

MIM Notes



April 1, 2003, N° 279

The Official Newsletter of the Maoist Internationalist Movement (MIM)

Free

STOP IMPERIALIST WAR!

Statement of principles regarding the Iraq War

by the International Minister
March 19, 2003

Today, with the long war against Iraq just having expanded into Baghdad with the first missile attacks after the deadline in Bush's ultimatum to Iraq, MIM mourns in advance the loss of life in Iraq. Whether the United States wins in a day or whether the Iraqi people grind out a war that turns a five or six digit figure of aggressor troops into dust, the loss of life in Iraq is unnecessary. Our species can do better, but it will take a global perspective.

No moral grounds

While even the reactionary Pope and French President Chirac have condemned this war, it is obvious it has no "moral grounds," no matter what one's upbringing. After all, Chirac is from the same reactionary wing of imperialism as Bush. Chirac comes from the French version of the U.S. Republican Party.

The bottom line is that peace in the world depends on an internationalist viewpoint's conquering the species. The kernel of that idea can be expressed in Christian terms as the "golden rule." It means placing oneself in the shoes of the "other guy." As long as the principle of internationalism applied as a "golden rule" among nations is ignored, we will be stuck in "what-goes-around-comes-around" terrorism and war.

This does not mean we are pacifists. It means that Bush's violence does not contribute to internationalist answers. Rather Bush's violence is partly fear-mongering panic about weapons of mass destruction. Yet weapons of mass destruction are merely a symptom. Bush's supporters often say "guns don't kill people; people do." There are reasons people create weapons of mass destruction and use them as in Hiroshima and Nagasaki and Bush has never addressed the causes of war except by making them worse.

Violence that prevents violence: a scientific question

What Bush does is a perfect example

Continued on page 6...



For more coverage of anti-war protests, see pages 4 and 5. An article discussing France's opposition to the war starts on page 3. For continuing coverage of the war and anti-war activism, check www.etext.org/Politics/MIM/ agitation/iraq/index.html.

Thousands march against war in D.C.

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 15, 2003

Demonstrators took more than 2,500 copies of MIM Notes in the Washington DC rally against the war in Iraq and RAIL tabled and distributed MIM Theory as well. It may be appropriate at this moment to thank President Bush for exposing the war-mongering nature of the system and taking the Democratic Party with him into this war.

The unity of the imperialists has left the political field open to the real anti-militarists, the people who are really going to bring global peace. In ordinary times, the imperialists conceal their wars against the Third World. Ironically, without the imperialists' going berserk, we could not have so many demonstrators. Police said 40,000 attended while organizers from International A.N.S.W.E.R. said it was 100,000 participants. (1)

Supporting Democrats not realism

Despite the Democrats' voting for the war in Congress, and despite the fact that major candidates for president Kerry, Lieberman, Gephardt and Edwards all

support the war—participants in the DC rally continued to hold many illusions about the Democratic Party. In fact, one of the speakers at the rally called for electing candidates to replace Bush & Co. and then called for revolution in almost the same breath.

As we go to press, the the Democratic Party Senate Leader Daschle has criticized Bush for failing in diplomacy, "miserably." (2) Others have criticized Bush for not having enough allies to go to war with international legitimacy.

Our movement needs to distinguish arguments that help Bush do a better job making war on the world and those arguments that are necessary for global peace. Democrats in 95% of cases are making arguments about how Bush could make war better. With the exception of some mention of Sport Utility Vehicles (SUVs), Democrats rarely attempt to address the causes of war and terrorism.

Democrats failed the Iraq test as they have failed countless other less-publicized questions of war and peace. What is more—even "peaceful" Democrats

Continued on page 5...

Block Patriot Act II's march to fascism!

While Bush and his war council prepare to bomb Iraq, John Ashcroft's minions have put together a second Patriot Act—a laundry list civil liberties they want to get rid of. The new law is officially called the Domestic Security Enhancement Act, and MIM condemns its fascist goals and calls on all people to see that it does not become law.

We only know of the DSEA's existence because someone leaked it to the press. The so-called Justice Department said after the leakage that it would be "derelict" if it were not "continually considering anti-terrorism measures." Yet this same office has yet to give Congress any report on the first Patriot Act and its effectiveness in preventing terrorism. Just as the USA Patriot Act was in the works before 911, and was made into law with

Continued on page 9...



What does defending Stalin have to do with opposing war in Iraq? Aside from the fact that his last public speech said, "down with the warmongers," we defend Stalin because we are for socialism—and not just when it drops from Heaven. Read more on pages 3 and 7.

Letters

What about the micro-states in the Gulf?

Dear Comrade,

I have a question regarding Maoism which I think you'd probably be well placed to answer.

Clearly the Chinese revolution against the decaying imperial past was made possible because the vast majority of Chinese lived in poverty under the yoke of a self-serving and incompetent clique.

But what is Maoism's, and the MIM's view of countries that don't have a working class? Before rejecting this as a non-issue, by claiming that there is no such country—consider states such as Monaco, Liechtenstein, and the wealthy Gulf States of Kuwait, Bahrain, Qatar, Oman and the United Arab Emirates. These are tiny oil-rich sheikhdoms in which virtually every citizen is a millionaire, there is no tax, and all services are provided free, courtesy of the fantastic wealth of the Emir. Qatar has only 50,000 nationals, all of whom are part of the ruling al-Thani clan, the head of which is the emir. They are all wealthy. There is no agricultural sector. There is virtually no opposition to the Islamic absolute monarchy which seems to provide such stability, peace and prosperity for all.

In such circumstances, how is even bourgeois socialism, let alone revolutionary Marxist-Leninist-Maoism to flourish? It's totally different from

somewhere like Iraq or Iran, where real social disadvantage brought down the monarchy.

In short, how does MIM see revolution ever coming to tiny oil-rich states of fantastic wealth and devout Islam?

—Reader from London, England, March 2003

International Minister replies: We would say that where whole geographies are bought-off, we do not have to respect those borders. Liechtenstein is rich thanks to the people it exploits abroad and there is nothing wrong with mobilizing those people against Liechtenstein. In many senses, we have a global struggle against u.\$ imperialism anyway.

The Gulf states are also in considerable contradiction, because they face continuous threat from the hyper-power united States, which is unsure about how much independence to allow these states. The national bourgeoisie of the oil-rich states has in many cases no choice but to turn to a global proletariat to defend it against the predations of u.\$ imperialism.

Far from denying that there is not a proletariat in every country, MIM spends much time battering ossified "Marxism" which prevails numerically in the imperialist countries. The principal significance of u.\$ imperialism and its exploitation is not within its own borders. The total surplus-value extracted outside u.\$ borders by u.\$ imperialism far exceeds the surplus-value extracted within u.\$ borders. The exploited of the world need to settle accounts with u.\$ imperialism even more than the exploited minority within u.\$ borders.

The U.S. is an overrated prize fighter

Thank you for the MIMs, especially the back issues that had specific articles on Korea. There is no doubt the subject of Korea will be on everyone's minds and lips. I can only hope that some good will come out of this mess. It amazes me, with all the possible implications (of Iraq and now Korea) that the U.S. will still drive forward thinking that it is their "right" to corner anyone they'd like. History has proven that no matter how powerful a

country or what technological advances they may have... it is these same characteristics that not only drive them to war (believing they cannot lose) but ultimately turns out to be their Achilles heel. Super-weapons that ultimately take up too many resources, or drives to gain new territory only to be unable to control it. I believe the U.S. is an over-rated prize fighter... a very strong first attack but in the event of a protracted war the aura of invincibility will quickly dissipate. And the tragedy is that this will not be learned cheaply but will cost a very high price in lives...

—A Pennsylvania prisoner



Editor, MC206; Production, MC12

MIM Notes

The Official Newsletter of The Maoist Internationalist Movement
ISSN 1540-8817

MIM Notes is the bi-weekly newsletter of the Maoist Internationalist Movement. MIM Notes is the official Party voice; more complete statements are published in our journal, *MIM Theory*. Material in *MIM Notes* is the Party's position unless noted. *MIM Notes* accepts submissions and critiques from anyone. The editors reserve the right to edit submissions unless permission is specifically denied by the author; submissions are published anonymously unless authors insist on identification (prisoners are never identified by name). MIM is an underground party that does not publish the names of its comrades in order to avoid the state surveillance and repression that have historically been directed at communist parties and anti-imperialist movements. MCs, MIM comrades, are members of the Party. The Revolutionary Anti-Imperialist League (RAIL) is an anti-imperialist mass organization led by MIM (RCs are RAIL Comrades). MIM's ten-point program is available to anyone who sends in a SASE.

The paper is free to all prisoners, as long as they write to us every 90 days to confirm their subscriptions. There are no individual subscriptions for people outside prison.

People who want to receive newspapers should become sponsors and distributors. Sponsors pay for papers, distributors get them onto the streets, and officers do both distribution and financial support. Annual cost is: 12 copies (Priority Mail), \$120; 25 (Priority Mail), \$150; 50 (Priority Mail), \$280; 100, \$380; 200, \$750; 900 (Express Mail), \$3,840; 900 (8-10 days), \$2,200. To become a sponsor or distributor, send anonymous money orders payable to "MIM." Send to MIM, attn: Camb. branch, PO Box 400559, Cambridge, MA 02140. Or write mim3@mim.org.

Most back issues of MIM Notes are available free on our web site. The web site contains thousands of documents, with ordering information for many more.

MIM grants explicit permission to copy all or part of this newspaper for any reason, as long as we are credited.

For general correspondence, contact:

MIM
P.O. Box 29670
Los Angeles, CA 90029-0670

eMail: mim@mim.org
WWW: <http://www.etext.org/Politics/MIM>

What is MIM?

The Maoist Internationalist Movement (MIM) is the collection of existing or emerging Maoist internationalist parties in the English-speaking imperialist countries and their English-speaking internal semi-colonies, as well as the existing or emerging Maoist Internationalist parties in Belgium, France and Quebec and the existing or emerging Spanish-speaking Maoist Internationalist parties of Aztlan, Puerto Rico and other territories of the U.S. Empire. MIM Notes is the newspaper of MIM. *Notas Rojas* is the newspaper of the Spanish-speaking parties or emerging parties of MIM. MIM upholds the revolutionary communist ideology of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and is an internationalist organization that works from the vantage point of the Third World proletariat. MIM struggles to end the oppression of all groups over other groups: classes, genders, nations. MIM knows this is only possibly by building public opinion to seize power through armed struggle. Revolution is a reality for North America as the military becomes over-extended in the government's attempts to maintain world hegemony. MIM differs from other communist parties on three main questions: (1) MIM holds that after the proletariat seizes power in socialist revolution, the potential exists for capitalist restoration under the leadership of a new bourgeoisie within the communist party itself. In the case of the USSR, the bourgeoisie seized power after the death of Stalin in 1953; in China, it was after Mao's death and the overthrow of the "Gang of Four" in 1976. (2) MIM upholds the Chinese Cultural Revolution as the farthest advance of communism in humyn history. (3) As Marx, Engels and Lenin formulated and MIM has reiterated through materialist analysis, imperialism extracts super-profits from the Third World and in part uses this wealth to buy off whole populations of oppressor nation so-called workers. These so-called workers bought off by imperialism form a new petty-bourgeoisie called the labor aristocracy. These classes are not the principal vehicles to advance Maoism within those countries because their standards of living depend on imperialism. At this time, imperialist super-profits create this situation in the Canada, Quebec, the United States, England, France, Belgium, Germany, Japan, Italy, Switzerland, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Israel, Sweden and Denmark. MIM accepts people as members who agree on these basic principles and accept democratic centralism, the system of majority rule, on other questions of party line.

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

- Mao Zedong, Selected Works, Vol. II, p. 208.

France is serious about multi-polar world, but French economic ties to U.S. are huge

In the recent split between President Chirac of France and President Bush, there is much speculation on the oil business that France has going in Iraq. The propaganda story goes that since 1991, France has gone to Iraq to obtain deals for future oil business while Uncle Sam has stayed aside in a moralistic huff, not wishing to make money from such a dishonorable business, especially while U.N. sanctions are still in place.

MIM is not going to say it knows all of what is behind the alignment of France-Germany-Russia-China against a war with Iraq as of March 6th. In Lenin's theory of imperialism, it is only a matter of time after the previous war before imperialists find economic competition pushing them toward new blocs for new wars.

However, the Washington Post has

accurately laid some ideas to rest: "Iraq is a relatively tiny trading partner for France, accounting for just three-tenths of a percent of French imports and two-tenths of a percent of exports. France buys about 8 percent of Iraq's oil, making it Baghdad's fourth-largest customer. The biggest customer, the United States, buys 56 percent."

"In any case, French officials say, the United States is a far more important economic partner for France than is Iraq, so why would the government risk angering Washington for business with Baghdad? Also, they say, if the question were simply future oil contracts, France would do better to support war now and position itself to win oil concessions from a grateful post-Hussein government."(1)

The French also sent 10,000 troops and 100 aircraft in 1991's version of Bush

vs. Hussein. Hence all the crude conservative American jokes and innuendos miss what is going on with France.

It could be that the imperialists themselves do not know why they are splitting when they normally unite in business interests against the Third World. The imperialists may be weighing their options and interests as they go along in this world without a Soviet super-power. Chirac said, "Any community with only one dominant power is always a dangerous one," he said. "That's why I favor a multipolar world, in which Europe obviously has its place."(1)

The diplomatic activity of France certainly points toward Africa, where Chirac has recently had a string of diplomatic victories. President of Algeria, Abdelaziz Bouteflika said that Chirac will

deserve the Nobel Peace Prize if war with Iraq does not occur.(2)

As MIM Notes 271 reported in "France swallows imperialist trade privilege," France eliminated a bone of contention within Europe when it agreed to let its subsidies to agriculture become proportionately smaller over a time, a sticking point when it came to actually achieving "free trade" within the European Union.

Once Chirac swallowed the big pill to tide things over with Germany and the rest of the European Union, he started using his new French attitude to flail England (for not paying its fair share to the EU) and the United States (for wrecking Third World agriculture with similar unfair subsidies to U.S. monopoly corporations, to the tune of \$190 in 10

Santa Barbara students reject bogus "security" policies

By Santa Barbara RAIL

SANTA BARBARA, CA—The Santa Barbara chapter of the Revolutionary Anti-Imperialist League led a number of organizations in denouncing the University of California police department's fear-mongering "security" policies. The police suggested campus organizations prevent students from bringing backpacks to extra-curricular events. They also recommended that organizations search all people attending their events. These requests followed the Bush administration's declaration of "orange alert status" during the Islamic Hajj.

RAIL rejected the proposed "security"

policies as a psy-war tactic to erode resistance to U.S. military action against Iraq and the destruction of civil rights at home. The Santa Barbara RAIL chapter drafted a statement refusing to comply with security ordinances as ridiculous as those proposed by the UCPD now or in the future. The statement of non-compliance was signed by 15 other campus organizations (see page 9). SB RAIL recommends that this model be repeated in other communities in order to create a strong anti-imperialist opposition to complying with bogus "security" measures.

The same day the statement of non-

compliance was published in the UCSB student newspaper, RAIL hosted an educational event on civil liberties. Speakers from MIM, Santa Barbara RAIL, and radical campus groups such as A.S.I.A.N.! and the Muslim Student Association discussed the Patriot Act, the implications of the proposed Patriot Act II (see article on page 1), the INS special registration program and the history of Japanese internment.

While the Department of Homeland Security website claims the "DHS is ... dedicated to protecting the rights of American citizens," its actions thus far have done nothing of the sort. The Patriot

Act II is set to cut civil rights ranging from freedom of speech to the right against unreasonable search and seizure. According to Patriot Act II, even doing lawful work with a group the U.S. executive labels "terrorist" could result in loss of citizenship. The INS Registration program targets males of Muslim and Middle Eastern descent, causing unjustified deportation and detainment.

Signatories to the statement of non-compliance pledged that they would not be frightened into giving up their civil rights or their ability to organize against the state without its approval.

Marking 50 years since death of Stalin: *What it means to defend Stalin today*

MIM released a longer version of this statement on March 5th. --ed.

Today we mark the 50th anniversary of the death of Stalin, the great Soviet leader (1924 to 1953) followed by bourgeois degenerates and incompetents who restored capitalism in the Soviet Union. Amongst all communist leaders, Stalin has received the greatest fascination in the imperialist countries with countless newspaper articles and 800 page books written about him.

Croatian Ivica Kostelic won a World Cup skiing race in January, 2003 and said Nazism was a "healthy system" and that Stalin was worse than Hitler, because Stalin supposedly killed people at random. People throughout eastern Europe are coming out with similar Nazi leanings.(1) Kostelic's Austrian bank sponsor was not pleased with the public relations fiasco,(2) but the fact remains that Kostelic's opinions are common in territory ranging

from the Baltics to the Balkans, where local hatreds trumped everything else and made it fair game to side with Hitler or Mussolini to kill off whatever ethnic group was out of favor. Let's not forget that during World War II, with German help and the Pope's blessings, the Croats committed genocide. According to Vatican historian John Cornwell, there were only 2 million Orthodox Christian Serbs, and the Croats led by Catholic priests managed to kill 487,000 of them between 1941 and 1945 in addition to 27,000 Gypsies and 30,000 out of 45,000 Jews. Then the press wonders why Kostelic says he prepared for his skiing race as if he were a Nazi soldier in 1941.

We can already hear the Croats saying our message is one-sided, and that Serbs commit genocide too. While Amerikkkan politics have unimaginable depth in their parasitism, Eastern European politics fall into an endless trap of provincialism.

Somehow, the small nations in that region always manage to blame their neighbors for all the world's evils, and through petty thinking, genocide always ends up being the solution in the eyes of people in Eastern Europe.

For the Eastern Europeans MIM has a message: Stalin and his line was the greatest factor bringing peace and harmony to your region. The proof is what happens when he is gone. All your minorities living without rights, all your ethnic cleansing and all your wars are fights amongst the proletariat. They can do nothing to advance anything. Yes, Stalin organized repressive violence, but when he did, the whole region was moving forward.

The United States and the phony communist movement does not want Eastern Europeans to know that the riches of the West come from super-exploitation. The imperialists say that

ordinary proletarians can live the life Amerikkkans live without exploiting others under capitalism. That is a lie. Right now you Eastern Europeans think that your neighbors are exploiting you: think again. The reason you are not shopping at Bloomingdale's right now instead of reading this is that Amerikkkans and others from the West enjoy luxury at your expense. Unfortunately, we at MIM are amongst a minority of people willing to tell you what is really going on economically. Only by uniting the proletariat in Eastern Europe do the people have a way out of their degraded material conditions.

Eastern Europe requires repression for peace. Some day in the future under dictatorship of the proletariat, the youth will rebuke the ugly past and the small nations of Eastern Europe will integrate and get along. Right now, the fighting and

Continued on page 7...

MIM and RAIL organize art against the war

San Francisco— Around 80,000 people joined the March 15 anti-war protest here. The numbers at the rally were lower than other recent protests, but about 2000 people participated in a “break away” march (not following the permitted route). Arrests were far more numerous than at past rallies with close to 200 people ending up in jail, including several tourists and movie goers who did nothing more than end up on the wrong sidewalk at the wrong time. San Francisco appears to be criminalizing the act of protesting the war outside of the confines of a permitted march.

At the pre-march rally MIM and RAIL put up a participatory revolutionary art display. On an American flag we sprayed painted “No Imperialist Wars!” and attached RAIL flyers and stickers opposing the war in Iraq and imperialist violence. Many people stopped to look at and take pictures of the display. We handed out MIM Notes to everyone who passed by, explaining that the paper represents our opinion of American imperialism and we invited others to express their opinions on the American flag. We had markers, spray paint, a knife and other supplies on hand. Improvisations included burning parts of the flag and an offer by one protester to wipe his ass with it.

The revolutionary art project was very popular. Thousands of people stopped to read what was written on the flag and many of them stepped up to express their anger at the American system. The majority of rally participants promoted pacifist or liberal anti-war sentiments. The revolutionary art project gave us a chance to introduce these people to an anti-imperialist perspective through MIM Notes while uniting with them in opposition to this war on Iraq. We also connected the struggle to an action that even those who did not want to desecrate the flag could take: we asked people to sign a petition defending one of the many victims of the U.S. terror campaign, Jose Maria Sison, a Filipino revolutionary leader in exile in the Netherlands.

Overall our revolutionary art project succeeded in gaining much attention for the MIM and RAIL literature table and interest in MIM Notes while also giving normally passive rally participants an opportunity to express their views on imperialism. But we failed to plan for a way to clearly demarcate our work as a project of MIM and RAIL. We did attach copies of MIM Notes to the trees next to the flag, but the banner above the flag only read “revolutionary art” so those who passed by just taking pictures probably were not aware of our intention. We did attempt to remedy this problem by approaching everyone who noticed the display to offer them MIM Notes and explain the purpose of the project.

There were a number of people who wrote statements on the flag that agree with MIM and RAIL’s revolutionary anti-imperialism including: “capitalism begets violence”, “notice media manipulation by



Protestors make their opinion of “Old Glory” known at MIM and RAIL’s revolutionary art exhibit.

Bush administration”, “O say can you see, by the imperialist light, how proudly we murder”, “Bush and his crew, international terrorists” and several statements in Arabic that translated into support for the Palestinian peoples right to self-determination.

Several who expressed their opinions on the flag represented anarchist positions including those who wrote “No govt.” But the largest group we encountered were those who didn’t see imperialism as the main enemy. These pacifists or liberals had a wide range of reasons for opposing the war on Iraq, from religion to patriotism.

We also saw a lot of signs blaming or targeting just President Bush, rather than the system of imperialism that gives him power. And even worse, many that implied George W. is evil only because his father, Bush Sr., raised him that way. This individualism leads to misplaced anger and an incorrect focus on the leader rather than the system that is causing tens of thousands of people to die daily.

The strong support for pacifism and religion was bolstered by actor Martin Sheen’s speech. His introduction was greeted with loud cheers and a standing ovation by the mostly seated crowd. He delivered something of a sermon, calling on god to grant the activists the power to stand peacefully in opposition to the war and praying for strength. During each pause the crowd continued to cheer.

Anticipating the photographic attention, and also knowing that police surveillance at rallies is strong, a few of the MIM and RAIL activists had their faces covered. Several people stopped to ask us why we did this and greeted our explanation that we intended to make it harder for the police to repress revolutionaries, with understanding and support.

The March 12 issue of the San Francisco Bay Guardian (a local weekly newspaper) ran an article on undercover cops monitoring peace protesters. At recent anti-war rallies, “A group of four officers assigned to the Violent Crimes

Task Force—a unit that normally handles gang killings—carried out the undercover operations. Dressed as protesters, the squad videotaped the demonstrations and marched along Market Street in the large antiwar parades as well as in the smaller, riotous ‘breakaway’ marches. They also made a handful of arrests for vandalism.”

The article goes on to explain: “The SFPD established strict guidelines on surveillance after S.F. cop Tom Gerard, a former Central Intelligence Agency operative, was caught spying on Bay Area leftists in 1992. Working with the Anti-Defamation League, Gerard had compiled dossiers on some 7,000 radicals.

“According to the SFPD’s spying rules, which remain in place today, police must receive written permission from the

‘Commanding Officer of the Special Investigations Division, Deputy Chief of Investigations and the Chief of Police’ before mounting a surveillance operation. In the files we reviewed there’s no mention of the appropriate command staff being involved in the recent undercover operations. “

Activists should know that it doesn’t matter if the police have policies supposedly governing their spy operations. The police and FBI have a long history of undercover surveillance and worse including infiltration, disruption and violence, against anti-imperialist activists. We can make it harder for them by disguising ourselves at public events, refusing to give out unnecessary personal information to other people (including our real names), and taking care using our phones and internet connections. We should not let fear keep us from organizing, but we need to be realistic about the power the government has and the existence of spying and counterintelligence operations.

Harvard students step it up against the war

CAMBRIDGE, MA March 12 2003— Harvard Students are stepping up their efforts against war in Iraq, judging by the 500 people turn-out at the March 12th rally which was three or four times bigger than the previous rally. Organized by the Harvard Initiative for Peace and Justice, demonstrators showed a diversity of budding political interests.

Most interesting was a speaker who mentioned that he had been fighting hard—up all night arguing before the rally. It turns out that the Harvard College Democrats came out against the war—thereby splitting with the national leadership of the party.

Another speaker borrowed some language from the 1960s organization called SDS to call for a strike. 800 people have signed up to walk out of classes the day war starts.

In criticism, MIM would say that the rally showed the same weaknesses as others like it across the country. With

global public opinion against the war and major imperialist powers like France and Germany throwing up roadblocks, the fact that we in the united States could not stop that war shows that the quality of our movement is lacking. Even though the pro-war and anti-war sides are evenly matched quantitatively in the united States— if we count all the “silent majority” on the status quo’s side as public opinion polls seem to justify — still we could not win with favorable global conditions.

Staying up all night to raise our political levels is necessary for us in the united States. We have a lot of ground to make up. The question remains why College Democrats still call themselves Democrats, if they look into this war and other questions of war and imperialism.

MIM handed out 500 copies of MIM Notes.

Note: <http://www.thecrimson.com/article.aspx?ref=346930>

MIM petitions against Patriot Act at L.A. rally

Los Angeles

Despite the pouring rain, MIM distributed more than 300 copies of MIM Notes with anti-war headlines and built opposition to the Patriot Act II at a March 15 rally against Amerika's war in Iraq in Los Angeles. More than 70 people signed our petition against John Ashcroft's latest proposed "anti-terror" legislation.

Patriot II (see article page 1) is a bold fascist power-grab by Ashcroft & co., and it is urgent that we shut it down before the congress has a chance to make it into law. Demonstrators who had heard of Patriot Act II (a.k.a. the Domestic Security Enhancement Act) were grateful that MIM was offering a way to oppose it in action. But at least half of the people MIM spoke with had not heard of the new Patriot Act before. This is no surprise, as only a handful of major U.S. newspapers have covered the story since someone leaked a copy of the act on February 7, and most of those papers only printed one story on it.

A Libertarian at the table next to MIM's commented that it's a good thing Patriot II has not yet been introduced in Congress because as long as it's not on the floor it can't be voted into law. But this is cold comfort in the face of the administration's highly secretive tactics in its "War on

Terror." The USA Patriot Act passed within hours and days of its introduction in the two houses of congress—not even enough time for the congresspeople to read what they were voting for, let alone for the public to chime in on the debate. Revolutionaries, civil libertarians and the oppressed must spread opposition to the Patriot Act II now. Our libertarian neighbor and several other rally-goers asked for copies of our anti-Patriot II petition. The rights this legislation would take away are vital to our ability to organize.

Among other things, the Patriot Act II would give the executive branch power to make secret arrests, strip American citizenship from anyone who supports even the lawful activities of so-called "terrorist" organizations, spy on religious and other non-criminal groups, view credit reports without consent or judicial review, and arrest and extradite citizens and non-citizens alike to countries with which the united snakes has no extradition treaties and without regard for those countries humyn rights records. Patriot II would further eliminate checks and balances in government by barring the courts from oversight on warrants and wiretaps and on the enactment of the law overall, and by voiding existing consent decrees that

require police (including the Feds) to show that they are acting within the u.s. constitution.

Tens of thousands showed up for the march, but by rally time the crowd had dwindled a lot as the less energetic or those who came unprepared for the drenching rainstorm went home. The crowd was pretty friendly to MIM Notes, and as we handed out papers with headlines "Amerika marches toward War for Oil!" and "Authority-lovers write Bush a blank check for War on Iraq" it was easy to see we were there carrying the anti-imperialist banner.

One womyn said it was "inappropriate" to be handing out MIM Notes, and that this demonstration was not about "Chinese communism" but about opposing a war on Iraq. This is rank sectarianism, when a demonstrator at an anti-war rally can ignore front-page articles against the coming war in Iraq and the ongoing wars against "terrorism" and the rest of the Third World to say it is wrong to be distributing these articles in a Maoist newspaper. You would think someone telling MIM to get lost with its newspaper would be distributing their own newspaper twice as big and with more material against the war. In fact even from someone doing more and better work than

MIM, this would be sectarian, but at least with some work to back it up this claim would be more than nihilist posturing. It should be embarrassing to the anti-war liberals that MIM has to point out that if anti-war organizing is your priority, you should be evaluating your friends by their agitation against the war!

A telephone poll on March 17—taken right after Bush's ultimatum to Saddam Hussein to leave Iraq with his sons or be bombed — found that 31 percent of Americans were ITAL relieved END at the prospect of war within the next few days. 68 percent said the U.S. did all it could to avert war through diplomatic channels, and 66 percent support Bush's decision — though one in five of this last group is not convinced going to war is the right thing to do.(1) That's right, more than one of every eight Americans surveyed said they are okay with sending the army to destroy homes, further wreck the Iraq economy, make more Iraqis refugees and kill people because George Bush says so. In a political climate like this, MIM wants to see as much anti-war activism out of as many quarters as possible.

Notes: <http://www.cnn.com/2003/ALLPOLITICS/03/18/sprj.irq.bush.poll/index.htm>

DC Rally

Continued from page 1...

tolerate the Bush administration, and believe it is legitimate to be in a system where they alternate power with warmongers attempting to rule the whole world instead of supporting global majority rule. In contrast, we believe it is ghastly to tolerate and accept Bush today—and for this, the Amerikkkan population, not just the rulers are to blame.

What the movement inside u.s. borders needs to understand is that making arguments that would work in the Democratic Party may help one obtain political office, but they do nothing toward peace. Getting elected in the united States and peace are two separate questions.

What is necessary for peace is in fact unpopular in the united States, but we cannot change the prerequisites for peace simply because Amerikkkans are too busy reading Marie Claire and watching NakedNews.com to support a real anti-war movement in vast numbers. We have to tell it like it is and hope for change, just the way a minority of anti-Nazi Germans had to tell it like it is while gaining the support of less than 10% of the population during World War II. Germans in the 1940s should not have supported more moderate Nazis instead of Hitler as a matter of being "realistic."

Counter-demonstrators

There were a few counter-demonstrators scattered throughout—a handful, plus the usual tent for the pro-

war speeches. As the anti-war demonstration wound down, a bellicose white male drove up in a car, opened his window and yelled "we're going to war. Deal with it!" He was probably the diplomat Bush sent to France.

The counter-demonstrators focus on "supporting our troops." Lesson number one in peace throughout the world has to be internationalism. If you want peace, then "our troops" cannot be any more important than "their troops." At least since when the united States dropped two atomic bombs on Japan in 1945, the whole idea that one side of war could win without taking a risk of being attacked back with devastating weapons of mass destruction has been out-dated. What goes around comes around, so if we cause problems for "their troops" we are only "asking for it" ourselves. In this war, both groups of troops are pawns being sacrificed for bourgeois rulers.

We are tired of these conservative counter-demonstrators. We live every day under threat of terrorism, because they and their rulers are too narrow-minded to address the causes of terrorism, both by the united States and lesser terrorists in the world. Then these backward counter-demonstrators want us to applaud their sending troops abroad where they are "under threat" and end up stirring up more "terrorism" of different sorts—including legitimate responses like George Washington's.

These hypocrites claiming to be oh-so patriotic ought to know that if George Washington used violence against colonialism, then so too, we might expect

the Iraqis to. Until we grant that the whole world has learned the lesson of George Washington, we are going to stay stuck in a pattern of imperialist violence. The safety of troops abroad is NOT a higher priority than our safety at home or the safety of others abroad—whether Amerikkkan or not. We should not be manipulated just because the rulers have succeeded in sending troops already.

Quality of the anti-war movement

The anti-war movement lost not its size but its quality, because of complacency of thought and action. Even a large portion of demonstrators are indifferent to politics. We see them turning down leaflets from people and also offering reasons against war that demonstrate a lack of political development.

The anti-Bush sentiment in the rallies comes from the least reliable sectors of the anti-war movement. Since Democrats in Congress voted for the war, there is really no reason to be hearing specifically anti-Bush sentiment except for that sector of the movement that just wants Bush to do a better job making war by having more military allies and using diplomacy even more in order to further disarm Iraq before attacking it.

A 48-year-old ex-Marine held aloft a huge "Fuck Bush" poster/banner right to the end of the rally. A teenage youth confronted him and asked for "respect" for Bush, while the ex-Marine equally aggressively asked for respect for someone who already served his country. We gathered from the exchange and the effort that went into the banner, that this

ex-Marine was not one of those tepid anti-war demonstrators who will bail out of the anti-war movement when Senator Kerry continues the war as the next president. There is definitely a need for more aggressive types like this one to join the anti-war movement.

As one speaker noted, in the 1970s, Bush (and his many ardent war backers) did not do service in Vietnam. In the National Guard where even there his service was under question, Bush was "busy protecting the skies" "against the Viet Cong air force." That was a joke, because the Vietnamese never sent any air force to attack the United States.

The reality is that veterans are on both sides of this conflict and even troops are divided into pro-war and anti-war camps. Hence, the whole question of "respect" posed by our teenage junior Republican is misplaced. How to get along with the rest of the world and the impact of this war are scientific questions. If an ex-Marine says this war will only cause more terrorism, he is not any more or less correct than a gay millionaire who never served in the military when he says this war will only cause more terrorism. If two people are saying exactly the same thing, one is not more correct because he once served the united States in battle.

Notes:

1. <http://www.internationalanswer.org/news/update/031503m15rpt.html> <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A30902-2003Mar15.html>

2. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A42660-2003Mar17.html>

Statement of principles regarding the Iraq War

Continued from page 1...

of reactionary repressive violence. It whips up a furor over a symptom and claims to tidy up after the problem. Fascism can also be seen as one huge effort to tidy up the problems created by capitalism, but fascism cannot succeed because it cannot let itself know the sources of its own existence. In contrast, Abe Lincoln also used repressive violence, but Lincoln's violence ended up being progressive repressive violence, because Lincoln had a plan to eliminate slavery and other causes of conflict. Lincoln used violence against a cause of violence. Bush uses violence that will only inflame the world's people more. People who understand this will readily understand how it is that Stalin violently repressed so many people but still the life expectancy of his people doubled. As a reactionary, Bush has no plan or capability to use violence to reduce violence. So absent is a plan to reduce violence that many have concluded the real cause of the war is "blood for oil."

When it comes to questions of international relations and peace, what is "moral" is what tends to promote species survival. If Israel were a "moral" actor, we would have seen peace in the Middle East a long time ago, given that Israel is much stronger militarily than its existing and potential enemies in a short-run conventional sense. Likewise, Bush's approach to turn the whole Third World into one giant West Bank cannot succeed anymore than Israel's approach.

At first glance the question of war and peace may seem to divide neatly into moral and tactical questions. That is wrong. Israel is not at peace: that is a scientific fact. The United States spends more money on the military than the rest of the world combined and it has the world's largest economy; yet the United States is subject to terrorist attack from people who could pick easier targets if they were opportunist. These are also scientific facts and they indicate something about the approach of Israel and the United States.

Bush tries to address moral concerns by saying Uncle Sam will try to make the war as short as possible and leave Iraq in a happy democracy better off than it was before the war. People with a knowledge of Iraq or any Third World people's love of self-determination know why the United States is hated there. It may seem to be a "tactical" question as to whether Bush has the capability to bring about "democracy" in Iraq, but in fact, moral and tactical (instrumental) questions are merged. We often hear that ideological dispute is messier than scientific dispute, but in this case, the morality of "world peace" is uncontroversial. The science of how to bring that about is controversial.

Mourning the death of innocent Iraqis

The Iraqi people are a victim of the most horrific imperialist power in history—the United States. What Iraqis

seek is self-determination, which is a natural and healthy motive that George Washington pursued. That is why the nationalism of the Iraqi people cannot be equated with the twisted nationalism of overfed Amerikkans who oppose "French fries" and use that as a justification to kill Iraqis.

We also mourn those of the U.S. troops who are too young and foolish to understand world affairs and why they die in Iraq—and of course, already some have died in training for this war. However, unlike the Iraqis, we can say that the U.S. troops did at least have a chance to avoid their fate. Whether they were watching too much nakednews.com (which is the leading news website in the male 18-34 age group) to pay attention to political matters or whether they read too many romantic tales of military adventure, the U.S. troops had the economic opportunity to educate themselves better and push their country away from aggression, but they failed.

Although there is almost no limit to humyn economic capabilities and growth, the population of the United States is too busy reading trashy romance novels and playing video games to consider economic cooperation that would bring global peace. Again and again, the Amerikkkan and Israeli rulers say that killing Third World people is the solution to the problem. They succeed in killing many people including their own in "friendly fire" while failing to bring "democracy," peace and economic cooperation.

In every way, the Amerikan rulers and the 70% of the Amerikan public that backs them (1) are "asking for it." It's clear that Amerikkans respect nothing but force—not international law, not the treaties they signed, not the United Nations and not the "humyn rights" they often speak of. The trouble is that these war-mongers impose their terrorism-generating system on the rest of us in North America. Vice-President Bush under Reagan armed and trained Bin Laden to fight the Soviet Union. Then the war-mongering majority waged a war on Iraq and caused Bin Laden to start attacking the United States; yet the Amerikkans don't get it to this day. Now they want another war on Iraq—and get this—because of a link of Iraq to terrorism! No shit, Sherlocks: you created it!

The stupidity does not end there. Vice-President Cheney said on March 16th (and subsequently backed by Bush) that Iraq has nukes; yet Cheney is exactly the one who has been pushing for war on Iraq all along.(2) Talk about asking for it! The fact is that every single humyn-being on this planet lives at the tolerance of other humyn-beings, and this becomes more true the smaller the planet gets. The sooner we get that through our skulls, the better off we will all be.

While some companies make money selling bombs, we of the U.S.-based peace movement live under the constant

threat of war and terrorism in retaliation for what the Amerikan majority did. We of the minority are tired of their wars for oil, their backing of Israeli massacres of Palestinians every day, their profiteering on weapons and everything else that deprives us of a non-negotiable right to live in peace without terrorism. If the U.S. imperialist majority wants to change things ("regime change") in Iraq, it can move there. In democracy, the majority only determines what happens among those who voted, not in countries thousands of miles away. If the Amerikan knucklehead yahoos want "regime change" in Iraq, they can move to Baghdad.

We the peace-loving minority have a non-negotiable right to be free of the violence caused by the majority's desire to remake the world in the image of Ronald McDonald. If they want a war to

remove the veil from Afghanistan's wimmin, and they think they know how to do it, the Amerikkans should move there. If Amerikkans don't want Kim Jong-il to produce nuclear weapons for profit, we'd suggest that they get out there and bid higher for those weapons than other bidders, because there is no other logic within the capitalist system. Whatever these Amerikkans want to do, they should do it without endangering anyone else's non-negotiable rights to security.

Notes:

1. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A52020-2003Mar19.html>

2. <http://www.msnbc.com/news/886806.asp>; see also Reuters published Mar 17 2003. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A42837-2003Mar17.html>



San Francisco protestors blocked streets March 15 (MIM Photo).

What is militarism?

Militarism is war-mongering or the advocacy of war or actual carrying out of war or its preparations.

While true pacifists condemn all violence as equally repugnant, we Maoists do not consider self-defense or the violence of oppressed nations against imperialism to be militarism. Militarism is mostly caused by imperialism at this time. Imperialism is the highest stage of capitalism—seen in countries like the United States, England and France.

Under capitalism, capitalists often profit from war or its preparations. Yet, it is the proletariat that does the dying in the wars. The proletariat wants a system in which people do not have self-interest on the side of war-profiteering or war for imperialism.

Militarism is one of the most important reasons to overthrow capitalism. It even infects oppressed nations and causes them to fight each other.

It is important not to let capitalists risk our lives in their ideas about war and peace or the environment. They have already had two world wars admitted by themselves in the last 100 years and they are conducting a third right now against the Third World.

Even a one percent annual chance of nuclear war destruction caused by capitalist aggressiveness or "greed" as the people call it should not be tolerated by the proletariat. After playing Russian Roulette (in which the bullet chamber is different each time and not related at all to the one that came up in previous spins) with 100 chambers and one bullet, the chance of survival is only 60.5% after 50 turns. In other words, a seemingly small one percent annual chance of world war means eventual doom. After 100 years or turns of Russian Roulette, the chances of survival are only 36.6%. After 200 years, survival has only a 13.4% chance.

What it means to defend Stalin today

Continued from page 3...

oppression in Eastern Europe represents the worst “false consciousness” on the planet with proletarians killing proletarians and imagining that Hitler was only as bad or even better than Stalin. At all costs, the Eastern European people need to obtain a bigger perspective.

In the 1960s, the Western bourgeoisie blamed all evil on Stalin and continued that practice right up to the present decade, as an excuse for any failure in Russia and the neighboring republics. Today, if something good happens in the former Soviet Union, we can be sure to hear the propagandists credit capitalism, but if anything bad happens, the mention of Stalin’s name is sure to follow; although, he has been dead 50 years. That is a product of the Cold War, as is the ethnic cleansing in ex-Yugoslavia—an event that occurred thanks to a loss of Stalin’s approach in the region, especially Yugoslavia where Tito abandoned Stalin after World War II and implemented “local control” economically which led to local chauvinism and genocide in one of the clearest examples of how the relations of production affect the culture and politics in society.

The Russian Maoist Party has recently pointed out that Stalin is still relevant today, not least of all because his last public speech said, “down with the warmongers.” In his last years of life, Stalin opposed capitalist militarism and the decline of individual liberties in the West.

We would also like to explain why we seek to keep what many see as an albatross around our necks, because people ask so often. We could defend individual liberties and oppose militarism without invoking Stalin’s name our critics would say. Invoking his name only kills our cause against militarism and for individual liberties they say.

Today, defending Stalin does not reflect any obsession with any particular detail of history. We can say that none of MIM’s founders had any experience living under Stalin, and MIM holds no nostalgia for him the way tens of millions do in the ex-Soviet Union today.

As with any other historical period or figure, there will be those who become involved as a matter of fetishism. There are countless Trotskyist and ultra-left Marxist groups saying History basically

Today defending Stalin does not reflect any obsession with any particular detail of history.

We defend Stalin, because we know Stalin did not invent the troubles of our species in getting to socialism.

ended in defeat in the 1920s. That is what interests them, the 1920s and the first socialist revolution—and that’s pretty much it.

While history is of life-and-death importance, we are not history buffs. We do not look into history merely to stimulate our brains or because we like one particular idea or leader.

The real meaning of defending Stalin is that we are for socialism, not just when it drops from Heaven, not when the people simultaneously and spontaneously realize the virtues of socialism and not only when there is no repression or violence. The vilification of Stalin is very much akin to the vilification of Abe Lincoln during the U.S. Civil War, which was a most ugly but necessary thing.

There is a vast petty-bourgeois flirtation with socialism. Hardly anyone opposes communism “in theory” as the colloquial phrase goes. The trouble is that the half-hearted support of socialism is what kills it today and provides a camouflage for imperialism, which generates social-democratic reforms in the imperialist countries while imposing violent super-exploitation in the Third World.

We defend Stalin, because we know Stalin did not invent the troubles of our species in getting to socialism. It took a war to end slavery in the united States less than 150 years ago. How can any humyn then claim that what Stalin did was so extraordinarily repressive and unnecessary? The Russian slaves fought Napoleon less than 200 years ago for the right to remain slaves while Napoleon offered freedom for the slaves and an advance into capitalism. Obviously if 200 years ago Russian slaves fought a major war against Napoleon and did not gain their freedom by so doing, the humyn species is less than perfect, less than Divinely placed. The thousands of years of struggle against slavery is a tell-tale sign that anyone saying that advance is easy or a matter of spontaneous Enlightenment screwed up by occasional bad individuals like Stalin does not live much in this world.

Yes, of course it is possible to build socialism in such a way as to fail and go farther backward than capitalism. There is no factual basis for saying that is true in Stalin’s case. Stalin’s critics often talk about Stalin as if he were a relatively backward political leader of his time. Quite

the contrary, Stalin stood alone against fascism as a leader of state until Hitler invaded Poland in 1939. We need only recall Hitler, Mussolini, Chamberlain and Quisling to know that political leaders were much worse than Stalin, who stood as a shining example of a leader of state.

Others talk about Stalin as if communist leaders were to blame for all humyn evils. There are many calling themselves communist in this boat. Most recently, there is a publication unrelated to us titled “Internationalist Notes” that just arose in the imperialist countries. It has a less than one and a half page platform which uses the words “not,” “no” and “nor” 18 times in addition to “enemy” and “against” several times. Yet the platform has not much to say for the accomplishments of the movements it does defend.

“Internationalist Notes” upholds the Russian Revolution from 1917 to 1918, but otherwise it sees all revolutionary progress as crushed in the 20th century. In other words, there is nothing that “Internationalist Notes” upholds worth speaking of, only two years of revolution in one country. These ultra-leftists go on and on how a few individuals like Lenin and Stalin crushed all the good progress happening. They have accepted a bourgeois idealist view of history in which a few individuals have that kind of power to destroy progress instead of realizing that Lenin, Stalin and Mao are the best leaders of state the masses produced in the 20th century. These idealists criticize reality from the vantage point of an idea instead of showing realities created by humyns that were possible and better than what humyns did do.

The “Internationalist Notes” like many ultra-leftists and anarchists believe they are criticizing Lenin, Stalin and Mao in this fashion. Yet, Stalin and Mao doubled the life expectancies of their people despite all their repressions. That is the concrete reality and it compares favorably with other realities if not the pre-formed ideas in the idealists’ religiously infected minds. The Bordigaists, council-communists and other ultra-leftists cannot point to anything that they support or that their political movement has accomplished in the last century other than criticizing the most advanced pole that actually exists. Their method is the same as that of the Protestant sects: invent an idea that sounds most attractive and then divide over it. In contrast, scientific communism says that we can only put forward that which has proved possible. We select that which was most advanced in humyn history—not from our imaginations or powers of fantasy.

Countless idealists misunderstand Stalin and science itself on this point saying that change requires something “new.” Implicit in their view is that history is not full of change. That’s why something “new,” namely their ideas are necessary they say. In fact, the idea that new ideas

The real meaning of defending Stalin is that we are for socialism, not just when it drops from Heaven, not when the people simultaneously and spontaneously realize the virtues of socialism and not only when there is no repression or violence.

will lead past a history of non-change is not new and has existed for thousands of years. [...]

The difference between a communist scientist and a dogmatist is that we scientists work with reality while the non-Marxist anarchists, ultra-left communists, Trotskyists etc. simply ASSUME that a better reality is possible than what Mao, Stalin etc. brought. Such an assumption is no different than religion. To be a scientist, you need to show IN REALITY, where something was better. The medical researcher does not say s/he can imagine a vaccine that would cure a disease and win the Nobel prize. S/he invents the vaccine, proves it works and wins the Nobel Prize. The point is not saying I can imagine better drugs than we have now! Such imagination serves its purpose in poetry and songs, not political analysis.

If the humyn-being were a perfect animal, do you think it would have taken thousands of years to put slavery on the defensive like it is today? Do you think the United States would have required the bloodiest civil war that it had? The humyn-being is fucked up and had to have slavery beaten out of him/her. Such a war is ALWAYS an authoritarian act—by definition.

The complete version of this statement, which includes debate with anarchist critics of MIM, can be found at www.etext.org/Politics/MIM/im/stalin50th.html.

Notes:

1. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/2665855.stm>

2. <http://www.signonsandiego.com/sports/20030115-1353-ski-kostelic-comments.html> See also the FAQ on Stalin

France is serious about multi-polar world, but French economic ties to U\$. are huge

Continued from page 3...

years, see MIM Notes 261). Needless to say, Chirac's newly found love of true "free trade" went over well in Africa in a recent conference, where he admitted that the West was subsidizing its own food exports while punishing Africa through the IMF whenever it tried to do the same.(3)

Chirac's song about Europe as a power with equal weight to the united States is an old French idea around since the 1960s. Hence, the split with Uncle Sam at this moment was a long time coming, if we take the French idea of why it is happening seriously.

As the events with Iraq unfold, the U\$. dollar has reached a low against the European currency called the "euro." As MIM Notes 266 reported previously, Arab dollars may be a big reason for the advance of the euro.

Along with the meetings with Africans and the influx of Arab money, there is also the matter of the Eastern Europeans. Chirac pointed out the obvious when he said that the Eastern European countries missed a chance to "shut up" when the united States came calling for support for war.

The Eastern European countries are in the process of admission to the European Union. Once accepted, members have the right to cross borders and use the same currency, much the way Amerikkans do in all states of the united States. MIM shares Chirac's astonishment that countries from Poland to Bulgaria sided with the united States on Iraq and took the chance of offending France and Germany with such economic enticements right in front of them. The Eastern European move to side with the united States says one of two very unflattering things: 1) the Eastern European bourgeoisie is not bright enough to perceive who is offering a better economic deal, the United States or Europe 2) the Eastern Europeans think that the united States is so much more dynamic than Europe that investment from thousands of miles away will be more valuable than being able to cross borders within the European Union.

Of course, the Eastern European rulers may secretly think that U\$. military support through NATO is more important than joining the European Union! Such an attitude would stem from an old fear of Russia on its borders. The Eastern European countries may also think that because England and Spain support the united States, they may also do it. In any case, we can be sure that the alliances have nothing to do with democracy, because as in countries other than the united States, England and Israel, more than 80% of the population in Eastern Europe opposes war with Iraq too—which comes as no surprise to MIM, because

most countries in the world do not have crusty labor aristocracies like England and Israel.

CBS News reported, "In Bulgaria, a February poll showed 19 percent 'sympathize with the U.S. and allies.' 10 percent sympathize with Iraq and 55 percent sympathize with neither. 64 percent fear terrorist attacks if Bulgaria supports the U.S.

"In Latvia, 81 percent were opposed to military action in Iraq.

"In Hungary, a Gallup poll showed 82 percent oppose military action 'under any circumstance.' In the Czech Republic, 67 percent are against military action.

"Public opinion in Poland is perhaps the most pro-American. Fifty-two per cent say Poland should back the U.S. politically, but 63 percent oppose sending Polish troops to help."(4)

The Eastern European case is not the same as the Turkish case, where 94% of the public opposes war, but the parliament's plurality still voted for it in another example why "majority rule" is a bunch of bullshit in the capitalist world. Turkey uses the united States to push Turkey into the European Union, as an advocate so to speak. In contrast, the Eastern Europeans have pissed off Chirac and have leaned on the united States to do so. Turkey clamors to get in to the European Union while the Eastern

Europeans take it for granted.

Aside from the issue of Africans, Turks and Eastern Europeans—the big unstated bloc would involve any Arab state truly wishing to get out from under the U\$. thumb. If for example Saudi Arabia would kick out U\$. business in favor of Europe, the reasons for a trade bloc become at least somewhat more discernible. It would still remain a question with the economic ties amongst the imperialists as they are whether oil alone is enough reason to form a bloc and have tariffs go up between the blocs so that countries favor other countries in their own bloc when it comes to trade. We can imagine that some imperialists might have differing views on that question and not a fully scientific outlook on global trade. After all, it again is a matter of business competition and whoever grabs the ear of these politicians such as Chirac and Schroeder.

Bush has already warned France and Russia that a vote against the Iraq resolution would cause long-term damage to diplomatic relations. When we see the various sides raise tariffs against each other in a huff, then we will know that new trade blocs have formed, now that the old Soviet trade bloc is out of business.

Henry Kissinger (Nixon's Secretary of State and war criminal) and Tony Blair (the prime minister of England) have

criticized Europe for going down the road that appears to open a new global balance of power game.(5) Meanwhile ex-president Jimmy Carter's anti-communist in the cabinet, Zbigniew Brzezinski has said that the united States has never been so isolated since 1945.(6) That certainly sounds like trade blocs and tariff increases are in the offing.

Notes:

1. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A48123-2003Mar5.html>

2. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/2818477.stm>

3. The British imperialist mouthpiece BBC finally admitted the decades-old practice as well while pointing out that the imperialists agreed in principle to do something to cut subsidies to imperialist country companies while failing to achieve anything yet. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/2824725.stm>

4. <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2003/03/06/opinion/meyer/main543005.shtml>

5. <http://www.nytimes.com/2003/03/06/international/europe/06ASSE.html>

6. <http://www.nytimes.com/2003/03/04/international/middleeast/04ASSE.html>

Princeton security disallows MIM Notes

Princeton, New Jersey

On March 10th, Princeton University security stopped MIM Notes distribution. "Are you students?" the security guard asked. "This is private property. You cannot do that here." The guard appeared within minutes of distribution. Protecting students against free newspapers is so important that it was necessary to send a guard in a car.

Last MIM checked, most of Amerikkka is private property. If there is no "free speech" on private property where thousands of people pass through, there is no "free speech" in most of Amerikkka for that reason alone.

Just for additional irony, MIM Notes distributors were standing outside an old Princeton building dedicated to an American "who fought for free speech." Maybe Princeton ought to read some of the plaques on the buildings there.

Princeton University received \$146,396,000 from government grants and contracts in 1999 according to the Princeton Treasurer's Office reports. Yet Princeton feels it has the right to stop certain taxpayers from handing out free papers.

We say "certain taxpayers," because while Princeton stopped us, we did find credit card and shopping brochures available. Apparently American Express is enrolled at Princeton.



San Francisco protestors: No business as usual March 15.



Block Patriot Act II's march to fascism!

Continued from page 1...

Congress shut down for the anthrax scare, this new draft law has been kicking around for months while Ashcroft's staff told Congress members that it did not exist.

Patriot Act II alarms us, as the same people putting it forward are the ones who failed to prevent 9/11. Many of the powers that would be granted in Patriot II have been used in the past and demonstrably failed to make Amerika any safer. Ben Franklin pointed out that "those who would give up liberty for security deserve neither." And Democratic Party congressperson Jerrold Nadler (NY) has called Patriot II "little more than the institution of a police state."⁽¹⁾

Before 911, Denver police were nailed for spying on the American Friends Service Committee, the Nobel Peace Prize-winning Quaker organization.⁽²⁾ And throughout the 1960s and 1970s, the FBI conducted a war of wiretaps, infiltration and provocation against oppressed nation revolutionaries and such firebrands as Martin Luther King, Jr. and prevented not one incident of violence including the Kennedy assassination. These police actions were illegal when they took place. Now the Patriot Acts are doing away with past safeguards — placing the police and the federal spy organizations above the courts and beyond the reach of law.

The new act includes scores of

horrifying provisions, taking us back before the Magna Carta imposed limits on executive power. As in the first Patriot Act, many provisions could be used in regular criminal cases. And more than in 2001, much of the Patriot Act II is aimed directly at political activists. Among other things, the "Domestic Security Enhancement Act" would:

- * quash habeas corpus and fair trial rights by authorizing secret arrests including those of material witnesses who are not charged with a crime, denying the right to sue for information on detainees under FOIA,⁽³⁾ and preventing defense attorneys from challenging use of secret evidence;

- * end freedoms of association and assembly and criminalize basic political activism by stripping American citizenship from anyone who supports even the lawful activities of organizations the administration calls "terrorist," making it terrorism to engage in potentially dangerous civil disobedience like that taken up to stop U.S. bombings in Vieques (even when the potential danger is only to the demonstrators themselves), and making it legal to spy on religious and other non-criminal groups;

- * eliminate privacy by further reducing the role of courts in overseeing search and wiretap warrants, creating a DNA database of American citizens who have not been convicted of crimes, making credit reports available to law

enforcement without consent or judicial review, creating a new category of "domestic security surveillance" for terrorism investigations with looser standards than criminal investigations, encouraging businesses (like your cable company and your ISP) to spy on their customers by immunizing them for any crimes they commit when they do it, and requiring bookstores and libraries to turn over records of their customers' reading habits upon request by investigators, without a warrant;

- * target immigrants by opening visa files to local police,⁽⁴⁾ providing for extended jail terms for common immigration offenses, allowing summary deportation, and deporting people to any country in the world, including those with no functioning government;

- * and finally, Patriot Act II would enhance Amerika's role as an international police state by permitting arrests and extraditions of citizens and non-citizens alike to countries with which the united snakes has no treaties and without regard for humyn rights.⁽²⁾ Had this last provision been in effect in the Twentieth Century, Amerika would have been deporting Armenians to Turkey during the genocide, Jews to Nazi Germany, and Blacks to Apartheid South Africa.

Amerika cannot make its people safe because it cannot change its own nature. Its rapacious brutality has made the united

snakes the sworn enemy of the world's people, who respond with violence — the only response this country understands. Gutting the first, fourth, fifth, sixth and eighth amendments will not protect this country from the wrath of those who have suffered its assaults. It will only lay bare the hollowness of Amerika's claim to democracy and right. The only chance for safety is getting right with the world's people through international peace achieved under communism.

Notes:

1. Baltimore Sun 21 February, 2003.
2. <http://www.aclu.org/SafeandFree/SafeandFree.cfm?ID=11817&c=206> Click on link "For a detailed section-by-section analysis."
3. With this provision, the DOJ proposes to resolve pending suits by the American Civil Liberties Union and American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee, et al, for information on the more than 1,000 people detained since 911. The new Act actually says that defending itself against the ACLU & ADC suits "requires extensive Department of Justice resources, which would be better spent detecting and [incapacitating] terrorists." ("Patriot Act Redux," abcnews.com 21 February, 2003)
4. Police in some cities oppose this measure, saying that it will make it harder to get cooperation from immigrant communities. MIM doesn't give a hoot about the ease of police work. We point this out to say that as the reactionaries' state of desperation increases, they have more trouble keeping their own interests covered.

Petition: Defend civil liberties against 'anti-terrorist' attack

This petition and more information are available online at <http://www.etext.org/Politics/MIM/agitation/civlib/index.html>

With the Domestic Security Enhancement Act, or Patriot Act II, the Department of Justice (DoJ) proposes to gut the freedoms of speech and assembly, freedom from unreasonable search and seizure, and cruel and unusual punishment, and the rights to due process and speedy and public trial eliminate checks and balances between the police agencies and the courts, and do away with the public's right-to-know what its government is doing.

If enacted, the Patriot Act II would:

- * authorize secret arrests including those of material witnesses who are not charged with a crime;
- * bar defense attorneys from challenging use of secret evidence;
- * deny the right to sue for information on detainees under the Freedom of Information Act;
- * permit arrests and extraditions of citizens and non-citizens alike to countries with which the U.S. has no extradition treaties and without regard for those countries' humyn rights records;
- * strip American citizenship from anyone who supports even the lawful activities of organizations the administration calls "terrorist;"
- * create a new category of "domestic security surveillance" for terrorism investigations with looser standards than criminal investigations,
- * provide for extended jail terms for common immigration offenses; and
- * allow summary deportation to any country in the world, including those with no functioning government.

Patriot Act II would sacrifice basic Constitutional liberties, and thus be detrimental to the security of the majority of people living in the United States. We oppose this proposed legislation.

Statement against UC Santa Barbara's "security" policies

As discussed in an article on page 3, RAIL drafted this statement in response to the ridiculous grandstanding of the University of California Police Department.

Campus Police recently released a statement, distributed to all campus organizations by the Office of Student Life, requesting organizations ban backpacks from events and post visible security in response to the recent national "orange alert."

These 'security' suggestions are ridiculous and inconsistent: students are not asked to leave their backpacks outside of classrooms, yet if a terrorist threat were real in Santa Barbara, the classroom would be just as vulnerable as any public event. More so, in fact, given how many people are packed into some lecture courses. The truth is the suggestions are not about security, they are local initiatives by authorities to implement the Bush administration's national objective of capitalizing on the fear of the American public in order to build support for and weaken resistance to the military annihilation of Iraq and the extension of the domestic police state.

The Bush administration's issuance of a heightened security alert on February 7th is an attempt to further incite fear in the American public during the Islamic Hajj, the annual pilgrimage to Mecca. It is one more instance of the US government representing threats in racial and ethnic terms, whether it's the war on crime or the war on terror. This latest incitement of fear linked to the Islamic Hajj is part of a policy of racial profiling, which scapegoats and targets people of color as barbarians at the gates of civilization. If the government was consistent it would also have issued heightened security alerts on Christmas and Easter in the wake of the Oklahoma City bombing in 1995.

While we recognize that we live in a time of insecurity, we understand the cause of this insecurity to be rooted in the policies and practices of the United States, its allies, and proxies around the world. Since the end of

World War II, the US and its allies have overthrown democratically elected governments, supported and trained terrorists, assassinated political leaders of whom they disapproved, and saturated the world with weapons. Insecurity today is the legacy of this history.

The pattern continues in the present. The incitement of fear and increased 'security' measures will make no one safer as long as the Bush administration provides overt and covert military support to repressive regimes in places like Israel, Saudi Arabia, Columbia, and the Philippines. A superpower dropping thousands of cruise missiles on a smaller, less industrialized nation already devastated by 12 years of war and sanctions will not stabilize the Middle East. Rather, these policies will ensure a future of continued insecurity and unending violence.

We, the undersigned organizations and individuals of the UCSB community, declare that we will not comply with the UCPD's security suggestions for the heightened terrorist threat of early February 2003, nor will we be intimidated into complying with any such ordinances in the future. ... If the University administration is truly concerned about peace and security, we demand it stop supporting weapons research on campus, cut its ties with the "defense" industry, speak out against UC oversight of the nuclear weapons factories at Los Alamos and Livermore National Laboratories, and divest from companies doing business with Israel.

SIGNED: Revolutionary Anti-Imperialist League (SB), Nikkei Student Union, Green Party-UCSB ASIAN!, Voices 4 Global Justice, HOLA, Muslim Student Association, Queer Student Union, II9C, El Congreso, Student Action Forum on the Middle East, Students Stopping Rape, Show Space at Biko House, Women's Commission, Take Back the Night



NY censorship techniques

There are some things I'd like to bring to your attention. (1) I've agreed to contribute my labor, intellect, leadership writings etc... to the cause. However I don't mind "hustling" stamps to donate, but in the New York State prisons system if I mail stamps to an organization the facility will confiscate them and I'll get into trouble, and you will be placed on my negative correspondence list which means we will not be able to correspond. Furthermore, every time I write MIM my mail must be left open for inspection.

—a NY prisoner, February 2003

MIM responds: The treatment described by this comrade is typical of how prisons target MIM and other revolutionary groups in their censorship. The policy on stamps is something that we have not heard of before in New York, and seems questionable. If others have info on the policies or regulations behind such actions please send them to MIM.

GA prisoner is target of further repression

I have been imprisoned in the Highmax Unit at Georgia State Prison since July 26, 2001, and I have seen my fellow prisoners coming back from recreation, sick call, general population, routine movements in handcuffs with swollen eyes, busted skulls and bleeding profusely from head, nose, etc. All were jumped by the pigs, both black and white, male and female, while in handcuffs behind the back.

Recently, I have received information from fellow comrades that a pig who holds the rank of Lieutenant has made threats that he was gonna hurt me bad and has been waiting on the right opportunity to have me leave my cell in handcuffs and be taken in a remote area of the prisons to be assaulted with gloved fists, kicked and beaten with sticks.

This Lt. is notorious for cursing, beating inmates in handcuffs and allowing other prisoners who are "snitches" to carry out assaults on prisoners such as myself who file grievances against these fascist, racist, coward pigs down here in Tatnall county, which is a former slave trading post and now a modern day plantation.

Also, since my arrival at this prison, I have had to continuously battle with my ink pen and paper in an attempt to force mailroom officials to turn over MIM Notes and/or notify me with proper paperwork of their arrival.

Any prisoner here at G.S.P. who attempts to file grievances, pass MIM literature around or show signs of political organizing and leadership, becomes an immediate target by administration officials and mail inspectors, who hold MIM literature for weeks or months and place all your mail on a "censor list" to search.

However, I have seen progress albeit slow, and have been receiving MIM from August, Sept., etc., and this is because of my continuous notification of staff members that MIM cannot be simply rejected because it talks negatively about prisons or pigs, and this continuous effort that has forced this

Under Lock & Key

News from Prisons & Prisoners

prison to allow MIM literature to slowly enter Georgia State Prison.

—a Georgia prisoner, December 2002

Connecticut prisoner encourages legal struggle

Would you please send me a subscription to MIM Notes? They are so informational that I still have some that are 12 to 18 months old. A number of guys are really feelin' them.

The gulags in Connecticut really like finger fuckin' our mail, particularly if it potentially inspires us to use their system to acquire freedom and retribution.

I frequently get mail from the Department of Justice and its various bureaus and offices. They refuse to acknowledge mail emanating from the Department of Justice as legal mail. This shows how arrogant and ignorant these piss-heads are. But their types of clear violations are happening because Connecticut prisoners (for the most part) appear to have their backs broken. I'm from New York but I have been down in Connecticut for 10 years and this was culture shock to me. I just can't get used to the passiveness that permeates the Connecticut prison system. After a full day of oppression, I've stood at the cell door steaming, as prisoners bid some of the most onerous suppressors good night.

However, there are a number of prisoners whom I've inspired to fight the courtroom battle. It's catching on. Another brother who also isn't from this state was transferred to Nevada because he had gotten a number of cases flipped for brothers. He is known as the Conqueror.

I'm doing all I can to free myself, and to wake these guys up. Furthermore, I implore all United Snakes prisoners to become registered users of the National Criminal Justice Reference Service. It's free. It's a great resource of all types of information. Ask for a registration package at:

National Criminal Justice Reference Service
P.O. Box 6000

Rockville, MD 20849-6000

—a Connecticut prisoner, May 2002

Illegal control unit status in GA state prison

For the last three months, Administrative officials at Georgia State Prison have begun a new experimental program in SMU units M-1, M-2, M-3, and M-4 in which prisoners on the bottom tier have been placed on Sgt or above status— they have had steel cages placed over an already steel and plexiglass window in which special locks which close off view and food tray slots have master locks which can only be opened by a sergeant, lieutenant, or above and [prisoners] are denied ice, hot water, etc.

Warden Hugh Smith, Warden of Security, Fred Brown, and unit manager Steve Dupree

have devised this illegal program, which has no Department of Corrections (DOC) Standard Operational Policy (SOP). SOPs are all policies allocated by state legislature to the pardon and parole boards, which in turn oversee GA prisons.

Many prisoners feel powerless because of their ignorance of the law and the fact that correctional emergency response teams (CERT) are allowed to use excessive force against prisoners in handcuffs. This policy is used against those who file lawsuits, grievances, Muslims, natural leaders, etc. I have attempted to encourage unity amongst these all Black prisoners, many who are enemies of one another and lately I myself have begun to be threatened and harassed by prison administration, but I will fight to the end.

— a Georgia prisoner

Juveniles tried as adults in Tennessee

On February 26, 2003, news channel 3 in Memphis, TN reported a new policy implemented by the Shelby County injustice system, which states that juveniles 16 or older who are charged with violent crimes will be turned over to the adult system for prosecution. It was also noted that some juveniles under 16 charged with violent crimes will be tried as adults in some cases.

Concern for the rehabilitation of juvenile delinquents seems to have dwindled dramatically. The juveniles whom this policy is directed at mainly are those from project housing, poor quality educational systems, dysfunctional families, and unemployment. That is to say that the violent behaviors of juveniles, which this policy was designed to attack, are frequently, and in many cases appropriately, attributed to the overall conditions of these juveniles environments. So, if in many cases the environment plays the key role, then the one's responsible for allowing such unfit environments to persist must be burdened with harsher policies to ensure that violent juveniles are no longer bred by their immediate surroundings. These environments are created by capitalism, a system that punishes youth for being born into poverty rather than offering equal opportunities for all. It is the capitalists who should be held responsible for this system. Once the systematic deficiencies of youth development are attacked, sufficiently corrected, and no longer serve as a 'cause' for juvenile delinquency, then and only then should such harsh policies (as charging juveniles with violent crimes as adults) be discussed.

Since juveniles in Shelby county charged with violent crimes are now being prosecuted and punished as adults, why not just reduce the age of legal adulthood to 16 instead of 18 or 21? The insinuation of this new policy appears to be that there is no hope for the rehabilitation of juveniles charged with violent crimes, regardless of it they are first time



offenders or not. Further, Memphis and Shelby counties are only inches away from imposing death penalties on its youth, which according to this new policy, makes juveniles eligible for capital punishment.

With such un-thought-out, cruel, unjust measures being taken, the injustice system and its advocates on this issue expose themselves as the true hypocritical beasts/oppressors/tyrants that they really are. If concern for the rehabilitation of "juvenile delinquents," as is the name adopted by the courts for youths who commit crimes, has been lost, then the so called concern for the rehabilitation of adult convicts is a farce.

Even as this policy is being implemented, there still remain the millions of tax dollars furnished for the sole purpose of rehabilitating the youth.

— a prisoner in Tennessee, March 2003

MIM on Prisons & Prisoners

MIM seeks to build public opinion against Amerika's criminal injustice system, and to eventually replace the bourgeois injustice system with proletarian justice. The bourgeois injustice system imprisons and executes a disproportionately large and growing number of oppressed people while letting the biggest mass murderers — the imperialists and their lackeys — roam free. Imperialism is not opposed to murder or theft, it only insists that these crimes be committed in the interests of the bourgeoisie.

"All U.S. citizens are criminals—accomplices and accessories to the crimes of U.S. oppression globally until the day U.S. imperialism is overcome. All U.S. citizens should start from the point of view that they are reforming criminals."

MIM does not advocate that all prisoners go free today; we have a more effective program for fighting crime as was demonstrated in China prior to the restoration of capitalism there in 1976. We say that all prisoners are political prisoners because under the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, all imprisonment is substantively political. It is our responsibility to exert revolutionary leadership and conduct political agitation and organization among prisoners — whose material conditions make them an overwhelmingly revolutionary group. Some prisoners should and will work on self-criticism under a future dictatorship of the proletariat in those cases in which prisoners really did do something wrong by proletarian standards.

California Prisons: Repression and Resistance

Setting up gang fights

I got a hold of one of the MIM Notes and am impressed with your frankness and realness about the going ons about us. After reading #272, Dec 15, 2002 issue, some articles about prisons, I'd like to share some experiences I've had while here at this Corcoran facility with you.

I am currently in Administrative Segregation. On March 2, 2002 a riot broke out on A facility between two Latino groups (Southern Mexicans and Bulldogs) where 3 inmates were sliced and one was stabbed. A 30 day lock down was put into effect, but no interviews were conducted of inmates from these two groups. When an incident of this nature happened before with two groups (Nortenos and Bulldogs) the smaller of the two groups was moved to another yard and the institution has kept these two groups apart. As should be done legally. This time the groups were not separated, no parley was attempted, and no placement of any inmates in ad seg pending transfer.

After the 30 days, on 4-3-02 both groups were let out. Partial Bulldogs from "one" building and all Southern Hispanics from "one" building. Another riot took place. The administration had all extra staff there in riot gear, face shields, extra flex (plastic) handcuffs, elbow pads, staff from all general population, ad. seg staff, escorting staff, ISU (Institutional Services Unit) MTAs (Medical Technical Assistant). In front of the A-Facility office the personnel who hold classification were there, correctional counselors, Lt. Diaz, they were just grouped up, waiting, watching, for something to happen. All they needed were lawn chairs and some popcorn. A video camera was manned by a CO on top of the gym which recorded the riot.

All of this was and is illegal for administration to set this type of incident up and let it go down, with full knowledge, being aware that a substantial risk of serious harm was present to the inmates from each other.

I was given a SHU term of 4 months for "Participation in a riot" which was completed back in June of 2002 but I am still being retained in Ad. Seg. The first Rule Violation Report (RVR) 115 was reheard because I was not allowed to view the video. The second same 115 is being reissued reheard because of another due process violation. When I went to have the second 115 heard I was not given my copy of the Investigative Employee report which is supposed to be given 24 hours prior to the hearing. At the hearing I let the hearing officer Lt. Miller know this that I did not want the 115 heard yet until I could review the

document but Lt. Miller didn't care and found me guilty anyway, another due process violation.

Here I sit in ad seg 10 months waiting to be issued an RVR 115 and have it heard. When normally this process takes 30 days. I have 602 appealed the write up, I have stated case law in it. Administrators can not just let violence take its course and then have a front row seat and watch. No that's not legal. I have also appealed the due process violations.

This place is so corrupt I wish others would let it be known about conditions in the prisons they're in.

— a prisoner in California, CSP Corcoran, February 2003

SHU rights violations

I am in the Security Housing Unit (SHU) here at CCI Tehachapi. The administration here has no regard at all for the Title 15 or prisoner rights, and one of the main problems is Sacramento seems to support them all day long. You have prisoners complain about violations but try to get them to do more than complain is near impossible. I have been reaching out to try to organize some form of collective resistance to no avail. A lot of lip service is the closest I can get to some support. I have been branded as a problem inmate because I dare to speak out against these violations. I commonly hear "why are you the only person complaining."

I propose first that all violations be documented, and written up state wide then a system wide suit pressed against the director for allowing the individual institutions to operate outside of the code of regulations. Individual lawsuits are useless, what's justice for one or two, we want a system wide overhaul. Second, a mass education campaign. So many of us prisoners are not conscious of the abuses focusing our energy on yard politics. Which amounts to nothing. This does not take a large group, just a few willing to sacrifice time and maybe a few liberties.

— a prisoner in California, CCI Tehachapi, February 2003

MIM responds: We do have a state-wide campaign on to both document and fight the abuses both inside the SHU and elsewhere in California prisons. We join this prisoner's call to get all violations documented and written up for MIM Notes. We will also say that there are many prisoners willing to stand up and do something more than just complain. We are in touch with hundreds of them across the state of California and United Struggle from Within, the MIM-led organization for prisoners, has been gaining new leaders by the day in this state. USW has initiated a state-

wide study group on the MIM Theory journal "Amerikan Prisons on Trial" to further study and discuss our strategy for the battle in California and across the entire Amerikan Criminal Injustice System. Contact us to get involved.

Three strikes: the fight continues

It should surprise no one that the United States Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of sending shoplifters to prison for life.

I am one of over 4,000 nonviolent inmates sentenced under the heavy-hand of California's three strikes sentencing law. All across the state, for those of us similarly situated, our families and supporters had hoped for a favorable ruling in *Lockyer v. Andrade* and *Ewing v. California*.

On March 5, 2003, a sharply divided Supreme Court held in a 5 to 4 decision that sending petty theft offenders to prison for life did not violate the 8th Amendment's ban against cruel and unusual punishment.

A nonviolent third strike covers a lot of ground. In California, a three strikes sentence can be given for "any" felony if one has two or more serious or violent priors. It does not matter how long ago these convictions occurred, or how minor the instant offense. Of the 26 states and the federal governments how have a form of three strikes on their books, California stands alone in the "any" felony distinction.

Regardless of what the proponents of three strikes profess, it should not take a Supreme Court debate to illustrate the fundamental unfairness of giving someone a life sentence for a crime which usually carries a sentence of a couple of years. But apparently it does. And obviously the nation's highest court will continue to give states strong deference to do as they please in criminal justice matters, no matter how outrageous or extreme the consequences.

A democratic society cannot support both huge prison systems and successful school districts. They are unable to coexist harmoniously. It is simply not feasible. One feeds off the other. Building and maintaining a vast prison system means school districts will have to suffer.

Dollars earmarked for criminal justice, weather they be for law enforcement or corrections, should never be used to vigorously police and systematically incarcerate as a macro and constant ideology. Obviously, those who victimize deserve to be punished. But education is the key, not mindlessly subscribing to endless domestic

wars against one's own people. Bankrupting the future in a futile attempt to sanitize the present has not made the streets safer. On the contrary, Amerika leads the world in both deviance and rates of incarceration.

Since Californians are the ones responsible for overwhelmingly approving three strikes in 1994, they should be the ones to fix it — not the Supreme Court. Three strikes is purely a California problem, created by California's drug war mongers and prison industrialists.

A 2004 ballot initiative is in the works to amend three strikes to apply to only serious crimes. The goal is not to set free predators and violent criminals, but to close an ugly chapter of California history that had both shoplifters and drug addicts receiving life sentences alongside murders and rapists.

For those of us struck out for non-serious transgressions, we are our only victims. While those who continue to dogmatically cling to the criminal justice status quo are the real perpetrators — supporting injustice, no matter what the cost.

— a California prisoner, March 2003

MIM adds: We join the fight for changes to the California Three Strike law while we maintain our position that it must be eliminated entirely. Laws that increase the imprisonment rate in Amerika are not making the streets safer, instead they are just helping with the targeting of oppressed nations while the real mass murderers, the imperialists, remain in power.



What is internationalism?

From the MIM "Frequently Asked Questions" page, <http://www.etext.org/Politics/MIM/faq>.

Internationalism is the ethical belief or scientific approach in which peoples of different nations are held to be or assumed to be equal. Internationalism is opposed to racism and national chauvinism.

We Maoists believe the nationalism of nations experiencing oppression of imperialism is "applied internationalism." We oppose nationalism of oppressed nations directed at other oppressed nations, because the economic content of such nationalism is intra-proletarian conflict. We seek a united front of oppressed nations led by the international proletariat against imperialism.

"I must argue, not from the point of view of 'my' country (for that is the argument of a wretched, stupid, petty-bourgeois nationalist who does not realize that he is only a plaything in the hands of the imperialist bourgeoisie), but from the point of view of my share in the preparation, in the propaganda, and in the acceleration of the world proletarian revolution. That is what internationalism means, and that is the duty of the internationalist, of the revolutionary worker, of the genuine Socialist."

V. I. Lenin, "What Is Internationalism?" *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky* (Peking: Foreign Language Press, 1965), p. 80.

Facts on U\$ imprisonment

The facts about imprisonment in the United States are that the United States has been the world's leading prison-state per capita for the last 25 years, with a brief exception during Boris Yeltsin's declaration of a state of emergency.(1)

That means that while Reagan was talking about a Soviet "evil empire" he was the head of a state that imprisoned more people per capita. In supposedly "hard-line" Bulgaria of the Soviet bloc of the 1980s, the imprisonment rate was less than half that of the United States.(2,3)

To find a comparison with U.\$ imprisonment of Black people, there is no statistic in any country that compares including apartheid South Africa of the era before Mandela was president. The last situation remotely comparable to the situation today was under Stalin during war time. The majority of prisoners are non-violent offenders(4) and the U.S. Government now holds about a half million more prisoners than China; even though China is four times our population.(5)

The rednecks tell MIM that we live in a "free country." They live in an Orwellian 1984 situation where freedom is imprisonment.

Notes: 1. Marc Mauer, "Americans Behind Bars: The International Use of Incarceration 1993," The Prison Sentencing Project, 918 F. St. NW, Suite 501, Washington, DC 20004 (202) 628-0871 Reference: SRI: R8965-2, 1994

2. Ibid., 1992 report.

3. United Nations Development Programme, "Human Development Report 1994,:" Oxford University Press, p. 186.

4. Figure of 51.2 percent for state prisoners there for non-violent offenses. Abstract of the United States 1993, p. 211.

5. Atlantic Monthly December, 1998.



Se intensifican las protestas del pueblo coreano contra las tropas estadounidenses

4 de diciembre, 2002

Traducido por Células de Estudio para la Liberación de Aztlán y América Latina

Los coreanos del sur continúan protestando contra la absolución de dos soldados americanos que habían aplastado a dos estudiantes coreanas con su vehículo militar en junio (1) a pesar de las disculpas tardías de Bush. Entre los manifestantes que han participado en las protestas están unos jóvenes militantes que lanzaron unos recipientes de cocktail Mólotov contra una instalación militar yanqui la semana pasada, y unos grupos religiosos que marcharon ayer en Seúl. (2)

Aunque no todos los manifestantes reunidos en torno a este incidente trágico más reciente creen que las 35,000 tropas americanas que se encuentran en el terreno coreano deberían marcharse- un dueño de un restaurante tomo la decisión de no poner en la ventana un póster diciendo "¡Yanquis, váyanse a su casa!" porque el mensaje era "demasiado fuerte" y, en cambio, puso un póster diciendo "Los americanos no están bienvenidos aquí" (3)- más y más gente está viendo esta conexión. Un sacerdote

anglicano entrevistado durante la protesta de ayer dijo: "En vez de ser asesinado por un vehículo militar estadounidense, preferiría morir por mano de nuestra propia gente en la Corea del Norte si es que hay guerra". (2)

Como mencionamos en la última edición de MIM Notes, la opinión pública en la Corea del Sur se está volviendo en contra de EE.UU.; hasta bandas de música pop coreanas sacan videos antiamericanos. Tan sólo un tercio de los coreanos del sur entrevistados recientemente tenían una opinión favorable de EE.UU. comparando con casi dos tercios, en 1994. Más de 50% de la gente piensa que Bush está metiendo en líos a la Corea del Norte con el fin de vender aviones de caza al régimen títere de la Corea del Sur. (4)

Los norteamericanos deberían hacer mucho caso de lo que están diciendo sus ex-amigos en la Corea del Sur. No debería haber ninguna razón para que los coreanos sospechen una intervención con fines lucrativos en sus asuntos por parte de Bush, aunque lo más probable es que sus sospechas tengan razón. Es bastante difícil llevarse bien tal como



El militarismo amerikano trae muerte y la destrucción a la gente del mundo.

están las cosas. Los norteamericanos tienen que afrontar a sus líderes probólicos; hasta entonces no tienen porque quejarse de los dueños de restaurantes que les impiden disfrutar su barbacoa favorita en Seúl.

De hecho, los norteamericanos corren suerte si lo único que tienen que enfrentar son insultos en la calle o un boicoteo en un restaurante. Este año unos soldados norteamericanos fuera de guardia se enfrentaron con unos coreanos del sur que se encontraban camino a una protesta en contra del asesinato de las estudiantes. Aunque los testimonios de lo que pasó varían- según los coreanos, los soldados se burlaron de sus volantes y atacaron a un señor viejo que acabó en el hospital- lo importante es que los manifestantes forzaron a uno de los soldados a atender la manifestación y leer una declaración pidiendo disculpas por la muerte de las niñas y el ataque contra los manifestantes.

Por un lado, es probable que aquel soldado en particular no tenía nada que ver con la muerte de las niñas y no había sido más que un "testigo inocente". Por otro lado, todo el personal militar había sido mandado a Corea como un ejército ocupante lo cual lo convierte en un obvio blanco del resentimiento por parte del pueblo coreano. El MIM responde a los militares estadounidenses que se sienten atrapados: "pues sí, están Uds. atrapados". Los imperialistas se pueden dar el lujo de permitir que unas cuantas personas sufran las consecuencias de sus sistema. Aquellos militares que

reconocen que son parte de un sistema bélico deberían intentar dejar de serla por medio de oponerse a algunas de (o todas) las responsabilidades. Definitivamente no deben permitir que su rabia afecte a los coreanos.

El MIM no se opone al intento de los manifestantes coreanos del sur de organizar campañas educativas esporádicas. Teóricamente, estaban haciendo lo mismo que hizo el gobierno revolucionario de China al encarcelar a Allyn y Adelle Rickett por su actividad de espionaje justo antes de la Guerra Coreana. Según lo describen los Rickett en su libro Prisioneros de la Liberación, su encarcelamiento y autocritica forzada les obligó a deshacerse de sus presunciones chovinistas sobre la superioridad de las vidas norteamericanas e intereses personales frente a las de los coreanos o chinos.

Fuentes consultadas:

1. MIM Notes 261, 1 julio 2002; MIM Notes 262, 15 julio 2002.
2. Video AP, 3 diciembre 2002.
3. Los Angeles Times, 27 Nov 2002.
4. MIM Notes 272, 15 diciembre 2002.

¿Que es el MIM?

El Movimiento Internacionalista Maoísta (MIM) es un partido revolucionario comunista que ejerce el Marxismo-Leninismo-Maoísmo. El MIM es una organización internacionalista que trabaja desde el punto de vista del proletariado del Tercer Mundo; es por esto que sus miembros no son americanos sino ciudadanos del mundo.

El MIM lucha para acabar con la opresión de todos los grupos sobre cualquier otro, naciones por naciones, clases por clases, y géneros por géneros. La revolución es una realidad para los Estados Unidos mientras su ejército continúa extendiéndose en su esfuerzo por asegurar la hegemonía mundial.

El MIM difiere de otros partidos en tres puntos basicos: (1) El MIM sostiene que después que el proletariado conquiste el poder estatal, existira aún el potencial para una restauración de tipo capitalista, bajo la dirección de una burguesía nueva dentro del mismo partido comunista. En el caso de la Unión Soviética, la burguesía se apoderó del gobierno después de la muerte de Stalin, en 1953; y en China después de la muerte de Mao y del derrocamiento de la llamada "banda de los cuatro" en 1976. (2) El MIM sostiene que la Revolución Cultural en China es la fase ms avanzada a la que llegó el comunismo en la historia. (3) El MIM afirma que la clase trabajadora blanca de los EE.UU. es primordialmente, una élite trabajadora no revolucionaria en el presente. Es por esto que no es el principal vehículo para avanzar el Maoísmo en este país.

El MIM acepta como miembro a cualquier individuo que esté de acuerdo con estos tres puntos basicos, y que acepte al centralismo democrático, el método de gobierno por la mayoría en lo que se refiere a cuestiones de línea del partido. El MIM es un partido clandestino que no publica los nombres de sus miembros para evitar la represión estatal dirigida históricamente contra los movimientos revolucionarios comunistas, y anti-imperialistas. Si Ud. desea una suscripción para cualquiera de nuestros periódicos o libros teóricos, en español o en inglés, por favor mandar dinero en efectivo o un cheque al nombre de MIM a esta dirección:

MIM • P.O. Box 29670 • Los Angeles CA 90029-0670