender that a related topic is whether love must be non-judgmental, even blind. Kristeva suggests that love and forgiveness for ourselves and our parents can overcome various inconvenient social manifestations.

True to the practice of psychiatry despite her protests separating it from psycho-analysis, Kristeva hews to negation and erasure.⁸ And if drugs are Kristeva's concern, then I fail to see why we cannot claim that certain drugs negate certain existing mental states and open the possibility of moving on to others, just as Kristeva hopes with psycho-analysis.

To her credit, Kristeva believes that nihilism leads to totalitarianism, the ages-old conservative criticism. We actually agree, because following Mao, we "learn from practice," which means history and current experience. We would say that the Freudian libertarianism that Kristeva speaks of⁹ is more likely to take nihilist political form than our Maoism. Her statement below applies to anarchist critics of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism better than to Maoism itself.

The pseudorebellious nihilist is in fact a man reconciled with the

stability of new values. And this stability, which is illusory, is revealed to be deadly, totalitarian.¹⁰

We would only say that in flight from nihilism, Kristeva ended up rationalizing Christianity for a more durable future with a psycho-analysis leading to reconciliation with lifestyle, instead of transformation of painful realities. Her aim was to distinguish "the modern man from both the Christian man, reconciled with God ('coram Deo'), and the nihilist, his enraged but symmetrical opposite."¹¹ She failed to achieve her noble goal.

Freudians say we can make conscious the unconscious that is now mucking up our lives. We can summon love to erase in order to be re-born according to Kristeva. For Kristeva, unfortunately, that is what rebellion is. It appears that one translation of what she is saying is that "What's the Use of Politics in Times of Distress?"¹² For Kristeva the central question is lack of capability¹³ and what can be done to aid capability. It is not that she sees a class war globally that she must intervene in and of course to the extent that white nationalists indulge her focus on France and the United States, she is correct. We might ask, even if 100% completely correct political concepts appeared in front of the Western population, how would it know to adopt them? Kristeva seems to be saying that psycho-analysis would be the most likely path to adopting the truth.

III. St. Thomas Aquinas's racket & hypocrisy

What it is that sometimes needs erasing is a tyrannical super-ego according to Freud. In a parallel fashion, Kristeva finds the same question at work in Sartre's discussion of nothingness. The whole concept of something "not being there" is proof to Kristeva of her theses. Somehow people came up with a way of saying and thinking "not being there" and using such concepts all the time. That means there was a transition from the unconscious to the conscious.

Here MIM would like to add its own remarks on Christian guilt and specifically how with the concept of hypocrisy, Christianity takes advantage of the division of people from themselves known as class, nation etc. by telling people to express the alienation they feel as guilt and prostration before God. In this way, emotions that might find more progressive outlet end up in the service of the Church.

Those who acknowledge their evils, are beloved, not for their evils, but because they acknowledge them, for it is a good thing to acknowledge one's faults, in so far as it excludes insincerity or hypocrisy.¹⁴

So to profess Christianity and then go to confess one's individual weaknesses is considered the good Catholic thing to do. Failure to do so may land one in "hypocrisy"—a conceptual tool still clouding people's thinking in 2006, especially in the unconscious left-wing of parasitism of the West.

The important thing to notice about the concept of hypocrisy is that it places blame on the individual. The quotation is not "those who acknowledge that God placed evil in us and allowed evil" are beloved. There would be no need for a Church then to mediate one's relationship to god.

Even St. Thomas Aquinas shamelessly connected ridding individuals of hypocrisy to confession, the practice of a sinner's telling his priest his evils.

Hypocrisy is an obstacle to Penance. But it savors of hypocrisy to divide one's confession, as Augustine says. . . . Therefore confession should be entire. Further, confession is a part of Penance. But Penance should be entire. Therefore confession also should be entire.¹⁵

This is nearly as perfectly saying that hypocrisy is an obstacle to the Church as one can say. Later, I will explain how it is also crucial that hypocrisy is a divisive idea pitting individuals against a god who may or may not grant mercy. For now, we should also note that later Protestants and Muslims objected that Catholicism amounted to dualism as Islamic author Qutb put it. There is a separation between what we know god wants and what we do, so Qutb charged Christianity with dualism rooted in modern society; although, it appears that even in his day, St. Thomas Aquinas was able to tap into anxiety over what Qutb would later call the ills of modernity. The dualism was between the spiritual world and what actually happens on earth. In response, any Christian can easily say "only God can judge the sinner," because the humyn is weakness incarnate. What all should recognize is that if the afterlife is the real strength, the place of the spirit, then stressing the afterlife to say that only god can judge the sinner is consistent, and we are back to a good reason for the kind of dualism between lifestyle and spirit that Qutb complained about, but which MIM calls lifestyle politics, or more technically lifestyle pre-politics. The dualism occurred originally in creation of the afterlife. It would be much better for Islam to retain its conquering goal and say "there is only the Caliphate." There is no way to mix together the afterlife and the present world without dualism.

For Maoists, humyns feel alienation and resulting anxieties because of the class society and lack of scientific and production achievement. The Catholics worsen people's alienation by dividing people they place before a god as individuals. Then the Catholic organization poses as the answer to the problem the Catholics partially created. In the place of such alienation, Mao said the people are actually god. The struggles of individuals either capture the imagination of the people successfully and therefore seem like successes

of struggle granted by god or they fail.

Kristeva says that in surpassing Christianity, psycho-analysis can point out that even Christianity found a need to put mercy higher than guilt because of the many negative implications of leaving guilt in place with too great a role in the religion. "If our ill-being is a result of structure—conscious or unconscious—and not the result of a fault, then, in the eyes of psychoanalysis, we are all innocent and responsible."¹⁶ That is provocatively stated for us revolutionaries.

Rather than Kristeva's erasure followed by continuous rebirth, MIM advocates retention of history followed by critical but consistent materialist method. For this, Kristeva might say we are dogmatist. For Kristeva, "dogmatist" means mentally frozen historically, but MIM would add her idea of "dogmatist" might also refer to anyone who refuses rebirth through Freudian "rebellion." The problem with Freudianism is that it is embedded in Christianity, not external or successfully critical of it. The Freudians, especially of the Marcuse, Reich or general liberal-radical nature tell us it is better to advocate for sexual weaknesses of the flesh as the Christians would refer to pornography and a variety of sexual sins than to be guilty of hypocrisy. Freudians might quibble with what exactly the list of lifestyle sins should be, but the underlying structure of an individual facing god is accepted and enforced by Freudians. Freudians will refuse to accept that we should accept our alienation until we have remedied it socially and not try to seek happiness through its artificial alleviation—with the result being a celebration of sex, drugs and rock'n'roll. Yet, we would say it is not the lifestyles themselves that are causing alienation.

We add these remarks because Kristeva is the perfect expression of the majority of imperialism's secular view of itself. She would make an excellent theorist for a youth wing of the Democratic Party friendly to Europe. The bourgeoisie cannot counterpose Marx to the Christian right of course. Freud is more appropriate for everyday use by the bourgeoisie.

When young Westerners come across MIM as a small submarine launching torpedoes into the super-tanker of capitalism, there is some shaking. The first word that comes to mind for both the pro- and anti-MIM reaction is "hypocrisy." The pro-MIM reaction sees MIM as a newly constituted and upright Christian force, the real deal in a time of crass commercialism. The pro-MIM youth rightly see hypocrisy in the Christian rulers of Amerika.

The anti-MIM reaction conscious enough to see a supertanker taking hits is also concerned about "hypocrisy," namely MIM's. We have the anarchists denouncing us for working with amazon.com; even though it was anarchists who caused it to be necessary to

work with amazon.com. We also have those Naderites who will not flinch even momentarily from opposing the "greedy" "big" corporations and then complain about "down-sizing"; even though Nader consciously rallies politically for medium-sized companies and smaller. This is not just the petty-bourgeois politics of Ralph Nader and Michael Moore: it is also the individualism of a Thomas Dewey, and those who equate big corporations and big government both with a loss of individuality. Most of the reaction to MIM is not close to being internationalist but instead stems from these sorts of Amerikan roots.

It will come as a shock to some of MIM's staunchest admirers and critics that there is no money in the united States or the West generally that does not come from a corporation. The Central Bank creates money in conjunction with private banks and even the Central Bank is not really federally owned. Somehow it is possible to study corporations and not transition to anti-capitalism generally; although we still support the exposure of corporations. The National Green Party in the united States just proved this point by rebutting the Democratic Party regarding Green activities in Pennsylvania funded by the Republican Party. The Green Party says it turns down all money from corporations, while accepting money from individuals who get their money from corporations of course. The Green view is typical of how political theory does not make much headway in the united States. The Greens actually think it is possible to sidestep Marxism and criticize corporations systematically as if it were possible to run a political campaign in capitalist countries without using money or other resources from corporations. The only thing the Greens could successfully accomplish is to become a party dominated by the petty-bourgeoisie instead of the imperialists. Escaping corporate money is not an option under capitalism, but the political use of the charge of "hypocrisy" is so powerful that Greens would prefer to wipe away the origins of money in corporations than to let go of a chance to charge someone with "hypocrisy" in regard to corporations. It's an important example of the self-limiting nature of the left-wing of parasitism, that it pushes along Christian concepts with a zeal ummatched by theologians themselves.

Neither the pro-MIM nor anti-MIM reaction is initially accurate. The reaction for and against MIM in both cases is a populist Christianity, one that is unaware of its own roots.

In St. Thomas Aquinas's "Summa Theologica," we learn via Bible quotation that for the sin of hypocrisy to be present we must find the motivation of vainglory or persynal benefit. Strictly-speaking then, anyone accusing MIM of hypocrisy is always going to be wrong, because MIM is not composed of public individuals who can be said to be "playing to the crowd."¹⁷ There is no vanity or "benefit" in an anonymous MIM article or a pseudonym, much as capitalism trains us to believe that individual benefit is

king to such an extent that our critics cannot escape thinking so even in regard to an anonymous organization. MIM members pay for the literature they distribute and receive no fame. Yet this has never stopped any ultra-left Christians from criticizing MIM and in fact the criticisms of MIM for "hypocrisy" show just how far Christianity reaches--beyond even what St. Thomas Aquinas would have intended. The reason is that the root of Christianity is an ideology protecting the class system and that root is what is popular, not the details of religion.

Ironically, much of the white trash so-called Left issues the hypocrisy charge against MIM at the same time as challenging us to become more open as befitting an organization that learns to respect the opinion of the white multitude. According to Christianity itself, since MIM professes a belief in change of lifestyles (just not created by lifestyle politics or pc attitude adjustments) MIM would become "hypocritical" if it had a public persona and continued its anti-colonial politics for example. In other words, MIM's oh-so-democratic-and-Liberal critics are also confused in that what they are doing to MIM is called "inducement to sin" in Christianity. People who do not know what that is can look up the Catechism of the Catholic Church. If MIM did operate in the open, then we would be more subject to the charges of hypocrisy thrown by inaccurate anarchists.

The combination of democratic Liberalism and Christianity is deadly, but it permeates the political reaction to MIM. In one of the Internet youth discussion groups with a history of discussing MIM, there was recently a comment to the effect "that I don't like" the First World Maoists in contrast with the Third World ones. MIM found this to be a confirmation of its effectiveness. For 20 years, MIM has put off oppressor nation petty-bourgeois youth and we would not be doing our job if we changed. The Third World Maoist is still in the stage of effecting new democracy--i.e. capitalism. During the bourgeois phase of revolution, individualism and hence Liberalism play progressive roles. To like Third World Maoists but not MIM especially at this time where there is no socialism is to avoid the question of socialism and the unpopular question of what it really is to surpass imperialism, including any existing variants of Christianity.

The Catholic Church as an institution has existed partly through the exploitation of psychic needs of its own creation. In St. Thomas Aquinas writings, it is evident from the long list of words of impossibly vague description that the Catholic Church has its subjects "coming and going." Although it is fascinating and a source of humyn pride to find a document such as "Summa Theologica" from the 1200s, the long list of words and sins that

it uncovers is indicative of the secular sin of "having it both ways." No matter what, it would seem that St. Thomas Aquinas will leave man in some state of sin or another. Even his own book could be seen as "sowing discord" and hence a sin, because it takes the open form of argument against objections. To which, the Church might well say that is indeed the point, that humyns cannot tell how to be virtuous in the morass of conflicting imperatives, so it is best to confess sins regularly and repent.

In contrast, MIM claims to have crafted a sword, that is somehow not evenly two-sided and thus "cutting both ways." Our sword is not supposed to cut both the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. To do this, we had to see two sides and focus on one. So in dialectical materialism, our analysis has an edge. It's a really long sword that we created, and being imperfect, we have not eliminated all parts of the sword that are evenly two-sided. Nonetheless, it is our objective to raise a sword with a sharp edge and not to leave people in complex guilt. Tension is good, but ambiguity and anxiety are the property of Catholics and Freudians.

Here we will explain that the whole concept of hypocrisy comes from defective Christian moral reasoning plaguing us to this day. To be fair, most people do not know all the systematic refinements that went into the question of "hypocrisy." For example, according to a strict reading of what the Catholic Church scholars said about "hypocrisy," no Amerikan would be able to say anything about anything since the united States is now the most murderous country in the world. In fact, even someone who seems to have done something wrong has not done something wrong if the people judging are wrong--according to the Christian development of the hypocrisy concept. The moral authority to judge is lacking, so "people in glass houses" don't throw stones.

What we like about the glass houses idea is the attempt at comparison and systematic effort. Nonetheless, it is not sufficient, because it is asocial, a comparison of individuals.

It is not apparent to the public, but the idea of hypocrisy is actually a profoundly conservative concept with many built-in constraints that prevent its use in most contexts. This may come as a surprise to the left-wing of parasitism often unconsciously embedded in Christian ideas. We find that most of Western so-called anarchism and New Age ideas cannot be called fully recovered from Christian influence.

If I had served as a Christian monk in the 1200s, I hope I would have

recommended that anything referring to a future state of being that does not exist yet cannot be grounds for hypocrisy.

Naturally this would not fly very well with people who are after all advocating pursuit of Heaven, a future state. The Christians badly wanted to be seen as virtuous for sincerely advocating a future existence in Heaven. They wanted this to be a key marker of their faith in fact--love of the afterlife above the concrete world of the "weak flesh." So a hypocrite for Christians would be someone who advocates pursuit of Heaven while going home to pagan rituals or even just wanting those rituals. As a result, MIM's critics are not entirely wrong when they call MIM hypocrites, since Christians invented the concept that way to preclude exceptions for arguments about future states of being.

It seems that a halo is supposed to accrue to people for advocating future states of being such as Heaven and this is what makes the charge of vainglory possible against scientific communists too. We are talking about something in the future too, but then we go home to our equivalent of pagan rituals.

The snide jeers against MIM for hypocrisy for anything from buying a pair of pants, selling our books through a corporation or having sex in an oppressive system all stem from the same twisted place in oppressor ideology that takes joy in the powerlessness of the oppressed--sadistic sexuality. Had MIM had the power to be done with capitalism, not use a corporation for books or abolish inequality in salaries between men and wimmin, we would not be accused of hypocrisy, and we would not receive an email along these lines every five minutes. In other words, the charge of hypocrisy has disproportionate use by the powerful or its lackeys against the powerless.

One result of the failure to think through "would the individual have done that, made that decision if the powerless were not powerless?" is misogyny. In explaining the gender struggle, it is actually more important to understand the lack of motivations of the oppressed, than to be surprised by the privileges of the powerful. When people of female biology criticize men, it can be done in a class and national way reinforcing the power structure. This in turn spurs misogyny. So getting beyond the hypocrisy question and asking "would they have said or done that had group power relations been different?" is key to overcoming misogyny. The classic divide is where men are concerned with sex and womyn with money. The writer has seen a t-shirt and individual persynal ads that say, "if you don't have a car, forget it." So here a womyn is making class criticisms of individual men, criticisms that would be meaningless in a system with good public transport. This in turn provokes misogyny among men, even among those with a rudimentary sense of justice on class questions. The root of the problem is that someone is taking joy in the oppression of the powerless. Kristeva would say not to be surprised, because womyn in general at this time is not highly sexually developed, and does not understand that question of sex for its own sake. MIM places no intrinsic value on sex for its own sake, though people who

pursue romantic relations should attach a value to sex for its own sake and not involve cars and other distractions. The best way to do that is make a thorough-going revolution to finish with the sources of various incorrect complaints. In the Freudian story, wimmin are oppressed because they do not know the joys of being sexually developed men and the goal is to become men, but according to MIM that is not workable and leads to further oppression.

Countless criticisms of men by wimmin such as "if you don't have a car, forget it," are in fact criticisms of men, but they are not feminist criticisms. We should not mistake random complaints with scientific feminism.

Here it again is crucial to distinguish between the individual and what is collectively possible. This writer still sees nothing wrong in Mao via Robert Jay Lifton's charge that he sought "revolutionary immortality." However, it is a sin against Marxism called historical idealism to believe in impacting the individual's afterlife. To think of oneself as impacting society into the future is not the same thing as professing one lifestyle and carrying out another—though they look identical to most Americans who have obliterated the social to such an extent it is easier for Americans to infer a scientific communist pursuit of the individual afterlife than conceive another goal. It is much better to be Japanese than for this question; though, both Japan and the United States are imperialist countries. The Westerner cannot take the scientific communist at face-value: the Christian only infers a communist pursuit of the afterlife in order to return to talking about that individual scientific communist's lifestyle, and corral the discussion back into the St. Thomas Aquinas ranch.

Christians got themselves into trouble of their own creation that we Marxists do not share in the least. Christians believe they have individual afterlives. We Marxists do not. The collectivity of the proletariat and the communist cause really do live on beyond us in the real world while the Christian afterlife is a mirage justifying an infinite range of strife (the sin of discord in Christian language) on terra firma. Their whole concept of "hypocrisy" is a case in point.

The Christian handling of the future is typically idealist. We should have known that Christians and Muslims both would have no concern about whether something actually happened in society or not, since the afterlife is more important than anything in society as far as they are concerned. But then again, that's pretty much 99% of anarchism's criticism of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism too. Just substitute anarchy (especially "social anarchism") for Heaven and then Christianity and anarchism become equivalent criticisms of Marxism.

Some Christians, New Agers, anarchists and followers of psychiatrist Adler

will say that their criticism of scientific communism still applies, because MIM professes something about the future instead of making something concrete happen now in our individual lives. Again it is a systematic way of ridiculing the powerless. MIM put the biggest new nail in the coffin of this sort of ideology with its line "all sex is rape." We expose many philistine Christian sorts this way when they come and deride the powerless for not having eliminated the coercion in ALL sex. Our secular critics such as anarchists attempt to put a secular goal in place where there used to be a Christian concept of hypocrisy—and hope we don't notice the substitution.

To return the secular volley of this sort, MIM points out the evils of individualism over and over again. The original church goal of breaking humyn solidarity for the benefit of unseeable goals was to exploit people. The individual confessed to an individual in the Catholic Church and gave money—and that was not even the most important part of the exploitation. Although church meetings may be collective, collective activity is not the goal of the Christian Church, a fact that became accentuated by the Protestant Reformation and its insistence that not even a church is necessary if one has a direct relationship with god unmediated by humyn organizations.

Although Protestantism arose in response to exploitive abuses of the Catholic Church hierarchy, the means by which it put its attack into effect was a more perfect individualism, a more highly symbolic destruction of the solidarity of the exploited classes. After a period of national wars sealed the question of Protestantism's existence, Protestantism slid into being an ideology propping up the ruling class. We should be thankful in a way, because a more perfect individualist ideology helps us to imagine its more perfect opposite. What is crucial is not the money the Church makes from manufacturing individual relations to god. Rather what is important is the whole perspective of how justice comes about.

MIM opposes individualism. All proletarians are exploited whether they say so or not; all oppressed nations should unite and fight imperialism and we say all sex is rape. The obvious Christian reply is, if you feel exploited by some company, then don't work or shop there. [Web Minister: to update this at the end of July, 2006, we received a letter from England suggesting we steal some software from a website so as not to support capitalist companies. A helpful fellow—we believe he was actually trying to tell us how to make video games more communist.] When we say "all sex is rape," our critics then say then don't have sex; although that certainly does not eliminate rape, the part our critics always leave out in their confused labor aristocracy "expulsions" as Kristeva would call them.

Before MIM gives its own examples of hypocrisy, it would be well to admit that as MIM formed it witnessed a local version of Kristeva take apart Christian idealism. A progressive womyn was arguing with a Trotskyist

about whether buying a pair of pants from a corporation is counterrevolutionary hypocrisy, since the corporation then makes a profit. The Trotskyist said no. Then a local Kristeva incarnated, also a more derivative follower of Trotsky, said "no" and cited the exact verse from Marx that the progressive student needed to go home and read. Later this friend of mine confided to me that "she [the Kristeva-type leader] was exactly right." She also told me that "somehow" our local Kristeva "always gets right inside me." She tried to explain to me how it shook her up, that someone could see inside her, and she was crying, but it was a good kind of crying. Here the local Trotskyist and local Maoist both pointed to political economy, but it was the local Kristeva who hit the ball out of the park. In retrospect, we need to recognize when a question is really coming from religion or philosophy, predecessors to political economy.

So MIM would like to develop more examples of "hypocrisy," and we do not like the first example here, because it is reformist, but just to give an idea of the sweep of the concept, if one has heard about social security and then one professes its merits for one's country, one is a hypocrite, unless one already has social security. The gist of the problem is that unless one is already living a lifestyle, it becomes immoral to advocate one according to many Americans who run the hypocrisy concept our way, even if that lifestyle is impossible to lead without social cooperation. The Christian invention of "hypocrisy" was designed to preclude social cooperation--to break the solidarity of people in order to substitute an exploitive relationship with alleged god.

There could be any number of neighboring countries or towns that have carried out something that one wants, but unless one already lives the life desired, it is hypocrisy to ask for it. When we think hard about the underlying premise, there is really nothing but the individual in relation to god, nothing about us here on Earth. We cannot say reality necessarily enters into the hypocrisy concept, because if we did bring in reality, we would find that we have to be in hypocrisy any time that we do not consciously love the lifestyle that we lead. If our circumstances change and our ideas do not, we enter into hypocrisy. The implicit message is one from religion that says to be happy with one's lifestyle. So if in everyday life one goes into the street and has to take a six block detour because there is no bridge over a very narrow stream, one lives hypocrisy to complain. In contrast, it is obvious that a proper emphasis on jihad (struggle) in Islam gets Muslims out of the Christian hypocrisy trap. Jihad and contentment with one's lifestyle as advised by St. Thomas Aquinas are two different things.

Absolutely out of consideration for the hypocrisy idea is any

group level reality. If marauding Vikings enter town to take wine and food, one could condemn individual Vikings for stealing if one does not steal oneself. If however, a Viking is playing an indirect role in the theft and we ourselves are not playing the opposite of that indirect role, we cannot condemn it or support it. What shall we say if a collective navy forms to handle the Viking ship, but we are not part of such a navy ourselves? It seems we cannot profess anything either way according to Christianity.

As another writer has pointed out, "love it or leave it," is very much in line with the American Christian concept of hypocrisy. It just has nothing to do with the American Revolution, because some had the sense not to love being a colony and did not leave it. Luckily some white radicals of the day were at least that much not enslaved by Christianity. Thomas Paine was a deist for example.

As a rule, any large social phenomenon, like being a colony, just is not going to fit into the hypocrisy idea. It should not be considered immoral to oppose colonialism even if one does not live free yet, but that is where Christianity leaves us, and that is also why it took the assault of scientific communism before most of the world freed itself from colonialism—an evil implemented by the Christians seeking to spread their religion as an excuse for plunder.

In her most recent book, Catharine MacKinnon talks about how she wants to pass a law against defaming feminism. As many others have noted, those who take the most action for radical feminism come under the most attack. The kinds of defamation attacks MacKinnon is talking about involve the Christian idea of hypocrisy. Her critics say she dates Penthouse executives and she herself says she has scanned more pornography than anybody else. The reaction to MacKinnon is one of the best ways to separate the wheat from the chaff. In the early 1980s, she did ally with the Christian Right against pornography. Yet then she alienated those same types of people with "hypocrisy." Most of the labor aristocracy Christian public simply guffaws. Then there is the chorus of lines about "needing a good f*" and the whole point is to close off discussion of a systematic change by attacking the character of the feminists asking for it. Without fail, the people who do this are Christian sleaze--Liberal reactionaries guilty of ad hominem attack. It is key to know that most calling themselves communist are not beyond that level of thinking.

Mao has proved that gender can be turned upside-down for a whole country. For MacKinnon or a Mao to want that is not hypocrisy and therefore immoral. People who think that way have yet to have a

single scientific thought. Alleged communists who talk in such a fashion deserve not one iota of respect, much less a vote in an organization.

Ironically it is the Liberal individualists including so-called anarchists most susceptible to unscientific reasoning despite their claims of being anti-authoritarian. People stuck in the anti-authoritarian discourse are like recovering Christians who have not made it out of the woods yet. Knocking down the credibility of an authority is not going to accomplish anything in terms of any group-oriented liberation. The anti-authoritarian fantasizes that by aiming big, the effect will be big. So take a shot at Jesus and then Stalin and Mao and this should get them somewhere. That's why MIM stresses that there is a thing called "emperor logic," not just that we oppose emperors but also we oppose the idea that emperors can make such a huge difference. Similarly, lazy belief in authority is mirrored perfectly by lazy nihilist attacks on individuals as if they were a substitute for scientific politics.

Simplistic authoritarianism and simplistic anti-authoritarianism are ultimately the same thing underneath-- historical idealism easily cycled through Christian culture. These days because of the historical inefficacy of anarchism now proved in contrast with Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, anti-authoritarianism merges with a fatuous nihilism. In the 1930s, Germans were apt to believe that Hitler's words were calling forth a new reality. Today's anti-authoritarians in the West are the same in believing that their attacks on authority figures in the name of their own "new ideas" call forth the activity of the masses. Those arguing from a basis in history have no choice but Marxism, so anarchism becomes the repository for historical idealism, including that our "new ideas" call forth change, when Marx said it was a changing class structure that brings forth change, changes in the real world first.

The concept of hypocrisy is very hostile to any theory. As soon as we can conceptualize a group of people larger than ourselves doing anything that we ourselves do not live directly, we are guilty of hypocrisy. Here I do not refer to theory as speculation, but theory as grouping together the realities of a large number of people as they are right now. So if I observe the PPP indices for international prices and I claim that they exist in the pattern that they do, because imperialists steal resources at a vastly discounted rate from Third World countries while leaving consumer lifestyle prices more or less comparable, I am actually guilty of hypocrisy already. I profess to oppose exploitation and in fact, I profess that my party is one of the first to explain how it works, but I live in a country doing the exploiting, so therefore I am a hypocrite and thence immoral, according to Christianity, at least in its popular versions,

even if St. Thomas Aquinas would not have been caught dead himself saying anything about MIM regarding hypocrisy.

By this reasoning, it is also wrong for the Civil War era white to act against the South, because the white benefits from slave-produced articles; it is wrong for Sartre in France to support the rebellion in the colony in Algeria and in recent innovations in Christianity via post-modernism it is wrong for a real man to support feminism, because man can not have the lifestyle of womyn. These crude ideas all come from the same backward place. Obviously a white in the Civil War cannot live free from the lifestyle effects of slavery without collective action against slavery; likewise Sartre could not live a lifestyle free of the Algerian colony unless others acted with him and if men and wimmin cannot understand each other because they are not similar enough, then feminism as other than lesbian separatism does not make sense to begin with; yet even achieving lesbian separatism for all wimmin would require a cooperative act. We have to be free of lifestyle outlooks and Christianity to have any feminism at all.

When the ground invasion of Iraq started, MIM dug up a picture of a veteran in Yonkers, NY who carried a poster saying protesters should shut up because they benefit from the oil. This veteran actually thinks it is immoral to complain against a lifestyle one is involved in. How he reconciles that with "thou shalt not kill" is probably a real head-twister of "hypocrisy." This same veteran says it is hypocritical to benefit from and protest against imperialist marauding and does so with Christian references to a doctrine that includes "thou shalt not kill" and "love thy neighbor."

So this is what we mean by the impossibility of taking the concept of hypocrisy and applying it to reality. This veteran lives both lifestyles, one dependent on oil as he and others correctly recognized and one in which he professed Christianity generally. Through no fault of his own other than being Christian, he is in a state of hypocrisy, no matter what he does. If he opposes the war he is immoral (and even the Pope made noises in this direction) by his understanding of hypocrisy and if he does not oppose the war, he does not love his neighbor or obey the Ten Commandments. It's easy to see how this all leads to Catholicism. No matter what one does, one is going to end up owing god big time, because simultaneous realities will never be in perfect harmony. Sin results and contemplating it is intended to create the feeling that humyns are imperfect, so therefore throw up our hands and praise god while confessing non-stop. From MIM's point of view, that is the real evil and we must

toss the concept of hypocrisy except for occasional casual use.

For MIM, focus on lifestyle is subject to moral reasoning like St. Thomas Aquinas's and is thus pre-political and hence pre-scientific. That means we are saying that even asking lifestyle questions is usually wrong. Many questions that people come up with are not scientific, because there is no possible scientific answer to them one way or another. Lifestyles are caused by larger historical forces involving millions and now billions of people. We can study the probabilities of a lifestyle showing up, but lifestyle discussed in terms of Christianity, Islam and various cultural movements is pre-scientific.

When we say "lifestyle politics," we are actually meaning "lifestyle ideology." There is no such thing as "lifestyle politics," only "lifestyle pre-politics." The political concerns matters of society and power that have to be subject to scientific analysis. Before the political is the ideological, and before the ideological is the purely emotional. So for example if we find ourselves simultaneously believing "thou shalt not kill" (and the Pope lightly opposed the Iraq War) and "I can't oppose the Iraq War, because it would be Christian hypocrisy via my consumption of oil products," then we should know we are trying to have something both ways and are somehow stuck in a subjective place. It's not our fault because we are sinners. It's our fault because we are pre-scientific.

Many are tied to lifestyle questions for purely emotional reasons, and this is something Kristeva tries to notice. The pre-political may be dualist in believing that there is a real world but also a world of emotions. The pre-political are most likely to find MIM's ideology—how we stand on this or that question as attractive while being unable to see the connection to MIM's science. Questions of stand and affect are close together. Yet systematic and motivated thinking about ideology is likely to lead to scientific politics in the long run. People motivated to take stands on group-level questions are moving in the right direction. It's not an accident that Marx in his early 20s was already concerned with "species-life."

As scientific communists we learn to spot questions that are inherently unscientific. No matter how we answer them, we are not going to get anywhere. There are countless bourgeois diversions from the development of scientific thought. Many people wrongly interpret the "question authority" slogan, to mean that all questions are good. The whole trouble with Kristeva is that there is really no such thing as the science of the individual.

In contrast to alienation leading to confession and god, we Maoists have criticism and self-criticism, scientific experiment and class struggle. In criticism and self-criticism there is no question of authority. We should undertake self-criticism and transformation with regard to any idea no matter what its source. People concerned about credibility, hypocrisy and moral authority are usually lazy authoritarians or lazy

authoritarians masquerading as anti- authoritarians and they need to get over their underlying Christian hang-ups. Thought has progressed since the 1200s.

IV. Kristeva's suspect atheism as a poor choice of tactics and a tactics-to-theory pragmatist misdirection

Kristeva opportunistically seeks to fill in where religion worms its way into the "soul," which she is also comfortable discussing. She calls herself atheist, but MIM doubts it. There is simply too much parallel, too much symmetry between Democrats and Republicans or between Kristeva's Freudianism and fundamentalist Christianity. It's clear she intended matters that way.¹⁸

As we said, St. Thomas Aquinas carefully crafted limits and boundaries for his system of thought. He would not have used the "hypocrisy" word against MIM the way the word has popular use today. The basic conservative element of being happy with one's lifestyle and not sowing discord or asking for something different in the future is there, but with provisos. In Freudian psycho-analysis, we have something more durable and general for secular use. In other words, when material needs of rulers call, some ideas get yanked out of context and made popular.

While Christianity called for a break of humyn solidarity for the benefit of a relationship to god, Freudian psycho-analysis calls for a break in humyn solidarity through individual erasure of that solidarity. Freudianism starts with a premise of possible unhappiness or anxiety, and then seeks an outlet through an attack on some poorly remembered early childhood event. Instead, what we should be doing is taking people with anxieties and unhappiness and tracing to their social sources, to search for other people with the same problems and unite them to overcome those social problems.

Possibilities of solidarity with the oppressed and exploited are lumped together under "super-ego" which must have its grip loosened in most left-wing and anarchist parasite versions of Freudianism in the West. For Catholics, confession is the route to repenting imperfection while for Freudians, erasure of completely counter-productive and arbitrary embarrassments is the route to the happy individual. Christians profess contentment with lifestyle as it is while Freudians advise some psychological erasure to achieve contentment with individual lifestyle.

The Catholic authority figure who takes confession and then sends the individual back out into life purged of anxieties is little different than the psycho-analyst who manages the erasure of an early childhood event or anything else before sending someone out into the real world again. We rather suspect that the Freudian secular version is more durable and robust for the long-run, as less subject to parochialism's weaknesses including a supposed war with Islam at the moment.

Kristeva talks endlessly about biology's promise at the edges of language and especially early infancy or childhood assaults as a more or less permanent basis for individual difference. There is no evidence, but the excitement Kristeva has is obviously from co-opting the place of the Church. There is a *deja vu* with the discussion of "intelligent design," which after all could refer to space aliens and not god directing species evolution. In place of intelligent design, Kristeva offers genotype and the biological drive behind the semiotic.

Kristeva proclaims her atheism repeatedly, but she proceeds so inefficiently that there is not much difference between her work and religion. Right down into saying that wimmin should have children, Kristeva echoes the Catholic Church. We agree with her that the life force and species survival is the whole game, but when she says it, it comes with more Catholic baggage than necessary.

An example of the inefficiency of her method that causes our suspicions is on the topic of individual biology. Kristeva attempts to locate the "soul" and individuality in biology. By not ignoring individual biological differences, psycho-analysis can fill in where people would be otherwise inclined to accept the reassurances toward eternity of the Church. The idea of the fixed personality was the province of the Church, which offered that god placed an eternity in each passing biological individual.

The hidden crackpot idea in Kristeva is the distribution of the genotype. When she depicts a society that for the most part cannot summon much more after-work energy than to handle the TV clicker,¹⁹ when she talks about the television society of the Spectacle²⁰ and then offers psycho-analysis, when she fails to explain how the distribution of the genotype could change historically, and apparently so quickly, she opens herself to our charge that she is offering psycho-analysis in place of religion but on the basis of the same fallacies.

The mode of production changes, sometimes within the space of a generation, certainly over a period of a few generations. Likewise, demography is another powerful explanation of medium-range phenomena--questions of 25, 50 or 100 years. The demography of Western society in 1968 was much different than it is now. Western society is older, with an age distribution more like a cylinder. Revolutions happen where the base of the demographic pyramid is in the youth or at least where a generation is not surrounded by older, tamer influences.

The demographic distribution and how it has changed in the West is incontrovertible. What is up to interpretation is what age groups under what conditions feel a weightiness to their generation that creates the desire to take control of history and undo what the other less present generations have done. We leave it to Kristeva to explain how a lack of proper psycho-analysis explains the lack of revolt and the consuming/expanding nature of Spectacle. We do not think she has an efficient explanation.

The other missing factor in Kristeva is simply surplus-value. The massive and increasing influx of surplus-value into the imperialist countries that enabled the switch to a service-economy is the other major factor behind the TV-clicker-culture. There is really no dispute factually regarding this shift into services, and it is a shame to omit its discussion out of pure regard for theory, as opposed to fact.

The failure to search for and obtain medium-run theories of history such as produced by Marx and the field of demography leads to aping religion, the poverty of philosophy as Marx said. To her credit, Kristeva says that there is a danger of going to political defeat and then taking up spirituality. She would probably say it does not matter whether an impeding structure is biological in the individual or social, as long as rebirth occurs successfully.

There is not going to be an explanation of how the social expresses itself as the biological and in turn shows up at the boundary of language. To the extent that the social changes phenotypes, there is no dispute but also no permanence. What biology does not provide Kristeva but which she relies on as a crutch implicitly is a suddenly changing distribution of genotypes. At one moment it appears there are large sections of society with drive, at another moment, no drive beyond manipulating the television clicker.

Yes, we accuse Kristeva of a tactically-motivated bad faith. We suspect her drive, though her intellectual drive is unquestionable. Our individual accusation is of only slight importance. Rather we should offer a social alternative, a different theory.

Since we have offered the flow of surplus-value as our main explanation for the current political despair of socialism in the West, we should turn now to strategy and tactics. Where Kristeva offers perhaps four cases of people to discuss in terms of psycho-analysis in a whole book, (and we'll give her five cases with the success we have seen by her comrade-in-arms mentioned above) while admitting she meets patients all day, we propose judo as our paradigm.

We accept with post-modernism the near omnipresence of the Spectacle. There is also a sense in which we believe that Kristeva would not be saying what she does now in the presence of a vibrant proletarian revolutionary movement, so we share her sense of the political balance of forces, even if she no longer shares our goals.

We do not wish to appear psychotic in continuing the proletarian revolutionary quest. Concessions regarding reality must be made all around in the West or we should stand accused of not just dogmatism but illness. MIM holds that those communists claiming not to see that Americans as a whole are exploiters are too ill, too detached from reality to make scientific communists, and revolutionaries; therefore we do not bother with them. Inevitably training them results in at least half their attacks being on the proletariat—just with greater efficiency than had they not been trained.

The lack of socialism in the First World is a question of bribery, but in the Third World it is one of repression. MIM continues the internationalist posture, not because we believe that we are mobilizing a First World majority in a straightforward fashion, quite the contrary: we believe strategy and tactics must be turned upside down in the First World.

The will to copy Lenin and Mao must be replaced. Those two leaders ended up leading popular revolutions, based on social forces inside their countries. In our current context, that is not possible. Instead we must learn from Stalin, the German red minority, the Red Army and Germany as a whole in 1945.

The inescapable conclusion is that the capitalist class (or possibly its ruling ally in the petty-bourgeoisie) itself must prepare the grounds for revolution, because we do not have a class going much beyond the TV clicker. Here we do not mean an infiltration of the capitalist class, much less charity or reform.

The metaphor of judo is all-important to us and we believe we have had much more success than psycho-analysis. A few people willing to stand and fight and pose as the opposite of imperialism can indeed throw great weight.

The essential reason for why a tiny minority can carry out judo tactics is that the enemy once placed in proper view can never admit its own character and then fully subsume that into the Spectacle. Individualism in its fascist or Liberal renditions leaves a clean spot. The enemy's relationship to the Spectacle is not dialectical unless we make it so.

The fact of mainstream media uniformity is a great certainty that we can make use of. Lilliputian as we are, we can plant our feet firmly on the media's character while throwing our enemy. We grasp the enemy's character and make use of it without flinching, without moralism or preconceptions--and without imitating religion.

Catharine MacKinnon brings us the question of pornography and she is really our best current weapon in terms of Marxism's conflict with post-modernism. Her insights are fresh for our times. On this point we also share the most overlap with Kristeva, though she is a Freudian and MacKinnon the ultimate anti-Freudian.

Our two strategic axioms in the imperialist countries that we wish to stress with the likes of Kristeva are: 1) Predictability means targetability. Just ask the Pentagon. 2) The imperialists must do our work for us without our taking them over until the international proletariat reaches sufficiently inside u.\$ borders the way the Red Army handled Hitler Germany.

People like Kristeva who were at the barricades in Paris in 1968 are apt to focus on the change in collective spirit since then. It's time to be done with all that and learn from the imperialists. They bomb a building and move on to the next. All the aspects of despair in realizing how there is no popular radical alternative have to be done with. If there is a need for psycho-analysis it is only in switching from the outlook of a potential majority to that of a most definite minority.

Pornography and spectacle in general are inevitable and MIM makes use of that in many direct and indirect or complicated ways.

On the question of nationalism, there are also important ways in which white nationalism is predictable in both the united States and France. This brings us to Mao's dialectical materialism and Mao's internationalism, the kind where nationalism of the oppressed nations is a progressive force while the nationalism of the imperialist countries is retrogressive. There is no need to surrender such internationalism and take up psycho-analysis analogous to Catholicism: we need only switch our tactics to those of the minority participating in a much larger international force.

The enemy cannot prioritize. That is what Mao's idea of dialectics means. Materialism without a sense of which causations are the most important ultimately falls into eclecticism. Giving up eclecticism is post-modernism's most difficult task, being

that its leaders are of an anarchist sort used to all-out attack in simultaneous directions. Nonetheless, eclecticism means a weaker grip on reality and hence idealism including religion down the road. Eclecticism in the revolutionary movement today is an ongoing psychosis, a backward looking inability to say "2008" instead of "1968."

When there is a concentrated force that really can topple everything in all directions and just needs to be given directions to show up at the corner of State Street and Class Avenue to start the Revolution, then eclecticism may be hidden as a diverse and successful attack on multiple targets. Carried over into the present, eclecticism is the punishment of Trotskyist Permanent Revolution, the all-out offensive of simultaneous revolution that is not happening. So listening to the common response to MIM we will hear that we cannot summon a force to take over State Street and Class Avenue, so nothing is going on, which in turn gets blamed on vanguard parties, anyone but the class reality of a bought-off petty-bourgeoisie. Consequently, as a result of failing to deal with reality, it is perceived there is no strategic and tactical thinking that needs to be redone for the changed circumstances. Next, correct ideas are overturned as incorrect ideas. The hangover of offensive-minded eclecticism often shows up with those who tell MIM to focus on this or that topic, as if we had a proletarian force we could concentrate "if MIM just did X, Y or Z." The most devastating result is limiting our cultural attack, followed by a restriction of the diversity of activity that needs to occur before there can be a revolutionary force or assistance to such a force. Today prioritizing the struggle does not mean we can concentrate a force that will defeat the enemy in any one area. Rather it is a matter of costing the enemy in several simultaneous areas, and preparing the grounds, the same way u.s. imperialism tries to conduct surveillance on all of Iran for later purposes. Nonetheless, we have to keep dialectical materialism, including Mao's idea of "principal contradiction" instead of reasoning from our tactically weak position to a need to changing dialectical materialism.

This will be the point least-liked by the post-modernists, and we also do not wish to emphasize it because it may sound overly optimistic to speak of the power of Mao's dialectics, indicative of another psychosis. Yes, we do know it is not 1968. We are questioning whether post-modernism or Kristeva's post-structuralism knows it and also does something about it other than capitulate. Even among those who do not capitulate, there will be those who strangely abandon Mao's concept of principal contradiction, between the imperialist countries and oppressed nations, again because of not correctly blaming the labor aristocracy and its extent: the blame falls on Mao's dialectics by accident, as if the contradiction between imperialism and oppressed nations were not more important than ever.

Our enemy may be able to study dialectics, but there is not much our enemy

can do with dialectics. The enemy has democracy for the white petty-bourgeoisie, an equality of sorts whether it is useful to the imperialists or not. This petty-bourgeoisie raises trouble via the Reform Party, the Greens etc. This is another somewhat usable fact for us. The petty-bourgeoisie does support imperialism, but with a mish-mash of ideas that weaken the possibilities of imperialist offensive focus—a natural trade-off when imperialism is already dominant and the status quo.

We also have the obligation to attack bourgeois democracy as an excuse for white nationalism, attacks on other nations and exploitation.

The attack on Ward Churchill is a predictable anti-intellectualism produced by democracy. Yes, democracy. Joe-Gas-Station-Owner sends children to college and he believes his political view is as good as anyone else's and his knowledge of indigenous people as good as Ward Churchill's. Joe-Gas-Station-Owner goes and votes for Mr.-Tax-Cut and then instructs Mr.-Tax-Cut to go kick out Ward Churchill. For Joe-Gas-Station-Owner not to vote and to admit that he does not care enough about politics would actually be a step forward.

This is something that the burnouts of the 1960s have yet to admit. The class structure changed. No, it was not a collective diaper tightening or even the collapse of the family that caused the current lack of revolutionary theory-mindedness of the population. The majority is petty-bourgeoisie; therefore majority rule is exploiter rule directly, not just via false consciousness. The critical gaze of Ward Churchill and other radical intellectuals is unacceptable to the exploiter mob. The fact is that the sado-masochistic, white nationalist mob does not know what it is talking about, and we need to point that out rather than equating the mob with internationalist intellectuals, if only to maintain our own forces.

There is no reason to surrender internationalism, because the basis for that internationalism exists in a global majority, just not inside Western borders. At the moment there may be clumsy outbursts of nationalism in ex-Soviet eastern Europe or in Rwanda, but the interest of the populations concerned is not in killing their neighbors, but a selective nationalism opposed to imperialism. We can be confident for internationalism for this reason, the fact that the exploited are still more than 80% of the world's population, just not in control of Paris or even Madison, Wisconsin.

Where Kristeva agrees with MacKinnon is that Kristeva fully admits the historically unique and spreading prevalence of sado-masochistic sexuality. Kristeva is in the situation she is today advocating psycho-analysis in part because of this trend that MacKinnon has correctly described.

MacKinnon links sadism to pornography, whereas Kristeva has a more difficult position to defend. If she argues that there

is a sudden shift in the distribution of genotypes that gives rise to sado-masochist sexual drives, she will have no historical evidence and population geneticists will laugh her out the door. If on the other hand, she wishes to say that early childhood assaults reached an epidemic in such a way as to create sado-masochism, she is back to blaming mother, but at least she has a reasonable socio-epidemiological explanation that only lacks historical detail.

In any case, the democracy of sado-masochism and white nationalism is predictable. Huey Newton understood the tactics necessary for handling the democratic movement of the sado-masochists and white nationalists—one that comes in guises of the New Right, Churchill-bashers and supposed leftism.

This may seem an irony in that Huey Newton consciously tapped into ultra-male conceptions of manhood and the Wild West with his gun-toting confrontations with police. Kristeva should be thrilled that Huey Newton was among the first pro-Stalin communists to say we must be done with homophobia. Newton had been a target of FBI- spread slanders that he was in fact gay, but Newton came back and charged that it did not matter gay or even KKK, the truth is the truth. So the enemy attacks in a pornographic fashion at the individual level, but Newton responds not at the individual level but by feminizing in general as Kristeva would say.

MacKinnon might complain that the new outlook on homosexuality is still tied up with the state and power and hence oppressive and pornographic. This is true, but it fails to grasp what is principal. Huey Newton did not overthrow patriarchy and capitalism it is true. But since the time of Huey Newton we can speak of the semiotics of the enemy. Thanks to the enemy which voiced a certain kind of attack, Huey Newton brought forward something new. We cannot afford to judge the Huey Newtons or others inside imperialist borders by their instant success in social revolution.

Julia Kristeva did not put Huey Newton through psycho-analysis. Rather the enemy caused Huey Newton to acknowledge his feminine side or possibly the enemy simply punished him for recognizing it. This is a stunning example of what we mean: the enemy does our work for us. The enemy did our psycho-analysis for us, and in a much more massive fashion than we could hope with a small band of proletarian internationalists or post-structuralist libertarians like Kristeva.

It was the enemy that brought forward the unconscious and since Huey Newton's day, even better examples have arisen. After

Newton's success and when it became apparent that the proletariat was not going to carry the day in the West, the enemy literally put Newton's associates through psycho-analysis and caused them to write sell-out books. This was a new pornographic attack left to MIM to deflect. Once again the counter-attack was general—against psychiatry and pseudo-feminism in general.

MIM was born in the early Reagan 1980s, among youth with little or no exposure to the heady days of 1968. Consequently, MIM was able to maneuver more quickly with the accepted premise of being in the minority not just in vague consciousness but action. MIM immediately took up gay liberation regardless of the low regard the population held for gay liberation at that time.

If we count 1945 to 1970 or the oil crisis of 1973 as one generation, we have to admit that another generation has passed, that from 1973 to 1998. In summing up that generation, MIM now makes it known that it made a number of tactical calls in the dialectical thread started by Huey Newton. These tactical judgment calls stayed loyal to the same dialectic and doggedly upheld MacKinnon while Leninizing her for revolutionary use.

Gay liberation, attacks on pornographic billboards and a structuralist view of wimmin epitomized by the line "all sex is rape" did nothing to gain MIM any popularity, but our expectation of maneuvering into power was not the same as Huey Newton's. In connection to all these issues we are still in a struggle with the enemy that will probably remain in the same strategic stage for another 20 years. When the enemy has received enough frustration from MIM's tactics, it will have to cease with its "communism is dead" tactics. The enemy will have to make communism popular again in part to be able to return to tactics of battling communism with a potential majority in hand. The enemy in the imperialist countries will wish it had our discipline, and not petty-bourgeois diffuseness. At that time, the enemy will grant the communists the "democratic" banner for the petty-bourgeoisie, but we should refuse it, unless there is a socialist bloc to defend against fascism or other advantage to us.

What we have found is that the enemy calculates its attacks with regard to the latest turns in public opinion. This demonstrates the drive of the enemy that makes it possible for judo to work.

Since I have already touched on gender and nationality, I should also mention class in this regard. At the recent migrant rights rallies, there was a Black artist distributing CDs with three songs. The songs start out as typical upbeat protest songs, rattling off a list of Caribbean countries that have shown up at

the rallies.

Then in typical gangsta fashion, the music proclaims over and over that "we" as in Caribbean migrants are pimps and drug-dealers. In fact, in invidious class distinction typical in much music today, our artist poses as Caribbean Black in order to put down Amerikan Blacks for not having the best prostitutes and cocaine. We can even view it as a strange kind of bourgeois internationalism, an assimilation into Amerikan culture.

At first one might think this is self-satire or even a provocation by racists. Surely in persuading majority whitey to let in more people, these songs will backfire. We can even question whether the artist knows what the issues are despite showing up at the rallies. Yet, these songs do unequivocally oppose deportation back to "my nation."

So what should we make of these gangsta protest songs? Or to put it the other way, what would it look like for the lumpen to show up at a migrant rights rally? The songs extoll self-reliance "on the street." We even hear that the lumpen brings Amerika the best drugs and hookers, so there is a subliminal message about Amerika being a libertarian place as part of its identity—a big mistake given the imprisonment rate, a mistake reinforced and made more likely by Kristeva in her current form loving "freedom" in the united \$tates. Kristeva's libertarianism, like most libertarianism, is really a denial of u.\$ repression, a form of white nationalism.

Ultimately, MIM finds these three songs to be straight-forward pride in Black lumpen status. As soon as we blot out the white majority's views, we can see clearly. In fact, there is a dialectic. Whitey can say "we" are criminals and "we" the Black lumpen will just explain how we are still the best. The TV can say whatever it wants about Blacks and migrants, but there is still going to be a solid political resistance--no matter what. This says something about what the domination through spectacle can and cannot accomplish. Even the lumpen will subsume some of the Spectacle culture, but it still showed up for the migrant rallies, with pride.

V. The father

Huey Newton triggered a train of struggles alive to this day, but Kristeva might say that like Mao he was playing with the father figure; albeit with feminist overtones. Here we would like to return to the question of the father, love and judgment. Kristeva has made some headway among intellectual circles and feminists on tying social problems²¹ to the

relationship to our fathers.

To state this most explosively, Kristeva says that current ills often stem from wimmin's not reconciling with their fathers. Putting aside blame, guilt and fear is necessary for access to the symbolic world for wimmin according to Kristeva, because the psychic energy of the female has to go into separation from the mother at much greater expense than for the male child. Even Kristeva's fear of test-tube babies stems from her belief that existing borderline personalities and a general malaise stem from a lack of a father role in the family. The banality of evil results in fact from a "lack of relationships, lack of authority"²² in the family. Obviously Kristeva directly challenges anti-authoritarian pseudo-feminism.

So for example, the attacks on Ward Churchill stem from his harshly critical gaze, one which brings up anxieties in connection to infant or early childhood sexuality. Did father see us in potty-training and screwing up? Did we see adults having sex and not know what to think? These sort of traumatic events lurk behind our current behavior according to Freudians. If we can admit that romantic failures can cause depression today, then why can't we admit that perhaps failures we cannot remember may also be influencing our behavior today?

There is a feminist component as well. In Ward Churchill's case, his attackers may have seen intellectually dominant fathers in conflict with mothers. At first one might think that the feminist answer is to side with the mother, but where does that leave judgment and intellectual development? To Kristeva's credit, she at least says that we should learn to accept conflict. We suspect she would advise many criticizing Ward Churchill to reconcile with intellectually dominant or critical fathers.

For womyn dealing with her relationship to her father, the answer is not siding with the mother. There will be conflict, but the daughter still needs something from the father. Feminism seeking the liberation and development of wimmin is not backward-looking and nor does it believe in a world without conflict. Siding with mother in the past does not eliminate her conflicts and nor does it help the daughter going forward.

These are the sorts of issues Kristeva is talking about. On the plus side, these are secular issues, not the Father who art in Heaven. On the whole though, MIM rejects psychology as an emphasis on individual motivations that leads to historical idealism. As an entire subject it is not capable of scientific insight, only a profound ideological role.

MIM would prefer that people look at dialectical materialism and accept it, as Kristeva did in words at least in her 1973 doctoral thesis. Against us, some would ask "on what authority?" "How do we know dialectical materialism is correct?" Psycho-analysts might further retort that incorrect judgment stems from unconscious places, so to produce a higher percentage of correct judgments we should encourage a correction of relationships to our parents.

MIM certainly does not want to deny that incorrect judgment is in the majority. Such a fact is an important assumption of our work. To bring this question sharply to a head, we can also say that having a vanguard party can be like having a father. Stalin's and Mao's parties consciously appropriated the father image. MIM rejects it, but carefully and not in binary fashion. Stalin and Mao lived among people raised under feudalism and for them, a bourgeois idealist view was a step forward. Like it or not, there are some who will use MIM to create or extend and improve a father image for their own personal reasons. Even Almond's study of 1920s and 1930s communists found that a large reason for Marxism's popularity was actually the feeling of "intellectual mastery" it gave people.

To those who say people are incapable of correct judgments because of unconscious pressures, MIM says again that we let the enemy do our work for us. That includes letting the capitalist class recruit our party. If there are no people capable of correct judgment, we admit no people to the party. It's very undemocratic, disciplined and elitist of us, but Kristeva should recognize from her own theory that MIM restores something that is lacking. Ours are the tactics for being in the minority with no material basis for being in the majority inside the borders of our own country—tactics for people who are literate but lacking access or interest in the symbolic order as Kristeva calls it.

If imperialism is decadent as MIM says and if parents are our first critics, then it stands to reason via Freud that there are more and more sexual traumas covered up and mishandled through incorrect relations to parents. This is important in terms of developing people capable of critical thought. When the attempt is made to carry out critical thought, the right concepts might be in place, but a shudder of emotion or anxiety overcomes us or there might be a blankness in desire. MIM says blankness of desire stems from the paralysis of the petty-bourgeoisie.

As in Freudian theory of the 1930s, the widespread lack of judgment ability points to the likelihood of fascism in the imperialist countries. Kristeva claims that internationalism of her sort is dying out in an era of resurgent

nationalism and she links this to the increase in proportion of sexually backward personalities.

Yet what MIM is saying here is that even if we accept all these Kristeva-like conclusions about imperialism and vanguard parties, it does not follow that we want more psycho-analysis. For one, the ability to reach correct judgments is not good for the class enemy to have. For two, MIM hinges its analysis of how to handle fascism on an analysis of both surplus-value and demography and we are confident we are on the right track there without psycho-analysis. There is also the danger that Kristeva's analysis could spread to the Third World after the First World. Even if she does succeed in overcoming some of the anxieties and apprehensions there in connection to sexual trauma, it is not clear that that would be a good thing. Moderating anxieties in the First World might be good, but it might be a middle-class overassumption for the Third World.

Kristeva speaks over and over about love. She is pleased with the intractable male lover who accepts a feminine side and this is something MIM picked up in the early 1980s from a disciple of Kristeva's--and sort of applied via MacKinnon.

Again for MIM, there is no conflict with MacKinnon on this point either. Love or seduction as it is now is about eroticization of power. Thus we should be on the look out for punishment of the male who accepts his feminine side. In Huey Newton's day, the FBI literally tried to make him pay along these lines. Feminists need to stand up for Huey Newton in that situation especially.

We may question the content of love or seduction; yet if there is anything real there other than adjustment to power and purely conformist role-playing, then we must struggle against the punishment of males who accept the feminine side. Kristeva says the feminine side has appeared in the male who has ever experienced desperately "waiting for" a loved one or the feeling of not being whole or existent at all without the loved one.²³

On this point, and her point accepting there is such a thing as morality, Kristeva is not completely post-modernist. There may be impurities. In any case, Kristeva does not try to put forward only a subjectivist view and she rather opposes inter-subjectivism without the benefit of analysis. When Kristeva tries to translate to men gender conditions, she is assuming universality, a communicable truth. Whatever if anything is there in love or seduction it is surely obscured by power games and role-playing of this historical moment.

With regard to another ages-old question, obviously MIM stands for unconditional love of the proletariat for-itself. Whatever judgmental conclusions we may reach regarding individuals by comparison, we must be more careful about judgments regarding classes without comparison. In addition, judgments of a class are really only appropriate for the exploiters. If we have uncovered the real proletariat and have not made some analytical mistake, that proletariat will be superior to any other class. Criticism of such a class as a whole risks historical idealism. There is no god position from which to criticize a real proletariat. When we criticize the proletariat for false consciousness, that criticism should only be toward achieving that class's own goals. A coach is helpful when he can compare a fighter's punches with punches that same fighter made in the past. Moreover, there is a thin line between criticism of false consciousness and historical idealism. Criticism of the proletariat can only be by comparison with the proletariat itself lest it be guilty of historical idealism and the authoritarian/anti-authoritarian trap.

Regarding the meaning of rejection of the father and Freudianism, Kristeva raises a very timely question. Now there are increasing numbers of female writers like herself and some husbands have psycho-analysts for wives. MIM would add that in the united States, the adult female is taking over in formal education as adult males drop out or simply do not increase their ranks in higher education. Will it be long before there are socially patterned and common complications of male rejection of female intellect? If we reject Kristeva now, are we asking for trouble in the future too? Will people start treating brilliant wimmin as the father? Is that good or bad?

On the questions of the father, Kristeva and MIM reach some similar points via different paths. For Kristeva rejection of the father can mean a slowdown of certain kinds of mental development, especially among wimmin. Christianity stemming from guilty feelings may follow. For MIM, anti-authoritarianism in opposition to Stalin and Mao is almost always historical idealism. Guilt and Freudianism may follow as a result. We must learn to reject "emperor logic," both that Stalin was horribly good or horribly bad in proportions only possible for God or Satan. We will leave it to our reader to decide if we have attacked Kristeva with Kristeva.

VI. Sado-masochism

MIM has been criticized repeatedly for insisting on the prevalence of sado-masochism among adult females of the West--to put this in Kristeva's language, but what we refer to as "gender aristocracy." In labor aristocracy "expulsions" (as Kristeva would call them)

regarding adult sexuality, the point might eventually become to preserve a clean spot, an oasis, we at MIM would say in pushing Kristeva. At first we may mistake the vehemence of labor aristocracy sexuality, because its directness masks the real point of defense.

The inversion happens through an attack on the father. What is really happening is a defense of the purity of the mother, but only implicitly. Kristeva warns in general against getting involved with the mother's criticism of the father. For this some will say that Freudianism is a natural sell-out of wimmin's interests. Kristeva and other Freudians might reply that her critics "just can't deal" to use the vernacular.

In general, MIM too holds that Freudianism is anti-feminist. Kristeva being so bracing as an alternative theorist though, we should humor her attempts to fuse Freudianism and feminism (which she variously says she has abandoned, but which she cannot in the sense that she holds sexual matters more causally principal (than most feminists)). We do not want to see any theorist talking about feminism taken down lightly, because we are at a stage where we need more theory in feminism, and less art and individualism. (Kristeva celebrates art and literature in a general way.) So though we oppose Kristeva, we want her taken seriously to encourage theory in general.

MacKinnon opposes what Western Liberalism lightly refers to as "S&M." While some men (including male and female biology) can handle "S&M" in relatively tame fashion, there are those hurt under its rubric--socially-oppressed wimmin. Such is a straight-forward criticism of Liberalism that is similar in other matters such as trade as MacKinnon rightly points out.

In Kristeva, the sado-masochistic sexuality of self-destruction carries Freudian but possibly profound feminist meaning. For example, one of her few clinical successes was ending an anorexia case.

To Kristeva, the womyn showing signs like anorexia must come to grips with her own sexual sado-masochism. One question may be "who to attack?" but another question is "who is suffering?" Since wimmin are suffering disproportionately from anorexia, if it were true that re-adjusting our relationships to our parents were helpful, then wimmin would disproportionately benefit from a reduction of sado-masochism. This however requires the acceptance of womyn's sado-masochism as a factual point to begin with and this is taken as anti-feminist meaning, so we can see why Kristeva is so controversial once understood. Is she just another pawn of the patriarchy asking wimmin to internalize patriarchal dominance or is she really benefitting wimmin disproportionately? Or is it even possible

that some kinds of patriarchal protection really do benefit wimmin disproportionately? Or is MIM correct and we are not even talking about wimmin in the first place, but people with female biology but gender privilege?

In MacKinnon, the question is muted, but in the end MacKinnon has to admit that wimmin "get off" on their own destruction, while MIM would say they "get off" on their own destruction as a gender to be recreated as oppressor gender. Without some discussion of this topic, MacKinnon has explained men but not wimmin. To stay with the theme of eroticization of power, there is no other possibility but sado-masochism for the womyn to explain what we see now in the imperialist countries.

So for example, we agree with Kristeva that anorexia is one expression of sado-masochist sexual drive. Yet it is not really biological because its distribution is by class and nation.

For Kristeva, anorexia necessitates psycho-analysis and stems from individual biological drive. She hopes to bring something from the unconscious forward and unleash a different biological drive, one individual at a time. Although conquering anorexia benefits wimmin disproportionately, Kristeva is subject to the criticism that her solution props up the patriarchy by blaming the victim for sado-masochism. Kristeva would retort that everyone is innocent and yet responsible. Her "intimate rebellion" centers on this idea, that sado-masochism and other problems are connected to the unconscious for which we cannot receive 100% blame contrary to Sartre who did not really believe in a Freudian unconscious; though Kristeva says Sartre introduced it through his discussion of nothingness instead.

While MIM agrees with Kristeva that there is no getting around the prevalence of sado-masochism today, we see that Kristeva has tapped into the origins and formation of a gender aristocracy. Just as there are those who die in yacht crashes, there are those currently with the privilege to die from anorexia. They make their friends and family miserable over a protracted period, because that is what they enjoy and they also have a general feminine masochism.

In some yacht crashes there is also an element of capitalism that can be exposed. Why for example does someone want a yacht and why did the persyn feel compelled to race it in a certain way and why did we feel so compelled to drink the Budweiser that day when we crashed and had deaths? So we can say the yacht crash victim is also a social victim.

The gender aristocracy as victim is more interesting than bourgeois

yacht owner. It is in the process of her victimhood, that the gender aristocrat rises to oppressor status. In the name of liberating wimmin oppressed by the veil, Amerikan wimmin bomb Iraq and Afghanistan. The first step was victimhood. The second step was attack for domination right down into sexual torture in Abu Ghraib. The confirmed and hardened anorexic is gender aristocracy and the articulate pro-anorexia writer is gender bureaucracy--enemies of the proletariat. We include writers promoting the emaciated druggy look, the Kate Moss obsession. The gender aristocrat has accepted the pressure from society to raise her gender status partly by cruel acts to herself and others. Anorexia is just one means of outlet for the sado-masochism rewarded in the gender aristocracy. That anorexia happens among young, upper-middle class wimmin above all, which proves that it is a question of turning female children into oppressors--gender aristocracy. Yet not all female children are in a social place to be able to transition into gender aristocracy. Some wimmin may make the transition after having children. Others go the anorexic route. Most female children in the world are not in a position to become gender aristocracy, most of which is in the imperialist countries.

Looking at the same problem, MIM sees a political solution at the group level, whereas Kristeva sees an individual solution. MIM is not blaming the victim, because we view gender aristocracy as enemy, not victims. Likewise, we do not give lifestyle advice to the individual and again cannot be seen as victim blaming on that score either. Our solution is general. Eliminate the conditions that create the gender aristocracy and anorexia will disappear.

One could have the old view of patriarchy as controlling everything always but in all directions. So we could go back to the "have it both ways" of saying men want access to wimmin but men also want control of wimmin to the extent that they die in advertisement-induced stupor and are thus no longer available, aside from which many "surviving" anorexics are too far off the deep end to be girlfriend material for the patriarchy as conventionally understood. Though a pressure on wimmin regarding weight comes from men in general, anorexia is only partly tied to that pressure.

The role of conventional patriarchy is there in anorexia. To go the extra mile and know that one is going to die or cause debilitating suffering from one's anorexia requires a participant. Thus it is little surprise that the anorexic route to oppressor status is the choice of disproportionately petty-bourgeois intellectual youth. Though we do not think of intellectual youth as the most influenced by super-models, the anorexic understands in the most symbolic way the general line of the patriarchy's alliance with the gender aristocracy. Kate Moss suffers in her one aspect as potential womyn and succeeds in her other aspects as a model and millionaire, and gains not just class status but gender status. The anorexic

easily confuses the gender aristocracy's internal logic of existence with womynhood itself.

VII. Anti-authoritarianism as the new Christianity

The defects of the authoritarian right-wing of parasitism are well-known. Former Nixon aide John Dean has just published a book on the problem facing Amerika with these right-wing authoritarians. Today we also have a resurgence of Christian fundamentalism aided by the TV, with leaders such as Pat Robertson appearing.

What needs more consideration is whether anti-authoritarian Freudianism does not have a better claim to Christianity than Pat Robertson. Did Kristeva offer an alternative to Christianity or merely rationalize it for the problems of our day?

On the question of abortion, it would seem that open Christianity is the real McCoy. The red states (Republican voting U.S. states) really do have a lower abortion rate too, no hypocrisy there. Yet on no other topic can this writer really say that Christian fundamentalists of the red states are really more Christian than our Freudians.

Charges of hypocrisy against MacKinnon for example are more likely to come from real Democrats and anti-Christian libertarians. In defense of pornography they say MacKinnon dated Penthouse executives, so how can she say it is possible for anyone to defeat pornography? The charge of hypocrisy is Christian.

On the question of the soul, some are willing to let the concept die. Kristeva insists on giving it new life through individual biology. Thanks to Kristeva, we may hear about the soul not just in church but also in the classroom. Who is here threatening separation of church and state more--those advocating "intelligent design" in the open or Kristeva importing Christianity via Freud.

Then what shall we make of those anti-authoritarians who spend more political time running down Leninist "cults" than doing anything else? Do they not promote historical idealism by implying the importance of leaders, this time in the negative? Is it not one more step toward saying if not having Leninist leaders is so important then having other non-Leninist (and hence more likely Christian) leaders IS important? And even according to Freudian theory, are not attacks on the political father likely to result in guilt? And who is likely to capitalize on guilt? This looks like a

racket where the anti-authoritarian Freudian is a front for the Catholic Church and Franco. The Leninist need not believe Lenin is god, to believe that the vanguard party is the most accountable form of revolutionary class struggle and hence necessary. The persyn who bothers to be anti-Leninist has usually made historical idealism a principle.

So MIM has to wonder about the people who feel they are accomplishing something by attacking the political father. Why do they feel they are accomplishing something and why are they uncomfortable--so much so--with Leninism?

Also, who said Bu\$h is a better Christian than Kristeva? Is not Bu\$h the one killing his neighbors, not Kristeva? Is not a possible reading of the Prophecy that Bu\$h is the anti-Christ heading Babylon and attacking Iraq?

Yes, the anti-Christ or Satan, is he Stalin? If so, then who again are the real Christians, the right-wing authoritarians or the left-wing anti-authoritarians? It seems there is not much difference, and rather a shared Christianity for all class and gender purposes.

MIM is not surprised. Freudianism is bourgeois. It is work that the capitalist class does for us and against us. There is no reason to suspect that Freudianism or the Democratic Party can really dethrone Christian fundamentalism. There is too much in common. Only over the long haul is it possible that one may survive and the other fade away. Ultimately, underneath, there is no difference in class. To make real strides against Christianity in the united \$tates, we need a proletariat that we do not have, hence the ineptitude of the Freudian assault on "old values."

VIII. Kristeva on Liberalism and internationalism

The unconscious and infant development can be infinitely deep grab-bags of opportunisms. So, like many others, we would cut down on calls on the unconscious and what calls we do make for scientific purposes we would insist that they not be "having things both ways." Freudian erasure tactics regarding the individual past are almost by definition opportunist. This present writer believes that an imperialist country persyn who can rewrite the individual past for a happier future outlook is also someone who can turn the other way when looking at war victims or global hunger--and be well on his or her way to being a typical twisted white persyn--privileged, comfortable and unconnected to the rest of the world except as exploiter and oppressor. It is in essence a question of what one does with one's leisure time in a privileged culture, so psycho-analysis may lead to erasure and open the path to greater acceptance of oppressor privilege.

Most of what Kristeva is talking about that is unique to her contributions is connected to the unconscious. Her idea of a distinct individual biology generating the "soul" and "style" is convenient for a secular co-optation of or by Christianity and Liberalism via individualism.

In contrast, MIM has to stress directionality and not "having things both ways." We can have much of the same theory of Kristeva without psycho-analysis, because the empirical plays such a small role in Kristeva's work. The practice in connection to Kristeva's work is very much in doubt.

In connection to internationalism, instead of saying that Germans are too orderly and tidy, and having people draw incorrectly permanent conclusions about a nationality, we should say that parents should be careful in potty-training and other exercises of similar self-control training not to make them the ultimate achievement of a child and the highest point of happiness in family life! Such advice can be given to all people in one-size-fits-all and it is not individualist, opportunist or chauvinist.

Likewise, we do not want to make the advice we just gave a point of guilt for parents either or we would be promoting lifestyle Christianity. This is another reason why MIM calls lifestyle advice "sub-reformist." We have to know it is tertiary or less important.

"Drive" can be loaded with chauvinist meaning, both male chauvinist and national chauvinist. Overemphasis on the joys of cleaning can lead to a concept of "ethnic cleansing," so to say a people has a biological drive to "ethnic cleansing" is wrong. Rather, at most, if we were to adopt a Freudian approach, we should say there was a temporary culture of overemphasis on potty-training, cleanliness and order. As soon as we say that a biological drive is rooted more in one nationality than another, we have entered a fantasy-world unsupported by fact. Arguments that hinge on such an imaginary national distribution of biological drives or imaginary sudden shifts in the distribution of genes arise for idealist reasons.

When MIM says that Third World people have more drive to politics and revolution than First World people do, we are not making a biological argument. Biology can be part via demography or after class and as an expression of class.

Totally co-opted by Western imperialism, Kristeva is now saying that she became comfortable with imperialism and she calls on

France to defend itself against the inferior culture of the Muslim scarf in school.²⁴ In a ritualistic fashion she once upheld internationalism and Marxism, but apparently never saw herself as an actor in a global power struggle, only someone going along with specific micro-tides in French politics. That much Kristeva admits.

What people attracted to psychology tend not to understand is that persynality is not an explanation. For MIM, nationalism of the oppressed nations is the expression that class struggle against super-exploitation takes. It makes sense when entire countries exploit entire countries. Yet, for Kristeva, nationalism is a persynality defect: "they withdraw into a sullen, warm private world . . . family, ethnicity, nation, race."²⁵ Likewise, internationalism is also a persynality defect according to Kristeva. The real internationalists are colorless, and in the case of wimmin, all-out lesbians.

There is a continuous streak of homophobia in Freudianism, including in its acceptance by the late Betty Friedan and Julia Kristeva. Kristeva's homophobia is the more difficult to prove. In essence, gay or lesbian behavior is seen as less adult, a failure of development. In this sense, Freudianism is not opportunist. It sees one path out of childhood that is optimal.

In any case, for Kristeva, internationalism is a question of persynality. In her initial book on Chinese wimmin and now later in life, she still asks the question that post-modernism is stuck on: "What Position Do I Speak From?"²⁶

Although there is much in Kristeva that is not really post-modernism, the obsession with this question is what she shares in common with her intellectual niche. Let MIM answer the question by putting words in Kristeva's mouth: "I am someone who has developed sexually and is aware of the lesser stages of development, especially common anal expulsive sexuality. Whatever problems I might have had, I have now found my path out of them and I no longer uphold a sterile internationalism. The people who put forward incorrect views of nationalism and internationalism are from certain groups of people with psycho-sexual defects."

For MIM, even if it could be proved that people who think the fart is the greatest thing are white nationalists and wimmin who adopt the cause of the murdered father are the greatest internationalists, it would not prove that white nationalists or internationalists are wrong. In contrast, when MIM addresses the distribution of surplus-value as the underlying problem generating exploitive nationalism, there is a solution.

Even more importantly, that is why we stress that people interested in psychological reasoning generally never reach a scientific understanding. The idea that the distribution of genotypes and how they change is critical to Kristeva's whole argument does not really come up, because science is not really the objective of psychological pursuits--and it cannot be. Psychology returns its users to questions of motivation and hence possible erasure of a question that cannot by its nature be scientifically formulated.

Speaking of France, Kristeva says:

The left demagogically flatters the immigrants and runs down the national reality into which they hope to become integrated, leaving to the far right the easy privilege of appropriating to itself the wealth of our cultures, which are indeed ambivalent but fraught with libertarian potentialities.²⁷

In reading Kristeva in such passages, it becomes clear that "libertarian" is now a buzzword of the oppressor nation. She sees no powerful material basis for internationalism. "Libertarian" is the cry of the dominator nation's petty-bourgeoisie worried about the impending authoritarianism of the Third World that will crush exploitation.

Since for Kristeva there is no powerful basis of internationalism, and we don't blame her if she concluded such just from looking at France, what is important is some kind of steering of moderation between the internationalists and the xenophobes. The supposed extremes simply come from defective people personality-wise according to Kristeva.

IX. An aside on Soviet wimmin

A Russian children's story goes something like this: a monkey is found with no identification papers. Police take the monkey away and leave the monkey on the potty. Disorder is seen as stemming from a lack of potty training. MIM sees a snide Freudian libertarian joke pulled on the Soviet people--probably right up Kristeva's alley.

In Soviet bloc societies where daughters lost fathers in war or other demographic catastrophes, the attitude toward Western feminism is different. Tens of millions of Soviet bloc families that arose after World War II know what it is to raise a family without an adult male presence, and there is no fantasizing about it. It's only remarkable that despite Islam's rapid growth in Russia, the Islamic upsurge is not further along given the threat of Western sexuality to people in a weak gender position in the ex-USSR. Kristeva is unique in not delivering a straight-forward rejection of the West and in fact mostly absorbing French theory. MacKinnon can claim to be the theorist of feminism, but whether we count two theorists of feminism depends on our evaluation of Kristeva's

attempt to fuse Freud and feminism.

Kristeva warns against Soviet wimmin who regress sexually toward maternalism. When faced with economic needs, Soviet wimmin will regress to the womb, Kristeva implies, a failure to separate from the mother that will have sexual implications in turn. This is a result of what happened during World War II that created a shortage of active fathers, a problem reduplicated since 1989 with the capitalist killing of Soviet men through alcohol and unemployment-related problems.

In such a scenario, where womyn regresses to the mother from a lack of male presence, advance for womyn is indeed sexual Liberalism. Kristeva says the stress has to go on freedom, not needs.

Freudians have thus doubly tarred the Soviet socialist experience. The wimmin who appreciate socialism's emphasis on humyn needs regress toward a failure to separate from the mother while the best of the Soviets never get beyond the anal stage.

At the same time, though we see the Western thrust of these criticisms, if the pattern of feminism in the Soviet Union is as Kristeva says and if wimmin do not turn to Bolshevism but warm and fuzzy nationalism, especially centered on command of language²⁸—then we have to pay close attention to Kristeva and not just toss what she says out of hand. Again, if we want feminism to be serious about theory, there are many times when we will have to take Kristeva very seriously.

Of note on the question of Islam in Russia, Kristeva would say a repressive version will rise with psycho-sexual regression. MIM would say that an Islam actively opposing Western sexual mores will rise in response to a real decline in gender status of people in Russia. We would say the sexual threat to Russians posed by the West is real, and not subject to adjustment via psycho-analysis. Because Russia is partly labor aristocracy, it is not as threatened as some other countries, so some of the Islamic culture we see in other countries will not take hold as well among Russians.

X. Individuation as prerequisite to pornography: therapy culture

As far back as her book on Chinese wimmin in her supposed Maoist phase, Kristeva gave up the real game with her comments on primal hordes and the lack of eroticism in Chinese wimmin, years before she admitted to not being Maoist. Today she can express a general ideology hostile to those who "universalize or organicize the intimate,"²⁹ as MIM does. Yet as MIM said before reading Kristeva's book on Chinese wimmin, Freudianism is not compatible with Marxism-Leninism-Maoism. So to see Freud's bourgeois Liberal comments about fascism applied to China tipped off MIM that Kristeva was on a bad political trajectory during her supposed Maoist

phase.

Kristeva is then the original "ifeminist," a part of the New Right attack on feminism. While MIM sees itself surrounded by labor aristocracy enemies where there was once a proletariat in the West, Kristeva sees people as having regressed so far that Liberalism is the best possible system at the moment even if that allies her with those whose sexuality requires an oasis of cleanliness, what MIM calls the Liberals or individualists (something Kristeva herself may not have openly admitted.)

Looking at the entertainment culture as Kristeva also calls it, it does seem "impossible" to resist. Here comes MIM saying individuation is the prerequisite of pornography. What now --we are going to have planet-wide solidarity on sexual questions?

Happiness comes from erasing or loosening thereby to erase, so says much of pop psychology. Restrictive and unnecessary ideas stand in the way of happiness--the overdone superego as Freud would call it. No matter what the social structure is, the individual will not fit in and will need to be reborn via Kristeva, especially if fathers are absent according to Kristeva. The individual will have to have corners rounded in order to become a peg that will fit in a circular hole.

Far be it that I would contest "Grunge" music of the 1990s. It was a music of complaint, but it was also great fun. Cast off the necktie and formal clothing and wear t-shirts and clothes with holes in them--and I still agree with that, not that I would pay extra for the clothing to make the point, but nonetheless. Through Freud we can wonder about the motivations of people who need to buy crisp new clothing all the time and starch their collars. We would suspect that the grunge-style people have gone on to pleasures in other things.

The problem is that in psychological culture, happiness stems from erasing a mental state or loosening and then erasing a mental state. In contrast, what we need is a little megalomania in everyone to achieve communism. Not erase the state of mind and be happy. Rather, see something, be unhappy, struggle, change that something and then be happy, only to start the cycle over again.

Changing that something could be something small. Ward Churchill's case is ugly. It's depressing and says a lot about Amerikkka. Go out and do something about that that you are sure would not have been done otherwise. If you put flyers out about it somewhere, where they were not before, be happy. If you scoop some dirt on Churchill's detractors, smile in your little shitpile. There are several steps of power struggle beyond that short of armed struggle on behalf of Ward Churchill.

Surprisingly, what I just said both confirms but contradicts other things that MIM has said. Let's take eroticization of power. MIM says it's bad, needs to be gone. Yet what I just said is in fact eroticization of power. Changing something is about power so being happy about changing something is a happiness with power struggle. "Freedom is the recognition of necessity," so for now, when MIM says eroticizing power is bad, we need to be clear about the stage of struggle we are in. We just say to eroticize those struggles that lead to an end to eroticization of power--and they are not individual breakings of the cycle. There is no way to contest eroticization of power without eroticizing power, power to undo power.

Of course, here is where our lifestyle anarchist or post-modernist enters and says, "I got you." Using some Christian concept of "hypocrisy," the lifestyle anarchist is going to contest our "desire" for power and call it "authoritarian" and other swear words.

What we need to understand is that the difference between the anarchist, individualist, psychologist, New Ager and libertarian on the one side and the authoritarian and scientific communist on the other is that the anarchist is in fact pornographic by nature, while even if a communist does not like sex per se, the communist enjoys some power struggles. There is no getting around the essential question posed by the lifestyle anarchists and New Agers. Happiness for some comes from the pictures, others from the act. There's a great song about the "fight for your right to party" in which "mom takes away your best porno mag," but let's not kid ourselves. Any single song of the Black Panther Party had more real lust behind it. The Beastie Boys are derivative, not the other way around as therapy culture would have it. Larry Flynt promotes and writes about a derivative experience called pornography, while Eldridge Cleaver wrote about his experience raping wimmin as a power struggle. This sort of comparison is where the anti-authoritarian has trouble. Is not pornography better than direct power struggle? Was not Cleaver the authoritarian supporting a party for Stalin, Mao and Huey Newton?

Fundamentally in the world today, the libertarian-psychologist lives in a world of erasure. Once someone has paid money or used force to get a model to take off her clothes and appear in a photo, the therapy culture enters in. It becomes OK to erase everything that happened before the picture arose and now just focus on the picture. So what I am saying about happiness in the therapy culture is that it stems above all from erasure, erasing every little nasty detail about the picture's production process--the pain of the model in losing weight if she had to, the washing of her clothes, the smell of smoke and alcohol on her breath, the means by which she came to want money in this fashion, maybe even her own stupidity (not to make a victim out of all models)--basically all the things where we might decide, "shit stinks!" Pop psych will say the superego is too restrictive to point all that out.

Through the process of erasure it becomes possible to ignore all the authoritarianism in life. The guilt of the vanguard party is not in being authoritarian in a world full of authoritarianism so much as disrupting anarchists' mental erasure of authoritarianism. The power structure itself in its conservative variants is happy to let anarchists mentally erase their unhappiness over the power structure. Instead of questioning what goes on in pornography production daily, the consumer of the therapy culture, the libertarian pop psychologists ask about the motivations of the activist opposing pornography.

The villification of a Catharine MacKinnon occurs essentially because the libertarian or anarchist opposition is pornographic by nature in a sense more profound than some narrow and useless definition of pornography. What matters to the pro-pornography activist is not social reality, but individual motivation, and this is something that for example Kristeva believes makes Westerners superior to Chinese and other East Asians by extension. She might as well point to "Summa Theologica" and all its fine points about the difference between sincerity and dissimulation. Reality could occur in a pattern every day with horrific oppression, but the pornographic anarchist has already erased that. What matters is that we not disrupt this libertarian's erasure of social reality. When the libertarian attacks the motivations of a MacKinnon, the libertarian is being consistent in living in the world of the image detached from its production.

Our lifestyle anarchists and psychologists are cogs in the Spectacle Machine, custodians that make sure everything gets swept in. Rather than erase actual authoritarianism, they erase an unpleasant image of authoritarianism, by say throwing MacKinnon into the pornography machine. It is not authentic sexual enjoyment by the libertarians if there is such a thing. They have no actual relationship with MacKinnon. What they enjoy is something else anyway, the step after individuation that makes possible the focus on the mental state or image. Though they never touch MacKinnon, the libertarians are enjoying themselves via discussion of her alleged or true relationship to Penthouse executives. The libertarians are unwilling to recognize that anymore than the anorexic is willing to see her own sado-masochism. Via a hyper-use of the Christian concept of "hypocrisy" usually, the libertarian attacks MacKinnon and never actually addresses substance. It is the *ad hominem* morass, which is a product of pornography in its entertainment aspect.

This is all that the unscientific and pre-political know how to do--act on the individual motivational level. This is an important distinction: the New Ager anarchists have given up on overthrowing actual authoritarianism, as their stand on sex usually clearly illustrates. What they fight for instead is an erasure of the mental image of authoritarianism. Sweep MacKinnon away as an individual who just needs to "chill out" or "loosen

up" or otherwise disappear the alleged anti-authoritarians can do and that is all they do do. "Don't shoot the messenger" seems not to have sunk in with consistent erasers. The trouble is that for some things, like getting people not to wear long pants and suits on Wall Street or shifting to grunge wear may be just a question of image and erasure, but surely not everything is as easy as Pearl Jam and Nirvana. Clothing is both physical as in causing too much warmth in summer and it is also image. Most libertarians and anarchists are content only with image.

So to apply the therapy culture, we erase and erase mental states and then are "reborn" (could it be any clearer in its refashioning of Christianity for Americans?) in the words of Julia Kristeva, psycho-analyst—hopefully even reborn in anarchist fashion according to Kristeva. This comes out clearly with regard to pornographic photos, but the metaphor can go much further as a general point.

As a scientific communist, my sense of "distrust" has always been different than that of what I identify as the pornographic therapy culture's. My distrust comes when I see someone look at something real, pass by, act like it never happened and then erase the mental state or bring it back later only to replace it with some ego-boosting images. In other words, those of us who assume happiness is our god-given right the way anarchist individualists do will inevitably erase what should not be erased. I've seen theoreticians erase the question of surplus-value countless times, even in the name of Marx. In activists I've seen many erase the question of their own level of commitment, usually with an erasure of their own past and possibly combined with passive-aggressive erasures of others' pasts as justification.

Who do I trust? I trust the kid who knows nothing about politics yet but sees the Christian TV ads for sending a few bucks a day to help starving children in the Third World. If such a kid then goes and gets her milk money to send into the program, I trust the kid on a psychological level, even if the tactics are wrong. Through whatever process, this child did not see ugliness and erase it, but instead saw ugliness and sought to change it. Crucially, I trust the kid not by asking the kid's motivations, but by seeing the actions. It does not mean I believe the kid overthrew capitalism even slightly, just that that is as far as the question of "trust" can fruitfully go.

If we let the psychologists have their way with this kid, some will ask if she were motivated by guilt. Some would say Christianity is an opiate of the people—even in this context. And the best anarchist move of all will be to wonder if she shook down the other kids in school to get some extra milk money to send off. More likely will be the lower-middle class question, "I'll bet her parents are rich." What they just cannot understand in the pornographic culture is anything apart from individual motivation and it is considered oh-so radical to question the individual motivation. Never is questioned action and most especially the lack thereof. Patterns of action are

unthinkable. The desire for action itself is suspect as authoritarian, a back-handed compliment of authoritarianism. Not for nothing I recently read someone openly defend "do nothing" as revolutionary on a supposedly radical left website. The "do nothing" crowd suspects the motivations of the authoritarians, but it has no more business to do than assassinating the father as some Freudians might say. In a lustier context of proletarian upsurge, these "do nothing" (who also therefore "know nothing") people would be shuffled out of the way and quickly as paid agents of the state.

We scientific communists look at patterns of action overall.

If I am going to use a hurdle for the individual, it won't be the method of 1001 motivation questions, because in the end no one can really say what it is that motivates a class of people when they do something excellent. They may not know or even intend what they did.

My concerns are: does someone erase and go off into oblivion? Ignore all the talk and rhetoric but did the communist take arduous action? Weed out the rest, even if they are better talkers.

In persynal life, do you hear someone feel like they have to insist that they "broke up" with them and not the other way around? Do they have to deny they were ever in love (and hence vulnerable)? Now what about death of family or other loved ones? Here most psycho-analysts and therapists are going to recommend some erasure. In contrast, what about those ancestor-worshipping East Asian cultures. Perhaps they do not erase some sufferings and are less gung-ho on psychiatry as a result. Ancestor-worship is a substitute for therapy culture with reputed benefits of a different sort. Instead of erasing, it is possible to remember them all and ritualize the suffering so connected to their loss. Not that ancestor worship is all that great either, so when a district comrade had to scare some starving civilians out of a village still worshipping the dead they could not leave behind, he boiled up some ancestors to eat--so would be my reading of some cannibalism stories from the Great Leap--nasty bastards and good district comrades in my book once we take ancestor worship into consideration. The point is for those who believe individualism is innate or impossible to overcome. In fact, the surprising thing is that in many contexts and cultures individualism does not exist at all, and we need not go back into distant history or anthropology.

So without question when we see 600 Lebanese civilians who are not even in our families bombed to death,³⁰ the same advice will apply in the therapy culture of the West: erase the mental state and be reborn into happiness. Just as the defense of pornography is derivative, the erasure of the possibility of internationalism starts by making the death of 600 Lebanese derivative. "Love it or leave it," will be the response to criticism of the u.S. role in Lebanon along the same lines of "MacKinnon just needs a good f*." Though these particular attacks will not be accepted at face-value by the politically

correct, most of the pc crowd will go on to different versions of the same thing—because the underlying Christian and pornographic rot is not understood.

So, I tend to believe the erasure culture may start with processes closest to us and then keep going. If that can count as psychology, then that would be mine—no trust for those who erase close to home or far away.

I don't see erasure as inherent to the humyn or even the West, though it may appear as pretty much a psychological explanation of the Western persynality. If there is psychology it is what therapists have managed to spread like wildfire through social means.

Unfortunately, the erasure culture is not something that can be accurately turned on or off at will. If only we could really erase the memories of grandparents' deaths and focus our energies on other things, there would be a case to be made. How often we hear "I can only work on my own issues." Yet I contend life does not work that way. The real game is expanding our memory of painful detail, not in an obsessive way about one detail to thereby oddly erase others, but to try to absorb the entirety of evil, pain and suffering and crucially, not let it go. So this is after 40 pages in an article, and we know the one reading this far is potential party material. We are not going to win this battle very often, so I'm not saying MIM is really going to figure out how to popularize dialectical materialism including retention of history that should not be erased in a genocidal culture that has become professional in erasing the oppressed. Even so, the vanguard party idea is for the minority so far in history, and we scientific communists have already proved that such a minority makes a difference. So I will still plug for a certain version of dialectical materialism anyway.

Dialectical materialism is seeing the struggles including suffering connected together as it is in reality and all at once simultaneously. The next step is to take action and enjoy power struggle. I don't imagine I will sell a lot of books or have a lot of clients pay me to tell them to remember terrible things and keep them all. There's also not much market for self-criticism. To the extent there is one, it is for the exotic, how an Amerikan prisoner fared in Mao's China for example.

I have to confess that I always thought I would meet more people who agreed with me on these points, but instead I have found myself disappointed. Yet again, the advice will be to "loosen up."

A big ally of the erasure culture is the individualist idea of dignity, that everyone is entitled to dignity without criticism. We have virtually made it a humyn-right in a systematic way. Yet what if reality is undignified and really ugly? The Kristeva follower will say people are entitled to remake themselves and be optimistic.

I have seen a woman go to a public event called a rape speakout and make her entire speech about an academic paper that hurt her feelings. In a way, I think she put her finger on exactly what the therapy culture is and how it is connected to pornography. She did not have someone jump her from a bush. She was not complaining about a significant other or anyone else in direct physical contact with her. Erasure has gone to the point where there is no aggressive or non-aggressive relationship to a person involved--just as there is no relationship necessary in pornography. Recently, a conservative commentator used a phrase something like "untethered from reality to such an extent as to make caricature impossible" to refer to those attacking Bush for not being globally aggressive enough in attacking Iran, Syria and northern Korea. This might as well refer to most of the country. The liberal Freudian and anarchist crowd can be called the "passive-aggressives" but the right-wing extremists are just plain aggressors.

In contrast, the scientific communist believes that Kristeva's project is like digging to China. Maybe she's technically or theoretically right it can be done with a pail and garden shovel if we all become expert psycho-analysts, but there is the question of efficiency. Fundamentally, contrary to what both the liberal Freudians and Cheney said, there is no right to be detached from reality. In fact, there is instead a right to correct violently those whose unreality disrupts others' survival rights.

Saying "but I was in therapy" about that problem is not going to cut it. We can even say the greater the unreality violating the survival rights of the proletariat, the greater the violence to correct it will be.

Self-criticism

I have some respect for Freud's ideas of libido and death drive, just not for the purposes he used them. To say that organic matter wants to return to inorganic matter sounds perfectly scientific, so I see no need to question the death drive Freud talks about, just its utility or finesse in application.

The psychology of the person who supports imperialist militarism--shall we say he had a separation difficulty and is now confused by whether he hates the Other, hates himself or simply needs self-criticism? I suppose we could, but again it seems like digging to China with a trowel.

Not erasing the mental state is important, because it's a side-step from the main act. But I don't see any problem of saying we are trying to master the death drive and even utilize it.

The typical Western therapist or psycho-analyst examines the shattering of egos that makes people crazy. Is something that could shatter the ego life-threatening? Even such a question seems designed to legitimize the Western concept of the individual, including the role of mythology in

protecting dignity. In the pseudo-feminist version, there is the "empowerment" of filtering out critical voices of patriarchy, but it ends up being filtering out all critical voices--a popular choice and one that Kristeva to her credit takes special measures against.

First of all, we need to understand that the percentage of people who really seem to be damaged beyond humyn interaction by possibly non-existent "ego formation" is practically nil. For scientific purposes, people alive but not able to speak intelligibly for various physical or psychological reasons are of course of great interest. For social purposes, the risk of "dignity" and self-esteem related hardening is much greater than whatever may have happened from "shattered egos," either in a pop psych version or Freudian version.

Marx said there is such a thing as "criticism of arms [weapons]," so we can't separate the question of death drive from criticism and self-criticism. Perhaps we will learn some day that self-criticism really does involve the death of some cells. By extension and more certainly, suicide is the ultimate self-criticism.

In response, that is exactly where our pornographic psychology culture will enter and say, "see there is such a thing as an unhealthy level of self-criticism. There is a need for many people on the edge in fact to erase." What can I say, but "what doesn't kill you makes you stronger" and the gains from erasure are not worth the price paid in other areas, including aspects of society that will cause more suicides. I have no tidy answer that can be cost-free at this time, but I do claim my answer is less costly than others.

I cannot help but think of the death drive in relationship to muscle definition. If fat burns up, that means some cells are not there anymore. This clears the way for muscle discipline or definition. At the same time, Kristeva will tell us that anorexics are dying, and again, it's time to erase or loosen in order to erase. But here again is another question, since more people are dying from overweight in the West than anorexia, how can we deny that the feel-good, therapy culture and its right to happiness did not result in self-medication by way of Fritos? If I take the blame for self-criticism and anorexia, will the psychology crowd own up for death-by-Fritos? No, it won't, because that would involve an actual comparison of realities and not an erasure of mental states.

Yet if we look at the obese in the world, we are going to see it's the West and its psychological individual with places like richer East Asian provinces starting to catch up now, thanks to the global propaganda war of Kentucky Fried Chicken, McDonalds etc. So now I have I have tagged psychology for both pornography and obesity. That may be enough by itself to undermine the argument concerning anorexia, but there is more.

Lying as the flip-side of erasure

Psycho-analysts would say they promote not just erasure but scientific outlook. The client can take advantage of analysis after erasing what is blocking it.

There is a class basis for the erasure culture. Therapists get their money. The petty-bourgeoisie gets its ideology of individualism. Those are obvious, but also the assumption of a right of happiness and dignity for the individual clears the way for lying as a right as well.

When we have gotten out of the business of changing reality and into the business of erasing mental states, then it becomes fair game to lie to cover up unpleasant realities that are disturbing happy mental images of proud individuals.

In my opinion, most in the West know there is a culture of lies but cover it up. White collar life itself seems to be one non-stop lie about how wealth and success arises. As MIM pointed out in MT#9, children and others may feel a lack of "self-esteem" from not having money in this culture. However, one may also feel a damage to self-esteem from not being willing to lie to obtain the money or from realizing how much lying goes on in the white collar world. So in other words, the suicidal may in fact just be more honest than others, less willing to erase and create myths or at least go along with them.

As people detach themselves from practice and live with dogmas or mythologies designed for self-esteem, they may successfully erase themselves into unconsciousness. Then maybe it becomes possible to speak unreality without lying minute to minute. The distinction between that and very heavy drug use would be hard to draw.

For people who have not experienced the feeling of minute-to-minute lying and have not met people along these lines, I think we need to suggest a means of experimentation to prove what I am saying. And I mean if you have not spoken with ordinary people who are either far into unreality or lying literally every few minutes, then you need to conduct an experiment. The experiment needs a base, because otherwise, people will evade lies in their face with reference to myths. The base needs to be something that all can agree is reality. Unfortunately I have no such test to give people with the popularity of a Dianetics test on the street. On the other hand, MIM has reported before on how Americans in psychological studies have proved to report as eye witnesses criminals they did not see at the crime.

In my experience one of the biggest lies told is that lies are not going on all the time and therefore only certain lies are noteworthy. People acting as if the "weapons of mass destruction" question in Iraq were new and shocking need

to be questioned for their basic white nationalism. It amounts to not just justifying war against northern Korea, which really does have weapons of mass destruction, but also it implies that the imperialists are not lying and causing a culture of lies all the time. In other words, raising this question in a certain way is in fact whitewashing everyday militarism of u.\$. imperialism. Most of the public discussion of "foreign policy" of the united States is along these lines.

Pornography and the death drive

Most people are familiar with a class structure argument and seeing it as a pyramid. When it comes to socio-sexual matters an important metaphor is the upside-down pyramid, womb or funnel.

If we visualize ourselves as an individual drop of water, we start at the top of the funnel but inevitably go through the more narrow bottom. So to it is with pornography. People are born into a social order, but pornography is necessarily individual and patchy.

In the class struggle we say we know we will win, for one reason because by definition the enemy cannot buy off the entire proletariat. The capitalist system cannot make everyone petty-bourgeoisie if Marx's labor theory of value accurately describes the flow of labor. We contend that pornography is a process of gender oppression that only works at the individual level or maybe in patches.

This is what makes Psych et Po and French psycho-analysis the gatekeepers of gender oppression, an exemplary sort of gender bureaucracy. It is the intersection between the science that provides access to look in the funnel, see up through glass ceilings and eventually get all the way through a murky swamp to a social condition potentially free of pornography. At the same time, Psych et Po and Kristeva have made a point of individualism, and therefore fulfill their roles as gatekeepers, pushing people down into their inevitable roles in pornography, births as individuals and also their deaths. What Kristeva found lacking in China was "eroticism," but her real problem was never coming to grips with how pornography can be defeated.

Here again, we have to stress that with rape and pornography we must break the useless definitions, get past the labor aristocracy expulsions and resistance, and capture the real causes of oppression. MIM has identified pornography as involving anyone and having an oppressive entertainment dynamic. We hope that is an accessible starting place for anyone interested in this hunt, so we can all show up at the same place before launching into investigations.

When we imagine pornography historically, MIM contends that what it has in common is individuality and breaking social bonds. Against us, there will

be those who contend that there have always been orgies discussed and made objects of pornography. Today, there is a car driving around the country with an advertisement for a video called "Girls Gone Wild," which is about college-age wimmin taking off their clothes at drunken spring vacations in Florida. Although the orgy has a special appeal in pornography, in fact, it is impossible for pornography to present a literal picture of a global and universal orgy, just as no ruling class has satisfied the entirety of the laboring classes.

We cannot say for sure if MIM would have come to its current position without MacKinnon had she not existed and only Foucault was in the air. However, in realizing that even the Catholic confession of Victorian ages or prior ages is pornographic, we can also see the point of privacy, discreetness and discreteness being necessary to pornography. The nudists at nudist camp theorize that if everyone always wore no clothes, eventually attitudes would change toward nudity. Even more true it is difficult to imagine pornography having any existence, once it managed to encapsulate everyone engaged in sex simultaneously. Instead, even in "Girls Gone Wild," most are left out. Older and much younger females are left out. In fact, "Girls Gone Wild" appears more than 90% of the way down the funnel of sexual economy. For us internationalists, individualism is not inevitable and unstoppable the way many post-modernists and Liberals assume.

A herd of dolphins may be self-aware of its bodies in public and there may be no hiding of sexuality, so there would be no pornography.

In Mao's China, there was a great cut into pornography with the uniformity of clothing, but inevitably there was individuation in individual discussion and interaction, and thus pornography, because it was only socialism not communism. The positive aspect of the "Mao suit" is that everyone knew what it was and in a sense there was no need for discussion or counseling regarding it. When any aspect of sexuality has reached consensus and unity to that level, we are on the verge of a breakthrough against pornography.

Marx said that in the future there would be no unrequited love, because people would know in advance the causes of love and not fall in love in a tragic way. Likewise we can say that in the distant communist future, the need for individual sexual communication and the possibility for entertainment at the expense of the individual would be both gone. All would be known to all, not necessarily because people dress and undress together in one big nudist camp: Mao's uniform and agreed upon "Mao suit" was also a means to all knowing all. Kristeva has given up on this idea as "totalitarianism."

To this we have our communist men who will say, then the solution is global orgy and free love. If Kristeva is correct, these men will have to arrange restructuring of society in a way no one has envisioned yet. Kristeva says

there is a libidinal economy or sexual economy. For example, the life force of the individual has an easier time expressing heterosexual and then genital sexual orientation in the male than in the female. So de facto females are more bi-sexual or ambiguous than males on average, because females have more hurdles to overcome than males do in becoming heterosexual. Starting in early childhood, the boy can separate from the mother, identify with the father and seek new female objects of desire that are not the mother. This route is not open to the female. The father loves the mother, so identifying with the father will not necessarily get her as far into adulthood as often as the boy. (In fact, the hopes of the daughter actually depend on the father's conflicting with the mother, but that route is also troubled if the daughter goes the competitive incest route for example.) So already by early childhood, there are not as many decisive influences in female heterosexuality formation as for boys. Here we speak of the group averages of course, not exceptional individuals.

Such an explanation of the gap in drives between the two genders explains a real difference that MIM has also noted. The difference also sets up for an intersection of the sexual economy with the commodity economy. In other words, just by tracing the difference between girls and boys as they grow up explains why there is conflict between men and wimmin later in life. The gap so explained is very similar to what Marx was talking about with surplus-value. Marx talked about flow of labor and MacKinnon and Kristeva talk about supply and flow of desire.

So on this question, though Kristeva uses many Freudian metaphors that most people find untethered from reality, we actually agree with her on the underlying factual pattern that has to be explained and theorized. According to Kristeva, the solution to the gap in heterosexual desire is to have wimmin become more like men; thus, we call Kristeva a theorist of the gender aristocracy, something like a spokesperysn.

Freudians come under attack for making it appear that men are almost by definition the more mature social group. Genitally-oriented sexuality is considered more advanced than earlier forms as described by Freudians, so wimmin appear to be a social group somewhere between children and men. Oddly this is also what feminists say in terms of the structure of oppression, but when Freudians say it, they mean that the goal should be to make wimmin more like men, more advanced. It's the same thing as saying that the solution to exploitation is to make everyone bourgeois.

From MIM's point of view, even having a father or a psycho-analyst is a matter of economics. Thus it seems unlikely to us that Kristeva has anything in her arsenal that can really close the gap between men and wimmin in sexual economy. As a result, we find her plan to have wimmin strive to be more like men far-fetched. As communists, we can see why Kristeva has

settled for inequality and Liberalism. She can only succeed among global minorities, precisely those gender aristocracy people typified by sado-masochism, people who can make the transition to sadism from masochism. Even accepting her analysis at face-value, there are not enough families with father roles and not enough psycho-analysts to go around. That's not to begin to address how children can be equalized with genitally-oriented men except among privileged minorities again.

That's why we rather suspect an increasing gap and eventual collapse of adult female sexuality in any form recognizable to today's heterosexual men. As we pointed out elsewhere, the flight of Japanese womyn from romance given certain economic conditions occurring today is probably most typical of the future. Even image-wise where that may seem untrue in the West, again, we would say that is true of only a gender aristocracy, a small minority of females turned into men. Globally the trend is toward less coercion of wimmin and therefore less sexual interaction, including even a lower birth rate. For some reason, there is only one party in the world with the courage to point that out. So we should turn to what Kristeva might have to say about fear of the line "all sex is rape."

XI. Imagining Kristeva as a MIM comrade

Had Kristeva lived in MIM's circles, no doubt she would have found many stunning confirmations of her work by now. At the most extreme and rattling end were experiences of literal sexual comparison with the father or perhaps just another case of someone reading Kristeva and acting on it. Reading Kristeva would help comrades be ready for all sorts of conscious and unconscious comparisons with the father.

Recently, MIM received a letter from Europe from someone hopeful for revolution in Nepal and India. The letter brings to mind the question of the bourgeois conception of the individual and Kristeva's analysis centering on dirtiness and holes. The question arises whether we should defend a spotless image of Stalin and Mao. Marx himself opposed the historical idealism of saying that history is product of great individuals. Rather there are whole classes of people at work to create history.

For MIM, the answer of how to portray Stalin and Mao depends on the context. In discussion of Trotsky, Stalin and Mao were better than spotless. When it comes to understanding the *Black Book of Communism*, again, the answer is stout defense.

For MIM the question is always relative to what. The anti-communists like to talk about Stalin's and Mao's failures without a systematic comparison of failures. This latter point concerns a book reporting the assertions of some scholars that Mao's Great Leap Forward was responsible for the death of say

30 million Chinese between 1958 and 1960. From MIM's rebuttals of certain anti-communist screeds one might think we are defending a spotless image of Stalin and Mao. We even say Mao was better than god, because god never liberated a country.

The problem is that whether one is concerned with bourgeois motivations for historical idealism or with Kristeva's psycho-sexual theories, it's wrong to think of Stalin and Mao as spotless and also wrong to think they were the dirtiest. In fact, it's wrong just to ask the question.

Before Marx came up with the science of political economy surpassing political economy, he spoke of "species-being" and "species-life" in his most Liberal-influenced youthful stage. Already he was concerned with group level questions for some reason. What we really need to learn about Stalin and Mao to get beyond capitalism is how to approach the question scientifically, including what kind of "one divides into two" is not fruitful. If we take a class and keep dividing it, eventually we get down to the individual. That's where the bourgeoisie wants to be, so in the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China they did defend a spotless and father-like image of Stalin and Mao respectively. Yet when they were alive, as first-generation revolutionaries, their peers were commonly from feudal conditions. So we should be clear that for the politics or psychology of these people, bourgeois historical idealism is actually an advance, especially in overcoming stultifying ideological influences of so-called tradition.

To go from capitalism to socialism and just to keep the party fresh and a repository of scientific thinking, we really need to know that asking the question of whether Stalin and Mao were spotless is wrong. Here MIM plays its role, and since we are based in imperialist countries with no generations of people with feudal ideas, except for migrant workers, we broadly disseminate the scientific truth in its entirety and make no use of bourgeois thinking.

The reason crime is such a great issue for the fascists is that it harps on a desire for order. The individualists whether fascist or Liberal need to believe that it is possible through infinite division to know things at the individual level. The same drive is underlying the discussion of the Dawes Act by the Churchill critics.

The fascists and Liberals are unconcerned with the fact that for instance about a third of people tested in academic studies will name a criminal in a police line-up, even when the suspect is not in the line-up. That's not even to mention the people who get the wrong persyn. The desire to pick someone as guilty of a staged crime is so powerful, because the underlying desire for order is so strong, that they really don't care if they get the totally wrong individual. They reason at the individual level, but we look at statistics and act on the level where we can be effective. That also means not acting on levels which are proven fruitless.

So here is the difference between life before and after Marx. Before Marx we did not know there was a science of society. We settled for stories about great individuals passed by word of mouth. Today, MIM is not going to let people speak of "Islamofascism" without pointing out that the United States has the world's highest imprisonment rate. We do not care about Osama Bin Laden except as a representative of a class. If pressed, we would have to say that ultimate knowledge of Osama Bin Laden the individual is unobtainable, thanks to axe-grinders and nit-pickers.

So when MIM says we can assume Mao is responsible for 30 million deaths in the Great Leap Forward, it is for the purpose of scientific discussion. We want our reader to know how that compared with capitalism. Our critics proceed by running down Mao's reputation as an individual, while we care about him only as a representative of a class. What MIM is saying about the proletariat is that when it comes to power, its political leaders are better than bourgeois political leaders, but we cannot say spotless. We need to get to the fact that if we scrutinize it carefully any individual leader in power is going to be responsible for the deaths of millions of people in a country as large as China—because scientific politics does matter that much. Political differences can result in doubling the life expectancy of a people, such as what Stalin and Mao did for their countries. At the same time, the proletariat is flawed, raised under conditions of capitalism and semi-feudalism. It cannot proceed to Heaven in one Revolutionary Swoop. Conversely, that means that proletarian political leaders have no choice but to accept the responsibility for millions of deaths that will occur through incompetence, lack of energy or just forgetfulness. There are no godly leaders that can arise to bring perfection with our imperfect material. The only question is relative. Somehow we will also have to find a way to make our leaders pay with their lives for failures which cost others their lives in the transition to communism. We will have to do that while simultaneously admitting that we are not in communism yet.

For the people in a country raised in semi-feudalism to have some bourgeois idealist sense of a Stalin, Mao or Kim Il Sung is to be expected and even progressive. For people in a totally capitalist country, there is no longer any progressive aspect of personality cults. The people who need that are gone or need to be surpassed.

Right now the bourgeois-minded public wants to believe that police solve murders; "American Idol" contestants are the ones with the most talent and that we can find the historical individual who came up with eugenics language. These shibboleths are not accepted by scientific communists, even in the format of their question. Police do not solve murders; otherwise we would have to believe some police in some countries are more than 10 times better than in others, with American police the worst. "American Idol" is about entertaining the public for money and an individual's idea about eugenics is not suddenly so overpowering that people take it up for no reason but intellectual dominance.

With Marxism, we learn to think of huge groups of millions. The next step is inevitably discussion of probability. MIM does not get involved in the criminal justice system mostly to solve individual cases. We know that is a myth. Some countries have murder rates more than 10 times more than others. That is what is important. Probability for imprisonment means knowing the rate of imprisonment. Probability for serving the people means knowing the life expectancy and how it is connected to food, clothing and shelter. It also means that action occurs at that level.

The bourgeois propagandists want us to believe that history is about Mao's individual personality for example. As a result, they make accusations against Mao in which they do not know the relative truth of other leaders by comparison. The truth is that 30 million dead in Mao's rule from the Great Leap is small relatively speaking and people who deal thoroughly with numbers of large groups of people know that already.

Kristeva opposes communism, but she gives us another reason that people will resist the scientific truth about crime, prisons, life expectancy and all other facets of life. The truth may be in front of someone to grab, but psycho-sexually, large swaths of people essentially cannot become interested in the questions. The right questions do not motivate people, because what "turns them on" is the equivalent of sweeping the floor over and over again. Order and the defense of the clean spot are attractive to people right now, and that is OK to get past feudalism, but it will not work for socialism. Whether pursuit of the clean spot is psycho-sexually driven or just ideology dominating the bourgeois superstructure, when we scientific communists see it, we need to steer people toward better questions to ask.

The United States has an imprisonment rate five times that of England's and England has the highest in Europe. That is what to "have a cow over," as Bart Simpson would say. Instead, u.\$ people are going to watch TV programs laud action heroes who track down individual criminals and neutralize them. The TV shows satisfy a drive for order around a clean spot free of crime—even while the whole country is co-responsible for massive and ongoing war crimes all around the globe.

Kristeva also gives us a reason to suspect the origins of philosophical dualism. Someone may even like to read Marxism or even produce Marxology studies, but then go home and watch "NYPD Blue" or some other cops and lawyers show and really get wrapped up in them. So a dualist can be half-way Marxist. A dualist may realize that Marxism is the truth about the world, but still conclude "I can't do anything about it" and go back to all the bourgeois individualist "solutions," whether fascist or Liberal and inevitably oscillating between both.

It is really tough to swallow for our existing bourgeois and psycho-sexual public, but Mao's act of land reform in China boosted life expectancy hugely.

Our bourgeoisie, our Ralph Naders of Mao's day would make the question out to be which individual landlords are no good in their personal behavior. That is wrong: even if stated in militant code language, it is bourgeois to the core.

We knew Mao's land reform would be potent from scientific study, but the very question is a non-starter for most people. That's an example of an action to take that actually influences so many other questions. It's an action at a class level and thus nearly impossible for many people to understand, so they make up stories about Mao's individual military history for and against and retread the same ground over and over again. There are wildly popular books talking about Mao's dental flossing habits, but no popular books that will sit down to discuss social probabilities before and after Mao-era class struggles in global comparative context.

From studying the broad sweep of history and social probabilities, we learn that investigation is not about investigating individuals. To really advance, we need to learn how to deal with probability.

For most of the public, probability is still a non-starter. It means "fuzzy," to the public, or maybe "messy," whereas the detective on the TV show always gets the real truth about the exact individual. Marxism would say that bourgeois ideology requires individualism and thus opposition to knowledge of probability. Kristeva could say that people are stuck at a certain stage of sexual development and thus find more advanced questions not motivating.

In actual fact, probability is only "messy" from a mythological viewpoint. Correct use of probability at the group level is vastly more powerful than the mere ideology of individualism. The security of socialism and the advance to communism depend on the ability of the people to apply probability and abandon countless myths of the old bourgeois order.

On the surface, the call to probability studies seems almost like a rather innocuous request. Yet resistance is actually fierce and in all areas of life. On the daily level, on the question of gender directly, we now have Internet archives going back almost 20 years of almost the same discussion over and over again. MIM opposes sexual liberalism. We try to kick the question up to the group level and avoid questions of individual experience and subjectivity. The audience opposes MIM vehemently. We ask "why"? We don't get much answer. We ask "what would be a better gender line" and even in allegedly communist circles we get no answer at all. That is true of both the circles where a majority are state agents but also the circles where there are random passers-by.

The point for Freudians is that some sort of discussion is repressed. To take MIM's line that "all sex is rape," what would that mean for our own mothers and sisters? So one possibility for the lack of theory and ideology in

feminism is that many refuse to handle traumas, just as Freudians always said. In general, MIM is going to oppose the Freudian idea that people repress the truth, but there are instances when the lack of substance in a discussion is indicative of repression. Life would be tidier if we did not have to admit to the world's Kristevas that in fact many gender discussions end up being substance-less. So when we see social or ideological repression of major gender questions, Kristeva can say, "I told you so; you have to deal with people's abilities to handle questions first."

So saying "all sex is rape" and "imperialist country females are men" raises opposition in a certain way—often silence but also often ridicule indicative of what Kristeva would call an "expulsion." Here the question is whether the substance of the argument is important or not.

As an aside, MIM would say that Kristeva's discussion of expulsive sexuality reminds MIM of a tenuous basis for labor aristocracy Liberalism. The creation of the individual oasis of purity for individuality would seem to go well with an aggressive political Liberalism.

"All sex is rape" and "imperialist country females are men" both do the same thing via the unconscious, attack the purity of the mother. So we often have people walk through our argument, even people who agree with us on a group-oriented and scientific approach to other questions, who when it comes to gender, just have to get off the boat—without so much as an argument and especially without an alternative. So it could be that MIM brings out something about our mothers or grandmothers (or possibly sisters depending on age and timing) that people do not want to know. There could even be a sense that what MIM does is drive some people to Mary-oriented Christianity or its equivalent, because of an underlying Freudian anxiety MIM uncovers without "curing." And a word of advice to MIM's politically impoverished competitors—tamping down on the question is in fact Mary-oriented Christianity, an attempt to squelch controversy for the benefit of the patriarchy.

One might wonder via Kristeva whether any sweeping theoretical argument about gender would raise resistance, in the Freudian sense. There is so little theoretical discussion of gender that it is hard to know.

If Kristeva were in MIM, she might say, "I told you you have to stop with that attack on the patriarchy. You go about it in the wrong, Christian guilt-inducing direct way. In fact, many must reconcile with their own fathers before they can lead productive lives filled with critical thought." Kristeva could tell us that we are right there is a paucity of feminist theory and the reason is what Freud called "resistance" common as a means of handling sexual trauma. Every

time MIM tries to kick a question up to the group level and there is resistance, MIM comrade Kristeva would be there to explain to people why they find the question unmotivating.

So there is an across-the-board problem that MIM has identified as a lack of scientific theoretical approaches to feminism and in fact an overdependence on art and literature. Some Freudians would say, "why should you be surprised? Didn't we tell you about wimmin?" Kristeva goes on and on about art and literature while making it clear they are not substitutes for her psycho-analysis, which in her mind is the greatest contribution to humyn freedom available at the moment.

Yet MIM maintains its directness. We don't get it. Why can't we go into public and announce across-the-board the sexual problems of society? Then when there is no answer, why cannot we announce a generalized resistance and then a generalized psycho-analysis of that resistance otherwise known as a materialist analysis of ideology formation?

Freudians may reply that the whole point is that society does not have the judgment and in fact resists. So the assistance of a psycho-analyst is necessary.

We say that individual communication in psycho-analysis is essentially a waste. History creates events that make it possible for people to undergo Kristeva-style rebirth (instead of reborn Christianity) without an individual psycho-analysis. At any given moment, events are shaking loose a certain percentage of the population. The question is whether the message is there to be heard in scientific form.

The relationship with the analyst is not as important as it is made out, because psycho-analysis just is not that efficient. First of all, as even Kristeva pointed out, it ends. The proletariat goes on. Secondly, identification not with father-like authorities but propaganda-created characters useful for the real lives of many people simultaneously can replace the analyst.

Propaganda-created stories or realities representative of many people should embody struggle, as Kristeva would say. On that point we agree.

Where we disagree is that we believe the bourgeoisie brings forward the unconscious in concrete struggles. It does that part of the work. We can play into that or needlessly do the work the bourgeoisie is going to do for us anyway.

Someone may say, "what are you talking about? The bourgeoisie profits from pornography." To which we say, yes, but it is predictable in that regard; therefore it is possible to struggle.

The tough part for us is the message. We the proletariat are under obligation to agree on a unified message correctly tapping into social forces that actually exist. It is possible to modulate for sub-groups in the population, but we cannot create individual messages. We argue that it is also impractical for psycho-analysis to attempt to do so.

The bourgeoisie competes in these realms across-the-board. 1) It has a Catholic Church uniting many but under one bourgeois man. 2) It has Amerikan-style Protestantism in which the individual can directly interpret god, but the relationship to Christ has no possibility of concretely social simultaneity. 3) It has secular psychiatry for those not easily flim-flammed by a religious authority figure, but which hides the individualism of the bourgeoisie behind medical authority. 4) It has Kristeva-style psycho-analysis which is the last-ditch defense of capitalism, with the trappings of science and atheism but with the scientifically fatal flaw of individualism.

Our disadvantage is that despite all these forces working on our minds in bourgeois society, we must correctly arrive at exactly what the proletariat is and therefore what it wants. The bourgeoisie wins by division, dissolution and diffusion. We need one good binary division and unity regarding that class division. Any style of organization recognizing and organizing the proletariat as it really is is a good thing.

To review, MIM sees psycho-analysis as an ideological project, not a scientific one, because science of humyn behavior is impossible without generalization beyond the individual. What Kristeva has accomplished is the rationalization of Christianity, a universalization of the attack on humyn solidarity.

At the same time, we have to admit concern with many similar factual patterns that Kristeva observed. 1) We explain the rise of what she calls sado-masochistic sexualities in the West with the creation of a whole social group of oppressors called the gender aristocracy. 2) Since the beginning, MIM has also noticed a lack of theory in feminism vastly disproportionate to the writing abilities of wimmin today. We're not going to deny that problem just to score points with the feel-good pseudo-feminist crowd. Better to call MIM "Freudian" than to let go of that observable pattern.

Kristeva may have a point about the role of the father, but we explain any

historical shift in patterns and proportions as the decadence of imperialism, including pseudo-feminism in the category of decadence. Females now hugely outnumber males in U.S. colleges and in obtaining degrees, but the loosening of traditional gender roles occurred in a decadent manner that did not guarantee womyn access to the symbolic as Kristeva would say. Again, Western womyn's new role is oppressor of a certain kind—gender aristocracy. She has the "capability," but not the desire for global liberation.

Notes:

1. Despite the fact that most people find her impossible to read, MIM expects patience from the communist movement regarding our discussion of Kristeva. We cannot simply pass over someone who was at the barricades in '68 and adopted at least a pretended stance for Maoist liberation of wimmin early in life; even though, now, she speaks of the "bankruptcy of Marxism." Julia Kristeva, *Nations without Nationalism* Leon S. Roudiez trans. (NY: Columbia University Press, 1993), p. 2.

She also says, "This led me to write an awkward book, *Des Chinoises* [1974], in which I tried to convey the strangeness of China and to explain the fascination we Occidentals feel for it. . . .It marked my farewell to politics, including feminism." "My Memory's Hyperbole," in *The Portable Kristeva*, Kelly Oliver, ed. (NY: Columbia University Press, 1997), p. 19.

2. Julia Kristeva, *Intimate Revolt: The Powers and Limits of Psycho-Analysis* trans. Jeanine Herman, (NY: Columbia University Press, 2002), p. 246 on how she is perceived by Americans as French.

3. Julia Kristeva, *Intimate Revolt: The Powers and Limits of Psycho-Analysis* trans. Jeanine Herman, (NY: Columbia University Press, 2002), p. 25.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 89.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 267. We have to stifle our "psycho-analytic listening" as Kristeva would call it in response to the University of Colorado.

6. She says that Freud led both a "Copernican revolution" and maybe "reserved a place for initiative, autonomy, the desire of the subject." *Ibid.*, p. 11. This is a way of saying that Freud established a science of sexuality and still succeeded at the individual level, a claim MIM denies as ideologically wishful thinking typical of the petty-bourgeoisie.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 266.

8. For example one of her chapter subtitles is "'To Forget:' Flaw or a Necessity?" *Ibid.*, p. 204.

9. "Freud has demonstrated to what extent the conglomeration of men and women into set is oppressive and death-bearing. 'Society is founded on a common crime,' he wrote in *Totem and Taboo*, and the exclusion of 'others,' which binds the identity of a clan, a sect, a party, or a nation, is equally the source of the pleasure of identification ('this is what *we* are, therefore it is what *I* am') and of barbaric persecution ('that is foreign to me, therefore I throw it out, hunt it down, or massacre it'). The complex relationships between cause and effect that govern social groups obviously do not coincide with the laws of the unconscious regarding a subject, but these unconscious determinations remain a constituent part, an essential one, of social and therefore national dynamics."

Julia Kristeva, *Nations without Nationalism* Leon S. Roudiez trans. (NY: Columbia University Press, 1993), p. 50.

10. Julia Kristeva, *Intimate Revolt: The Powers and Limits of Psycho-Analysis* trans. Jeanine Herman, (NY: Columbia University Press, 2002), p. 6. She also lumps in Sartre as being too extreme in negativism and thus clearing the way for Maoism and what she calls "totalitarianism." *Ibid.*, p. 131. She also defends against Sartre's attacks on psycho-analysis in following pages up to 140.

She should have known that it was her libertarian Freudianism more likely to lead to nihilism when she defended Freud's statement, "'society is a crime committed in common.'" "My Memory's Hyperbole," in *The Portable Kristeva*, Kelly Oliver, ed. (NY: Columbia University Press, 1997), p. 17.

11. *Ibid.*, p. 7.

12. "My Memory's Hyperbole," in *The Portable Kristeva*, Kelly Oliver, ed. (NY: Columbia University Press, 1997), p. 13.

13. One example would be how spectacle culture cuts down on the need for the internal power of fantasy. Julia Kristeva, *Intimate Revolt: The Powers and Limits of Psycho-Analysis* trans. Jeanine Herman, (NY: Columbia University Press, 2002), p. 67. "Hence the banality of evil, the result of the inability to judge." *Ibid.*, p. 68.

14. Aquin.: SMT FS Q[27] A[1] R.O. 2 Para. 1/1 is the Christian abbreviation for the place in his work where St. Thomas Aquinas says the paragraph about hypocrisy quoted. SUMMA THEOLOGICA (Benziger Bros. edition, 1947) (available on Internet in zip files)

15. Aquin.: SMT XP Q[9] A[2] OTC Para. 1/1

16. Julia Kristeva, *Intimate Revolt: The Powers and Limits of Psycho-Analysis* trans. Jeanine Herman, (NY: Columbia University Press, 2002), p. 19.

17. "Wherefore Gregory says (Moral.) that 'hypocrites make God's interests subservient to worldly purposes, since by making a show of saintly conduct they seek, not to turn men to God, but to draw to themselves the applause of their approval.'" Aquin.: SMT SS Q[111] A[2] R.O. 1 Para. 1/1

18. She and Lacan even admit that Freud himself was "strangely Christocentric." Julia Kristeva, *Intimate Revolt: The Powers and Limits of Psychoanalysis* trans. Jeanine Herman, (NY: Columbia University Press, 2002), p. 229.

"Psychoanalysis is a vivid Judeo-Christianity, colored by desire and drives, to the point of biology." Ibid., p. 234. She says philosophy hollowed out theology and psychoanalysis hollows out Christianity, but for Marx even philosophy was ultimately idealism, a means of intellectual impoverishment. When MIM says that Kristeva has merely rationalized Christianity, it's not that there is no direct and literal textual evidence for our position. Here she straight-up admits that psycho-analysis "is a vivid Judeo-Christianity."

19. "To put it even more gravely, who can revolt if man has become a simple conglomerate of organs, no longer a subject but a patrimonial person, a person belonging to the patriomony, financially, genetically and physiologically, a person barely free enough to use a remote control to choose his channel." Ibid., p. 4.

20. "The moral and aesthetic dimension finds itself marginalized and exists only as a decorative alibi tolerated by the society of the spectacle, when it is not simply submerged, made impossible by entertainment culture, performance culture, and show culture." Ibid.

21. "The tragic history of the twentieth century, with its two totalitarianisms, as well as the symptoms of postmodern society (the collapse of taboos; the prevalence of sadomasochistic sexuality, delinquency, vandalism, and new maladies of the soul: psychosomatosis, drug addiction, the diffusion of psychosis in neurotic structures, etc.)" Ibid., pp. 235-6.

22. Ibid., p. 68.

23. Ibid., p. 119.

24. Julia Kristeva, *Nations without Nationalism* Leon S. Roudiez trans. (NY: Columbia University Press, 1993), p. 34, 47.

25. Julia Kristeva, *Nations without Nationalism* Leon S. Roudiez trans. (NY: Columbia University Press, 1993), p. 3.

26. This is a major subheading in Ibid., p 15. She asks the same question in her book on Chinese wimmin. Correct to point out that suspicious people ask the question, she should have gone further with the point. "Whence do you speak? This is what distrustful people always ask, and they are not wrong in doing so. It is rightful that I introduce myself. The one writing here is a representative of what is today a rare species, perhaps even on the verge of extinction in a time of renewed nationalism: I am a cosmopolitan." Julia Kristeva, *Nations without Nationalism* Leon S. Roudiez trans. (NY: Columbia University Press, 1993), p. 15.

27. Julia Kristeva, *Nations without Nationalism* Leon S. Roudiez trans. (NY: Columbia University Press, 1993), p. 32.

28. "Worshipping the national language arouses a feeling of revenge and narcissistic satisfaction in a number of women, who are otherwise sexually, professionally, and politically humiliated and frustrated. The very recent studies that are beginning to be published on the underlying logic of Soviet society and of the transition period (that is already bitterly being called "catastroika") show to what extent a society based on the rudimentary satisfaction of survival needs, to the detriment of the desires for freedom, could encourage the regressive sado-masochist leanings of women. . . . Considerable watchfulness is thus needed in order to ward off that too facile symbiosis between nationalism and, if not 'feminism,' at least a certain conformist 'maternalism' that lies dormant in every one of us and can turn women into accomplices of religious fundamentalisms and mystical nationalisms as they were of the Nazi mirage."

Julia Kristeva, *Nations without Nationalism* Leon S. Roudiez trans. (NY: Columbia University Press, 1993), p. 34.

29. Julia Kristeva, *Intimate Revolt: The Powers and Limits of Psycho-Analysis* trans. Jeanine Herman, (NY: Columbia University Press, 2002), p. 49.

30. "At least 797 people have been reported killed in Lebanon and Israel since fighting broke out July 12 between Israeli forces and Hezbollah guerrillas.

Lebanon: At least 689 have been killed including 605 civilians confirmed dead by the Health Ministry, 29 Lebanese soldiers and at least 55 Hezbollah guerrillas.

The Lebanese government's Higher Relief Council said 973 Lebanese had been killed in the conflict.

As of Sunday Israeli security officials said they had confirmed the deaths of 165 Hezbollah fighters and estimated that about 250 others had been killed.

Included in the civilian deaths are eight Canadians, two Kuwaitis, one Iraqi, one Sri Lankan, one Jordanian and 23 Syrians.

Israel: Ninety-seven have been killed, including 65 soldiers, 36 civilians, according to authorities." USA Today, http://www.usatoday.com/news/world/2006-08-08-midest-fighting_x.htm