Lynch mob attacks Ward Churchill for allegedly defending fragging in an unjust war
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According to the Denver Post, Colorado Governor Bill Owens has called for Ward Churchill to “account for his words” on fragging. Churchill is the target of a bureaucratic witch-hunt for speaking the truth on issues relating to 9/11. Last week in Portland, Churchill encouraged his audience to consider whether opposing reactionary wars might involve supporting U.S. soldiers who have fragged line officers.

The publicizing of this story by Bill O’Reilly on “The O’Reilly Factor” last night has within a matter of hours unleashed a whirlwind of media Lynch mob attacks on University of Colorado Professor Ward Churchill. The Lynch mob has made death threats against Churchill personally even though Churchill obviously never encouraged people to organize U.S. soldiers to frag their COs.

Bill Owens has in the past repeatedly called for Ward Churchill to be fired for a variety of reasons, going so far as to ask CU officials to fire Churchill. In early February, Owens said “[i]deas have consequences, and words have meaning” and called for Churchill to resign. Now, Governor Owens twists Churchill’s words on fragging under the pretext of making Churchill accountable for their true “meaning.”

What this latest attack on Ward Churchill illustrates is that the scrutiny of Churchill has always been about his particular views on U.S. militarism and genocide. That’s the real issue, not the various unsupported and specious allegations of academic and research misconduct.

The Denver Post quotes a supposed anti-war Viet Nam veteran as saying: “I’m against this war. It’s a terrible mistake. But fragging—that road’s dangerous, and we shouldn’t be going down it.” This veteran certainly heard of fraggings during the war, and these fraggings did not help the genocidal imperialists, so for whom are these fraggings dangerous is an important question. This writer wonders whether Iraqi liberation fighters responding to United States-led troops is also “dangerous.”

Demokrats and other “anti-war” pragmatists ask: how dare opponents of the Iraq War actually support the Iraqi people?

The world’s exploited and oppressed deserve better support than that.

Notes:

Imagine these Ward Churchill quotes are meant to be some kind of slam dunk against Churchill, but even at first glance what Churchill is saying is not only legal but justified and true. Everyone takes a side in this imperialist war of aggression against Iraq whether they know it or not. So do the critics of Churchill care more about U.S. commanding officers’ families than the families of Iraqi liberation fighters? This is what it comes down to, and the reactionaries side with the U.S. soldiers even though many times more Iraqi liberation fighters and civilians have died than U.S. soldiers.

This writer has reviewed the two-hours long “Ward Churchill [sic] 06-23-2005” audio file at http://indytorrents.org/. Churchill was not recruiting people to join the army and frag their COs. Rather, Churchill encouraged his audience to consider where they, as self-described opponents of the war, stood in relation to the army and the reactionaries side with the U.S. soldiers.
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Surprise! O’Reilly lies about fragging
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Last night, Bill O’Reilly on “The O’Reilly Factor” accused Ward Churchill of “telling these pinheads in Portland, Oregon, that not only should they encourage conscientious objectors, but they should also encourage soldiers to kill their officers on the battlefield.” (1) Ridiculous O’Reilly said Churchill should be prosecuted for his words, but O’Reilly’s own guests, including conservative law professor Eugene Volokh, said Churchill could not be prosecuted. Ward Churchill is the target of a bureaucratic witch-hunt for speaking the truth about World Trade Center professionals’ complicity in U.S. militarism and genocide, and the U.S. government’s double standard with regard to “collateral damage.” Churchill is a favorite topic of O’Reilly’s. O’Reilly was instrumental in publicizing a deceitful story on Churchill that originated in a Hamilton College student newspaper. Now, O’Reilly amplifies a story apparently originating in Volokh’s blog at http://www.thesubversive.com/2005/04/5048.html and http://www.dailykos.com/story/2005/04/17/208964/1/story.htm.
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fraggling. Churchill said that “how you see things is very much involved with how you act in the world. If you purport to be in opposition to war, well, for starters you might as well be purporting to be in support of the sky. We can all pose ‘war is bad’: we’ve just said nothing. Is there anything, anything kind of specificity, that might be involved in that opposition to war? Is there a particular kind of war? Or is it just all war? ‘I oppose oppression. I oppose violence. I oppose everything not nice. I blow bubbles and look at butterflies. I am groovy and cool. Like me. I am different than the ones that would kill you.’ No, you’re not because you’re not doing the killers from doing what it is that they do.” Churchill pointedly opposed leftist reformism. Later, he said that opponents of war ought to take personal risk; although, he said this does “not translate into picking up a rifle . . . it’s not that difficult.”

Churchill asked the group whether they’d render support to soldiers who have fragged their leaders. “Lesson to be learned: the United States army in the field of Southeast Asia disintegrated in that field on the basis of, in 1970, the reported number of 1,100 incidents of which soldiers did exactly what I was talking about. The life expectancy in combat of a second lieutenant of an infantry unit was shorter than that of a sand flea. The ability of the military to project what it was engaged in doing upon its opponents in the field disintegrated accordingly. That’s 1,100 reported incidents of what they call ‘fragg’ ing. . . . And the unofficial number put out by the Army was over 10,000. You cannot maintain a military projection of force in the field when your own troops are taking out the line officers . . . conscientious objection removes a given piece of the cannon fodder from the fray. Fragg ing an officer has a much more exotic appeal. No, if you would support, in opposition to war, in opposition to what it is that’s being done to the Iraqis, in opposition to what’s being done to the Filipinos, what’s being done all over the Third World in the name of the imposition of stability, democracy, and freedom, by the United States, what would be your response to someone who took in terms of doing material damage to the capacity of the United States to do what it’s doing, that you oppose, a much more impactful act? . . . The mass anti-war movement in the United States was neither anti-war nor did it achieve the effect that he [David Dellinger] said it did. It did not stop the war in Southeast Asia. What stopped the war in Southeast Asia was the refusal of the United States, the Andes, and the Cambodians, to accept the imposition of U.S. military firepower in terms of dictating their destiny. It was not a non-violent struggle. They lost three million people. That’s what brought the United States to a halt. That’s what destroyed the imperial adventure in Southeast Asia. I was there. I remember. I remember Bell helicopters at a half-million dollars a pop being taken out of the air by people with catapults and log chains. . . . not that mass mobilization in the United States was utterly irrelevant. No, it had an effect. It just did not have the effect that its poster said it. It had effect in concert only with the willingness of the people on the receiving end to return in kind what was being imposed on them. Giving back what was being dished out.”

During his speech, Churchill said he fought against the Vietnamese then, and the least he can do is support liberation struggles now.

“No people were not anti-war. Ultimately, they were anti-draft. They were not in solidarity with the Vietnamese. They were in solidarity with their own self-interests . . . This is a perfectly reasonable position, but let’s call it by what it was. It was narrow self-interest.”

People can become revolutionaries even out of narrow self-interest, especially in the Third World, but Churchill was correct to point out that many Americans who oppose imperialist militarism in a piecemeal way are not revolutionary or even anti-imperialist at all. “You learn from the past. You pick up from where the past left off. We didn’t win that one because we’re back here doing it again. We’ve got a projection of U.S. power at a much more sophisticated level. You can’t do it with smart bombs. You can’t do it with laser technology. You can’t do it with Star Wars. You can’t do it with any of that. You’ve got to actually put people on the ground with the training and with the willingness to close and kill the enemy.”

The volunteer army is in decline. People were doing that as a career trajectory. They weren’t doing it because they had any conscious understanding of what it meant to fight a war, which is really ugly, really stinking, impossible business, nothing redeeming about it at all, and they actually got called to do what it is that armies are called upon to do, and that was a big shock. Now, they’re trying to get out. Now, they refuse to enlist. . . . But conscription being met with draft resistance and draft resistance only without the consciousness of what the draft is entailed to symbolize and imply is essentially useless—we’ll be doing it another thirty years, a repetition of the same thing.”

Most of Churchill’s critics during the question-and-answer session were phony leftists making idealist, unspecific criticisms of the “method” of violence but in reality putting Americans first in wars of aggression against the Third World. Churchill called them out on this. Others disagreed with Churchill because they felt imperialism in the belly of the beast was the most irrefutable and unarguable struggle. Churchill pointed out that the alternative is to let the enemy dictate the strategy of resistance. Churchill said it even leads to leftists fighting each other instead of the enemy.

Notes:

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 Aztlán, 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 new 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 possible by building public opinion to seize power through armed struggle. Revolution is a reality for North America as the military becomes over-extended in the government’s attempts to maintain world hegemony. MIM differs from other communist parties on three main questions: (1) MIM holds that after the proletariat seizes power in socialist revolution, the proletariat establishes the state, not a new bourgeoisie. (2) MIM holds that the people under the leadership of the new bourgeoisie will lose power to the Communist party itself. In the case of the USSR, the bourgeoisie seized power after the death of Stalin in 1953; in China, it was after Mao’s death and the overthrow of the “Gang of Four” in 1976. (2) MIM upholds the Chinese Cultural Revolution as the farthest advance of communism in human history. (3) As Marx, Engels and Lenin formulated and MIM has accepted 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 Marxism within those countries. Those who speak of the 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.
Amerikans react positively to Bu$h’s speech, illustrate need to support Iraqi liberation fighters

By HC116
Posted on mimnotes.info
June 28, 2005

In his speech at Fort Bragg, President BuSh said liberation fighters in Iraq are just terrorists from outside Iraq. “The terrorists believe that free societies are essentially corrupt and decadent, and with a few hard blows they can force us to retreat.”(1)

Apparently, BuSh did not notice what the media itself has called a “corruption epidemic” in Iraq.(2)

A year ago, about a month before the so-called handover to the lackey government in Iraq, BuSh admitted in an interview with Paris Match that not all liberation fighters in Iraq are “terrorists.” “And they don’t like to be occupied, and neither would I, and neither would anybody. That’s why we’re handing over sovereignty. Full sovereignty will be transferred here very shortly.”(3)

BuSh was hoping that his audience didn’t know that non-military occupation with a puppet government was still occupation. That’s something that urgently needs to be understood otherwise there is a risk of legitimizing imperialism in Iraq: imperialism without a military occupation is still imperialism.

In the post-game show on “Larry King Live” after BuSh’s speech at Fort Bragg, John Kerry said “Americans have a right to expect a higher level of accomplishment, and a higher level of safety and security” in Iraq than the government under BuSh had achieved.(4) This and other comments in the media, such as other Democrats saying that there was no “hotbed” of “terrorism” in Iraq until the united states-led invasion, shows that Amerikans can disagree with the Iraq War on a variety of different levels, but still back this imperialist war against the Iraqi people.

The article “American ‘anti-war’ sentiments not enough to end Iraq War” (see below) points out that the imperialists will take advantage of the seeming inconsistency in the public’s so-called opposition to the Iraq War. A Gallup telephone poll of Americans (adults) on June 28 shows that 46% reacted to BuSh’s speech positively, 28% said somewhat positively. That’s 74% combined. Only 9% indicated very negatively.

It is only “seeming” inconsistency because for Americans to disagree with the conduct of the Iraq War, but on tactical grounds only, is not really a contradiction. It is not as if these pragmatist Americans were conflicted. What this means is that the imperialists need only convince more Americans that the united states is succeeding in the Iraq War. The vast majority of Euro-Americans in particular have no principled opposition—not even in words—with imperialist wars, nor do they have any basis to, as oppressors who benefit from imperialism. Exceptions include those who feel that u.S. militarism will eventually result in the united Snakes’ using nuclear weapons and causing a disaster for the entire world.

The Iraqi people cannot rely on the American majority to end this war, and there is no piecemeal approach to supporting the resistance movement in Iraq.

On April 27-30, 2003, 75% of Amerikans approved of the way BuSh was “handling the situation in Iraq.” Now, about 75% have reacted to BuSh’s Fort Bragg speech positively. On April 27-30, 2003, 70% of Amerikans thought “the war with Iraq was worth fighting” “considering the costs to the United States versus the benefits to the United States.” On March 10-13, 2005, and on June 23-26 recently, 74% of Americans thought “the Iraqi people will be better off . . . as a result of the U.S.-led invasion of Iraq.”

The world’s exploited and oppressed can’t wait for Americans to catch up with them in opposition to imperialist wars and occupations. People in the internal semi-colonies of the united states, and altruistic Euro-Amerikans, must take responsibility and organize to help end this barbaric and predatory imperialist system.

Notes:

Amerikan ‘anti-war’ sentiments not enough to end Iraq War
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BuSh is going to give a speech Tuesday night at Fort Bragg to try to reverse a reported decline in public support for the war against Iraq.(1) The decline is said to be reflected in recent polls, such as the ABC News / Washington Post telephone poll on June 23-26.

Vague mainstream media reports of three out of five Amerikans having disagreements with the Iraq War are bound to put the imperialists in an awkward position, but anti-war activists need to have a more realistic picture of what they’re up against and the contradictions in the public’s “opposition” to the Iraq War that the imperialists will exploit.

Some have faulted the media for not paying more attention to changes in public support for the war against Iraq— as if Amerikans’ perceptions of each other’s opinions were the main factor in the continuing war against Iraq. This writer’s answer to that is: get real. So 56% of Amerikans (adults) disprove of the “way” BuSh is “handling the situation in Iraq.” And 53% think the war against Iraq was not “worth fighting” “considering the costs to the United States versus the benefits to the United States.” Shit, that’s one big “whoops.” 70% of the gluttonous Amerikans, sitting comfortably in front of the boom tube, think of the number of American military casualties in Iraq is “unacceptable.” 62% of Amerikans think “the United States
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Fraggings reflect demoralized imperialist-army troops
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In June, charges were filed against Army Staff Sgt. Alberto B. Martinez of Troy, New York, in connection with the June 7th deaths of two other soldiers in his unit. Martinez, along with the two dead officers, Capt. Phillip Esposito and Lt. Louis Allen, were all members of the New York National Guard. This is the first documented case of fragging in Iraq.

Fragging originally referred to killing an unpopular member of a military unit with a fragmentation grenade. However, it has come to mean any purposeful killing of officers by those under them. Fragging was a fairly common occurrence in Vietnam. Between 1969 and 1971, the U.S. army reported 600 fragging incidents that killed 82 Americans and injured 651. In 1971 alone, there were 1.8 fraggings for every 1,000 American soldiers serving in Vietnam, not including gun and knife assaults. (1) Although the two deaths in the Martinez case were initially thought to be a result of a mortar attack, investigators found the blast pattern inconsistent with such an attack.

This incident might be a sign that the powerful Iraqi resistance is proving to have a deeply demoralizing effect on the imperialist armies. Even though this is the first officially documented fragging, we should not forget that an earlier incident happened on March 23rd, 2003. In this incident, Sgt. Asan Akbar, after being reprimanded for insubordination, lobbed three grenades into tents, wounding three soldiers. In the Martinez case, investigators found the blast pattern inconsistent with such an attack.

All of this points to the truth of what the Maoist Internationalist Movement calls strategic confidence in the international proletariat. The imperialists are making mistakes, and this resistance is spreading.


Américan ‘anti-war’ sentiments not enough to end Iraq War

From p. 3...

has gotten bogged down in Iraq,” which could mean anything from wanting the United States to attack Iran or Korea instead, to wanting the United States to further militarize the United States-Mexico border.

Have ABC News and the Washington Post struck the mother lode of anti-imperialist sentiment—or even anti-war sentiment? The same pole shows otherwise. 50% want the United States to keep its military forces in Iraq, and only 41% want to withdraw at least some forces. And fully 75% think “in the long run the Iraqi people will be better off as a result of the U.S.-led invasion of Iraq.” An Associated Press / Ipsos telephone poll on June 20-22 has only 37% of Americans wanting the united states to “bring [at least some of] its troops home from Iraq immediately.” A Gallup telephone poll on June 6-8 has only 28% of Americans saying the United States “should withdraw all of its troops from Iraq.”

What these seemingly conflicting poll numbers show is that Americans who disagree with the war against Iraq disagree with certain aspects of the war but not others. That’s no surprise. What’s disturbing (but still nothing new) is that, while many draw analogies between the Vietnam War and the Viet Nam War, few are noticing the long-standing pattern in Americans’ support for predatory imperialist wars of aggression, that is, supporting them and then trying to come up with an alibi for where they were when the war was starting and at its peak. Stories about a lying media and a lying President are popular with spineless oppressor Americans who waste what literacy they have on paying more attention to such burning issues as Michael Jackson, Scott Peterson, Jennifer Wilbanks, and “The Apprentice.”

It’s the same shit, different day. And instead of organizing to end this criminal imperialist system, many are choosing to exaggerate “popular opposition” to the war against Iraq by counting reactionaries and even fascists as “the people.” Meanwhile, the imperialists’ plans for more predatory wars, and their ongoing repression of the popular movements in countries including Nepal and the Philippines, continue. Opposition to U.S. military casualties is confused in the most simplistic ways with support for the Iraqi people. It paves the way for opponents of the Iraq War to join the Democrats, there to save the face of U.S. imperialism—instead of working to end this barbaric and predatory imperialist system. It is profoundly disorienting.

The world’s exploited and oppressed don’t have the time or the lives to spare for this confusion—spreading by the imperialists and their allies about who opposes the Iraq War. Imperialism must be defeated, and will be defeated regardless of how many Americans back it. What the people of the world can hope for right now is a decline in Americans’ support for certain wars on the basis of narrow self-interests about drafts or their own country’s military casualties. That’s it. Draft opposition is a reasonable position for Americans to take, but enduring opposition to imperialist wars cannot thrive on that. There has never been a massive political movement among Euro-Americans, or U.S. whites, against imperialism. The world’s exploited and oppressed must have confidence in their ability to defeat imperialism. And the exploited and oppressed in the internal semi-colonies in the belly of the beast, and their allies, must step up and organize to end this imperialist system, which endlessly engages in reactionary wars. U.S. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld on Sunday said that the “insurgency” in Iraq may go on for twelve more years. (3) Rumsfeld’s lowest estimate was five more years. That’s some crystal ball. Those imperialists who really thought the resistance would peter out have miscalculated. The imperialists are doomed. The resistance will never die out while the imperialist occupiers—or their lackeys—remain.

Notes:
Some thoughts on the growing wave of repression against migrant workers
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“As deal with fundamental socioeconomic issues that are, in my opinion, as threatening as terrorism itself: Failure of our public schools, decaying infrastructure, our broken borders, which 700,000 illegal aliens cross each year, the outsourcing of hundreds of thousands of jobs to cheap overseas labor markets and a population that is growing too fast for our limited natural resources. . . Those issues, and the way in which we resolve them, will shape our nation and our future economy.”

—Lou Dobbs, November 11, 2003

I want to talk a little bit about the “immigration problem” and so-called “immigration reform” in the United States, and what they mean for the fight to end the imperialist system, in which the criminal imperialists flout all borders except the ones they create and murder millions of the world’s people every year through economic and political domination.

There has been a lot of attention paid to border vigilantes and their allies recently even though the mainstream media has been reporting on border vigilantism on the United States-Mexico border for decades. The Minuteman Project is one incarnation of most of this interest in the Minutemen, the latest incarnation of border vigilantes, has been widespread coverage of the Minuteman Project around the time the project happened.

But even before the Minuteman Project began in April, major TV news programs were covering the Minuteman Project and its predecessors. “Hannity & Colmes” interviewed Civil Homeland Defense Corps founder Chris Simcox in January 2003—almost two and a half years before the Minuteman Project. In mid-January, the same year, MSNBC interviewed Civil Homeland Defense Corps organizer Chris Simcox as well as some CHDC members. The MSNBC on the same program also interviewed Federation for American Immigration Reform Executive Director Dan Stein.

What else was going on around this time? Well, U.S. Senator John McCain in a hearing on the nomination of Asa Hutchinson for Undersecretary for Border and Transportation Security said that “the entire border issues are in a situation that could be described as a crisis”—the same John McCain whom anti-immigrant activists accuse of being soft on immigration. But what else did McCain say in front of dozens of U.S. Senators on January 22, 2003? He said: “Bisbee [Arizona] militia leader, Chris Simcox, says he is set today to launch the first patrols along the border with members of his homeland defense group. Simcox has said he plans to have groups of armed citizens patrolling three areas of the Arizona-Mexico line, although he wouldn’t specify the sites. A second patrol to be put on for the news media is scheduled for Sunday, etc.etera.” That’s what McCain said to illustrate American unrest with the so-called immigration problem.

Fox News repeatedly interviewed Chris Simcox in 2003 and then in 2004. MSNBC reported on Chris Simcox’s Civil Homeland Defense Corps in January, 2003, too. “This is not the first group to converge on the U.S. border with Mexico to try to stop illegal entry. But the name Chris Simcox has given to his group, Civil Homeland Defense,” suggests an objective that is different: stopping terrorists from entering the United States. The media associated border vigilantes with fighting terrorism.

“Hannity & Colmes” interviewed Minuteman Project co-founder Jim Gilchrist in late January of 2005. “Lou Dobbs Tonight” promoted the Minuteman Project in late March, right before the Minuteman Project began. CNN correspondent Jeanne Meserve said “officials announced the first phase of the Arizona border patrol initiative a year ago, and they say it is purely coincidental that they are announcing this second phase (boosting the number of Border Patrol agents in Arizona by 500] just days before the Minutemen begin an action along the border.” Congressman James Sensenbrenner, sponsor the now-passed REAL ID Act, on the same program praised the Minuteman Project as an expression of Americans’ “extreme frustration” “at the fact that we are not having effective border security.”

So, the imperialists have known about the Minutemen and their predecessors for a long time. They have used the Minutemen to nudge already reactionary collusion of harassment and trampled-over civil rights.

Animated by the experience, Steven explained how he and his friends had been stopped back-to-back, by different officers one day. “Get out of the car and lay on the ground, they command. Then they search your car, pat you down, and let you go.” They don’t ask permission, and they certainly don’t get a search warrant. He said it was like the Jim Crow era, when Blacks had little rights or civil protections. “But what really got me,” he complained, “was how the people out there accept it. Like it’s supposed to be like this.”

In contrast, he shared that in Missouri it wasn’t considered suspicious to ride four deep in a car. “If you have four passengers then that’s your business. They didn’t criminalize camaraderie. Here, every Black and Latino knows that a car full of people is an invite for this special attention from the LAPD.”

The consequence to such profiling can prove deadly for minorities. Jessie Ramirez’s death is just one example of this. It will be interesting to see how this one is justified. I would imagine that it would be pretty hard to sing their unfailing mantra; “I feared for my life,” when Ramirez was running, unarmed, and away from the officers. But after several acquittals and justifications for these ever-common incidents—some caught on tape—one just never knows.

One stunning statement by Steven was that we are treated like this in our own neighborhoods. In Missouri one has to go blatantly “out-of-bounds” to attract such a traffic stop. But even then it isn’t liked to the extent it is here. A unique perspective seldom confronted for sure. He’s right, we have apparently been conditioned to accept this systematic denial of our civil and constitutional rights. It appears that our unalienable rights are not so unalienable after all.

Notes: KTLA News, Ch. 5, May 16, 2005.
Repression against migrant workers
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Migration policy in a reactionary direction. Some have dismissed the Minutemen as “vigilantes” but only to make their own reactionary imperialist migration policy seem harmless in comparison to the Minutemen’s activism, if not the Minutemen’s proposals. Some imperialists, such as BuSh, want to distance themselves from the Minutemen. But other imperialists find the already harsh and lethal repression of migrants to be inadequate, ally themselves with the Minutemen to garner support for even more ruthless migration policy.

Buoyed by anti-migrant radio talk show hosts and speakers at anti-migrant activist gatherings, such as BuSh’s United in the Fight Against Illegal Immigration Summit in Las Vegas, and praised by politicians in the highest levels of AmeriKan government, the Minutemen seek to whip up more public and political support for intensifying the repression of undocumented migrants, that’s white migrants. Barely disguised racism, and thinly veiled threats to repress those who protest the Minutemen, permeate this movement. But this vicious movement to raise the repression of migrants to an even more ruthless level is thoroughly white nationalist in character.

The white nationalism isn’t limited to those, such as Ventura-based Save Our State and the Council of Conservative Citizens, who fear the decline of white AmeriKan government, in fact, there are various manifestations of white nationalism. Whenever someone takes settler-created borders for granted, and says there is an “immigration problem” that needs solving, that’s white nationalism. Whenever someone talks about protecting “national identity” as if different nations, such as Aztlan, the Black nation, and First Nations, didn’t already exist inside u.s. borders, that’s white nationalism, too. Everyone who evaluates “immigration issues” on the basis of whether migration benefits the “American people” or “American workers” is using the selfish and callous chauvinist criteria of white nationalism.

White nationalists vary in the sophistication of their arguments. Some, such as NumbersUSA.com Executive Director Roy Beck, say that repressing migrants is beneficial for documented migrants already inside the united states. What such arguments neglect to point out is that borders themselves contribute to standard of living differences between the united states, and Mexico and other Third World countries, and that it is imperialism that keeps the standard of living of oppressed-nation documented migrants low.

The white nationalists try to come up with various ways to pit oppressed-nation persyns, such as Blacks and Latinos, in the united states against undocumented and also documented oppressed-nation migrants. Some oppressed-nation persyns have bought into this lie, believing that migration is against their short-term interests. But reactionary migration policy reinforces the same imperialist system that oppresses the internal semi-colonies inside the united states. Some anti-migrant activists have highlighted this fact by saying that all migrants, documented or undocumented, African, Asian or Latin American, are incapable of assimilation. But these anti-migrant activists don’t really want integration, or even forced integration, but the subjugation of all those living in the united states. They don’t want to integrate with Asian-descended persyns, Blacks, First Nation persyns, and Latinos—they want to subordinate them.

In the face of certain “immigration reform” proposals, some chauvinists have been calling for the unity of all workers in the united states on the basis of imaginary shared material interests. The fact that these chauvinists stop short of calling for eliminating imperialist borders shows their true nature. Fully invoking the same logic, the argument that non-white persyns are unable to keep their power even if Euro-Amerikans do, even some so-called socialists have objected to the imperialist Secure America and Orderly Immigration Act for the reason that it would contribute to the “Third Worldization” of the u.s. working class, by which they mean the Euro-American working class.

There are divisions in the oppressor Euro-American settler nation. The imperialists support migration policy that highly privileged workers perceive to be against their interests. The labor aristocracy supports migration policy that is out of step with the imperialists’ own plans. Simultaneously, there are divisions among the imperialists themselves. All of this is the case not just with current “immigration reform” proposals, but with Operation Jobs and the earlier INS-named Operation Wetback of the 1950s.

There is a dynamic at play here where each side criticizes the other for being ineffective in “solving” the “immigration problem” or “fixing” the “immigration system,” but the end result is an overall reactionary imperialist policy toward migrant workers. All sides seek the backing of the “American people” for legitimacy. But are they genuinely concerned with the interests of the world’s people or Third World workers? No.

The anti-migrant activists’ loftiest goals represent an incipient, budding, fascism—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 fighting. The proletariat doesn’t want 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.

What is militarism?

Militarism is mostly caused 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 goes on only 60.5% after 50 turns. In other words, a seemingly small 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 goes on only 60.5% after 50 turns. In other words, a seemingly small one percent annual chance of nuclear 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.
ALIPAC illustrates anti-migrant activists’ fascist and white nationalist aims

By an HC

The Center for New Community recently released a report documenting Americans “for Legal Immigration” PAC President William Gheen’s “association with some of the most bigoted of the anti-immigrant activists.”(1)(2)

Such information is interesting from the viewpoint of looking at how anti-migrant activists organize. Other sources, in addition to the Center for New Community, have said that Federation for American Immigration Reform Western Field Director Rick Oltman, another speaker at last month’s “Unite to Fight” summit in Las Vegas, not only has worked with the Council of Conservative Citizens but also is a member of this openly white supremacist group. The CCC believes “illegal immigration must be stopped, if necessary by military force and placing troops on our national borders; that illegal aliens must be returned to their own countries . . . We also oppose all efforts to mix the races of mankind” (“A Statement of the Principles of the Council of Conservative Citizens,” http://www.cofce.org/manifest.htm).

What William Gheen himself thinks is important, too. Gheen, like other prominent anti-migrant activists, illustrates where anti-migrant activists’ concerns really lie. Open white supremacists aren’t the only threat to migrant proletarians. The fact that some of those whom Gheen associates with are open white supremacists is just icing on a foul-tasting cake.

The Center for New Community report, entitled “Americans for Legal Immigration (ALIPAC): Xenophobia, Nativism and Anti-Immigrant Hysteria,” correctly points out that ALIPAC opposes both documented and undocumented migration despite ALIPAC’s thin pretense of supporting “legal immigration”; mimnotes.info reported this a while ago. Indeed, ALIPAC puts the interest of America for first and above all else when it means continued super-exploitation of workers in Mexico, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, and elsewhere in the Third World.

ALIPAC’s opposition to the pending Secure Americas and Orderly Immigration Act of 2005 is also telling. This legislation represents a thoroughly imperialist migration policy—make no mistake about it. The Act would result in beefing up already repressive U.S. borders with personnel and/or technology. The Act would result in further surveillance of both documented and undocumented migrants. And its visa limitations would potentially limit oppressed-nation migrants’ upward economic mobility. In fact, the Act’s fine requirements target the poorest migrant workers.

But that isn’t enough for ALIPAC. Like many other anti-immigrant activists, ALIPAC opposes any semblance of amnesty even when the legislation in question would not end the repression of migrant workers. That is, ALIPAC wants even more reactionary imperialist migration policy and even more reactionary imperialist borders. It objects to the Secure America and Orderly Immigration Act, not because the Act doesn’t do enough to “secure the border,” but because the Act supposedly legalizes undocumented migrants in the United States when it does not. In other words, ALIPAC’s activism could have the effect of reinforcing the exploitation of undocumented migrant workers.

The Center for New Community report points out that the Americans “for Legal Immigration” Political Action Committee actually had very little money in 2004. Well, ALIPAC was founded in 2004, but ALIPAC’s funding is still somewhat surprising because at the May Unite to Fight Against Illegal Immigration Summit in Las Vegas, ALIPAC President William Gheen proposed withholding donations from candidates who don’t support intensifying the repression of migrants. What donations? In May 2005, with all the talk about withholding donations, they were as if ALIPAC had hundreds of thousands of dollars at least.

Through stunts like agitating against the Channel 62 billboards in Los Angeles, ALIPAC seeks to whip up support for the miniatization of the immigration of migrants inside the United States. “We need to block any guest-worker, new and improved, disguised amnesty bill from passing before the next election . . . They want to lock in the 10 to 20 to 30 million illegal aliens because they’re already totally here. They’re giving anywhere but say that’s an opinion statement. It is an opinion statement.” (What precision from a hysterical reactionary. One of those is bound to be right. In fact, the number is closest to 10 million.) During the same speech, Gheen ridiculed migrant workers who were deported during the INS-named Operation Wetback, raising the specter of another bushlift.(4)

“Study after study shows that Americans work harder than any other industrialized nation in the world. Don’t tell me we don’t want to work.”

There is a fine line between ALIPAC and many Americans who believe that bourgeois myth, which consumes dollar output per hour with “working hard.”

White nationalism in all its manifestations must be opposed. This vicious movement to heighten the repression of undocumented migrants must not be allowed to pave the way for even more reactionary imperialist policy toward Latin American and other oppressed-nation migrants.

Notes:

Report calls for militarizing the united States-Mexico border

By HC116

The 30-page report signed by Charlie Norwood (R-GA), “Results and Implications of the Minuteman Project,” lists as an “actionable item”: “California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, Arizona Governor Janet Napolitano, New Mexico Governor Bill Richardson, and Texas Governor Rick Perry should immediately request full federal funding from Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld for the mobilization of 36,000 National Guard troops for border duty within 30 days, as authorized under Title 32 Section 9 U.S. Code.”(3)

The 30-page report signed by Charlie Norwood (Fred Peterson and John Stone are listed under “Author Contact Points”) calls for militarizing the united States-Mexico border by placing U.S. Army National Guard troops there. Yet, this contradicts the notion that the Minuteman Project was effective by just “watching” the border. Minuteman leaders have openly supported intimidating and terrorizing would-be border-crossers to prevent them from crossing in the first place, and Norwood’s report itself states: “Many volunteers were former military, while some had previous law enforcement training. Operational organization was military in nature.” “It appeared more than half of participants were prior military.”

Other Minuteman organizations have called for people with military and law documented experience and volunteer while at the same time claiming such skills will not be used in the “border watches.”

Minuteman Civil Defense Corps and these other Minutemen inspired by the
James Chase postpones Border Watch at Campo

By HC116
Posted on mimnotes.info
June 22, 2005

North County Times reported on Monday, June 20, that James L. Chase was no longer going to lead his border vigilantism project in Campo, California. Chase’s Campo Border Watch was going to begin in mid-July. Chase’s organization, USA Minutemen (formerly known as the United States Border Patrol Auxiliary), recently updated its Web site, saying that the Border Watch at Campo “has been postponed.” This writer does not yet know whether USA Minutemen’s New Mexico project is still going on. Campo is northeast of Tecate in Mexico.

USA Minutemen (a.k.a. California Minutemen) is just one of several border vigilant groups that have planned “border watch” in California. Friends of the Border Patrol and Minuteman Civil Defense Corps plan to begin patrols in California in the fall. Friends of the Border Patrol’s border vigilantism project is also called “Border Watch,” the “FBP Border Watch.”

USA Minutemen has puts on its Web a revealing March 2005 e-mail from Chris Simcox to James Chase. Chase’s intention in posting this e-mail on his Web site is not absolutely clear. On the surface, Chase is just building his credibility after squabbling with other Minuteman leaders, but many others are trying to suggest why he left the April Arizona Minuteman Project early. According to Chase, he was “in-charge of covert operations outside the posted MMP SOP, per this email from Chris Simcox.”(2)

In the e-mail, Chris Simcox says he would like James Chase “to be in charge of our most concentrated sector of the border, that would be the sector we went on Saturday that you missed. . . . Plenty of places to hide and set up ambushes 500 to 1,000 yards inside the line. It is exciting in this area because you trap them, too far inside the line and they typically run north instead of south, great opportunity to track them and B.P. [Border Patrol] usually arrives within 20 minutes to run them down the rest of the way” (my emphasis).

MIM Notes has for months said that Minuteman Project leaders were interested in doing more than just watching the border. The “no contact, no engagement” policy was just tactical only by the Minuteman Project’s own admission in its Standard Operating Procedure and probably related to a concern involving the media. Now it comes out in an e-mail that Civil Homeland Defense Corps was doing “sweeps.” In the e-mail, Civil Homeland Defense Corps leader Simcox says he is “set on you being a competent leader who can lay down the law,” corroborating reports that the CHDC has itself detained suspected undocumented migrants for the Minuteman Project. Civil Homeland Defense Corps is now known as Minuteman Civil Defense Corps.

These fascists and self-styled pigs aren’t the only Americans threatening further repression of undocumented migrants and would-be migrants, but they are at the forefront of an effort to influence public opinion to intensify the already harsh and deadly repression of undocumented migrants and station military troops at the border. They are the flip side of those who would keep undocumented or documented migrants in the United States to continue exploiting them, as well as those who want to keep repressive imperialist borders but with a friendlier face. All of these people have no problem exploiting proletarians. Some pretend to oppose the exploitation of undocumented migrant workers in the United States, but do so only insofar as they believe American citizen workers or American citizens’ quality of life are harmed. This vicious cycle wherein the imperialists oppose each other, but only to move forward with plans that are overall and inevitably imperialist and reactionary Euro-American so-called workers, and their allies. The proletarian does not need “immigration reform” because there is no “immigration problem” except for fascists and white nationalists who evaluate migration on the basis of how much migrants benefit or don’t benefit Americans.

“Fixing” “broken borders” is not needed. What’s needed is an end to this imperialist system that repeatedly creates these so-called immigration problems and threatens fascist repression against undocumented migrant workers and other oppressed-nation persyns.

Notes:

U$ fascists further isolated in Nepal

By HC93
Posted on mimnotes.info
June 23, 2005

After more than four months of martial law the u$.funded god-king of Nepal, Gyanendra, stands alone with his Muslim wife and Shah caste members and his increasingly demoralized Royal Nepalese Army being payed off with imperialist dollars. The bourgeoisie parties of Nepal have announced that they will boycott proposed elections as long as martial law is in place and have made moves to unite with the proletarian forces of Nepal for the common goal of democracy. The bourgeoisie cannot deny that elections are not democratic when there is a gun to their heads. They are not in power.

The ruling government in Kathmandu threatened to extend the fascist tactics they have used against the peasants and lower castes to the bourgeois parties who have increasingly faced repression in clashes with police and mass arrests and imprisonment since the February 1 declaration of martial law. In response to signs of a United Front between proletarian and national bourgeois forces, a government spokesperson said, “We urge the parties not to compel us to treat them in similar manner (like the Maoists).”(1)

The majority of the Nepali citizens live in the countryside where some degree of Maoist governance is in place. These peasant and proletarian forces are seeing the bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie of the urban center refusing to work with u$.imperialism and its god-king puppet and instead joining the patriotic struggle for national self-determination. These parties have acknowledged a common goal of democracy that has been a thwarted struggle in Nepal for decades.

While the u$ continues its massive slaughter in Iraq in the name of disposing dictator Saddam Hussein, u$Ambassador

Report calls for militarizing the united States-Mexico border

From p. 7...

Minuteman Project are actively trying to present themselves as a military threat to undocumented migrant workers. And they stir up sentiments that there is a war situation at the border when there is not. Minutemen and their supporters are fascists.

Some critics of the Minutemen still want repressive imperialist borders but with a friendlier face. But these are white nationalists like the Minutemen. Demographer Jeffrey S. Passel says that 6% of undocumented migrants are from Europe and Canada.(5) Yet, anti-migrant activists concentrate on oppressed-nation migrants from the Third World. In Britain and Canada, too, there is much hostility toward oppressed-nation undocumented and documented migrants.

In an “editorial” attached to the report “Results and Implications of the Minuteman Project,” Congressman Tom Tancredo’s ex-Marine senior homeland defense adviser, Frederick A. Peterson III, disingenuously asserts that “open borders humanitarians” contribute to migrants dying in the desert when in fact it is u$. migration policy that causes these deaths by pressurizing migrants to cross into the desert. Peterson denies that American citizens benefit from oppressed-nation workers’ labor, whether they are inside or outside the United States, and says that migration is a threat to “cultural cohesion” as if the United States had only one culture. “Mass illegal migration . . . is rising without measure and eroding the very fiber of our safety, life and culture.” But Peterson does not want to end the repression of migrants that turns them into “illegal immigrants.” No, in reality, Peterson opposes migration in general, documented and undocumented, just as the Congressional Immigration Reform Caucus openly says it does. This reactionary movement to intensify the already harsh and lethal repression of undocumented migrants and would-be migrants must be defeated.

Notes:

Go to 9...
What is Mimnotes.info?

Mimnotes.info publishes news articles and culture (media, movie, music, video game and other) reviews from the standpoint of the world’s exploited and oppressed under imperialism, capitalism, and patriarchy. Inspired by the Maoist Internationalist Movement, mimnotes.info (“MIM notes dot info”) opposes all group oppression, including the oppression of gays and lesbians, wimmin, and youth. The imperialist-patriarchy is full of horrors and misery for the world’s oppressed majority. Mimnotes.info aims to build public opinion for revolutionary change. Nothing short of revolution can end this messed-up system. Knowing the world and conditions inside the belly of the beast is key. Equip yourself with mimnotes.info and write for mimnotes.info.

Write for mimnotes.info

Mimnotes.info relies heavily on contributors to submit articles and always needs more contributors and writers. Mimnotes.info focuses on news and agitation, and currently publishes only English-language articles. Mimnotes.info is looking for writers who can be consistent with MIM’s line while writing news-type articles for militant public opinion-building among those among the people who have access to the Internet. MIM’s audience also includes students and others.

If you are not familiar with the Maoist Internationalist Movement, check out its electronic and print literature. Mimnotes.info contributors personally do not have to agree with MIM on everything, but submitted articles should not express disagreement with MIM’s current line. Mimnotes.info is not meant for publishing polemics with MIM’s line. Mimnotes.info accepts articles geared toward public opinion-building. Articles should not pretend to be atheoretical or not have any theory, but at the same time articles should not assume too much knowledge of either terminology or theory. The distinction being made here is not between bias and objectivity, but in how to effectively use theory in a factually accurate article. Mimnotes.info does not seek to water down the truth, but there is no need on mimnotes.info to spell out all the underlying theory.

Mimnotes.info accepts articles about particular current events or happenings, for example, fascist Save our State’s May and June 2005 protests against the Baldwin Park monument “Danzas Indigenas.” An example of an article that would not be appropriate for mimnotes.info is an article that discusses, in a very general way, Liberal versus Marxist views of art. This does not mean that articles have to deal with particular places. An article about why Al Sharpton and Lou Dobbs were in May 2005 being buddy-buddy on Lou Dobbs Tonight, on undocumented migrants, would be appropriate for mimnotes.info.

Mimnotes.info also accepts reviews of movies, music, video games, concerts, art exhibits, etc., and will occasionally publish letters to mimnotes.info of the Letters to the Editor type. In general, a good guide would be to look at what MIM has published in MIM Notes; although, mimnotes.info content is not necessarily MIM’s position. Mimnotes.info is an unofficial, volunteer-maintained Web site that handles articles that would have been e-mailed to MIM’s Web Ministry for MIM Notes. On May 18, 2005, MIM announced on its Web site that its Web Ministry was going to shut down for summer 2005.

Mimnotes.info credits articles to the handle or nickname that the writer provides. If none is provided, then the article will have no byline. If mimnotesinfo1@mimnotes.info substantially adds to, or changes an article, mimnotes.info will credit the article to both the original author and mimnotesinfo1; if an article could be improved, mimnotesinfo1 will work with you to improve it if the article is not that urgent. An example would be: “By X and mimnotesinfo1@mimnotes.info.” Articles sent to mimnotes.info could possibly appear on not only mimnotes.info’s Web site, but also in electronic and print issues of MIM’s MIM Notes. MIM Notes staff may come to mimnotes.info and use material from mimnotes.info. Mimnotes.info permits redistributing original articles posted on mimnotes.info, but you must credit the articles’ authors and provide the original URLs of the articles (links to the articles on mimnotes.info). An exception is made for MIM, which does not have to display or otherwise provide the original URLs. Articles sent to mimnotes.info should be spell-checked and proofread at least once. Writers should follow the guidelines for MIM Notes in “How to Write for MIM Notes and MIM Theory,” which is on MIM’s Web site.(1)

E-mail all articles and correspondence to mimnotesinfo1@mimnotes.info, or use the form below. Currently, mimnotes.info does not accept file attachments unless they are images smaller than 500K. Please do not attach Microsoft Word documents, only plain text files if you have to, such as Notepad, Pico and TextEdit files. Sorry, mimnotes.info does not use PGP. See also: “Public opinion work versus party-building work,” on MIM’s Web site.(2)

Notes:
6. See also: “Public opinion work versus party-building work,” on MIM’s Web site.(2)

Nepal

James Moriarty is playing golf with Nepali royalty(2) who lead the world in civilian abductions and assassinations according to Amnesty International. While giving repeated lip-service to ‘restoring democracy,’ Moriarty has clearly stated that the u$ opposes the efforts of Nepal to attain true democracy and to provide for the needs of its people.(3) Anyone who questions what the u$ means by restoring democracy need only to look at Iraq today.

While the desperate measures of for martial law and fascism have created greater unity in the national struggle in Nepal, the People’s War continues to advance as well. On June 21, Maoists led an attack on government buildings in the town of Diktel that freed 66 prisoners and killed 8 after over five hours of battle.(4) People’s War remains the primary front of the revolutionary struggle of the oppressed nations for liberation from imperialist domination. The Nepali people learned this lesson after the bourgeois-led “People’s Movement” that led to a short-lived and ineffective parliamentary democracy. This lesson brought Nepal to where it is today with a proletarian-led movement dominating the countryside and exerting scientific leadership in the latest attempt by the people of Nepal to achieve the basic needs and security that is due to all of humanity.

Notes:
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Under Lock & Key
News from Prisons & Prisoners

Access to Elected Officials Denied
This is my second letter to your organization. I received a letter from you about a month ago. I would like to receive your newsletter. Also I am having problems with my mail being returned to the mail room here at WSP [Washington State Penitentiary]. I wrote to our legislature and asked for contact information to our elected lawmakers for my state. Now the mail room is improperly labeling this directory a telephone book and not allowing me to have it. This to me seems flatly wrong—like every other policy. We only have 3 hours per week of law library access. So I am having to gripe along with every other mail issue. If you have any information on these subjects please send it along. Everyone needs a hand battling the diabolical Mechanism. Thank you for your time and attention and have a nice day.

—a Washington prisoner, May 2005

MIM responds: We sent this comrade a copy of our prison censorman with information on how to battle censorship behind the bars. Censorship is a major focus of MIM’s Prisoner Legal Clinic and we always welcome reports of censorship in the pages of Under Lock and Key as well as updated information on winning such battles. MIM is actively tracking censorship in prisons all around the country in an effort to further coordinate this struggle.

Kansas SHU: “Martyrizing supporters of our cause”
I am currently isolated in the Supermax (SHU) Unit in the Kansas Department of Corrections. I have been in isolation for almost two years now, with no sign that I’ll be getting out soon. My initial placement was questionable to say the least. One day I was grabbed by the facility “pits” and thrown into isolation without being given any reason. A week or a week later, a report was given to me claiming I was a member of a “Security Threat Group” (STG), and that I had been involved in assaults on and intimidation of inmates. But they refused to allow me to present any argument or to gain any adjudication on these allegations through disciplinary procedure. The officials’ accusations are speculative at best; this is certainly the reason for their circumventing established procedures.

I truth is: agencies such as KDOC enjoy power, and it is as much a vice to them as a responsibility. They fear resistance. But I say foolishness is a Social Consciousness and laying out baldly, the evils perpetrated on society by capitalism and internationally by 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.
Formal mis-education not necessary

I have very little formal education, the last grade of school I completed was the 6th grade. Some people would consider that a curse, yet it has proven to be a blessing. It has allowed me to be more objective in my studies.

I watch shows like Meet the Press, Hardball with Chris Matthews, the Wall Street Journal Report, the CBS Market Watch, etc. These shows interview the top business and political figures in this country, all of whom are products of america’s educational system. They all seem to be robotic, and they use a lot of flowery speech. They remind me of Baptist preachers. They can talk for hours about nothing and make it sound good. And just like a preacher, when you question them on the particulars of the sermon, they give you an answer more confusing than what they already have said, and then try to get away as quick as possible.

But they all agree they value profits over life. It’s just like the guy from The Matrix [see IM review of this movie on the MIM web site] said, humans are supposed to be mammals. Mammals are supposed to live in harmony with their environment. On the other hand, parasites destroy their environments and then move on. It was reasoning that humans behaved more like parasites than mammals. I think about Europe and how they colonized the world, and murdered millions in the name of “progress.” How the continuous murder millions, and destroy the environment wide for money, and they will seek to destroy anyone who opposes them. It is inhuman not to fight these people. Time has shown they cannot be reasoned with. Killing them is like self-defense.

The u.s. is the offspring of the greatest colonial power, and is the greediest of them all. Resources are limited to non-existent in Europe as the continent started to become industrialized through military might, they started to rob the world of its natural resources. A practice that carries over even into today with no end in sight (imperialism). They are buying the raw materials and those who are not for sell are only those countries with their own imperialist designs. Kill or be killed. Wow, some civilized world.

—a California prisoner, March 2005

Educating the people

You wouldn’t believe how many prisoners are illiterate and can’t write or read. I’ve run into a lot of brothers like this. It’s a shame, because the government agency which calls itself “corrections” prevents a man from educating themselves, and practicing their human right to pursue of knowledge. This system has failed us, and I will not fail my people, those of the struggle for liberation. I spend a lot of my time in here, helping uplift others, because I see potential revolutionaries in many. And if it means teaching a brother how to read and write, or passing on beneficial revolutionary literature, then I’m doing my duty. Serving the people in everything I do. Because once you’re committed to doing right, the power of righteousness will never betray you.

—a California prisoner, Feb 2005

Lockdowns at Soledad

It’s next to impossible here to organize a study group with the constant lockdowns. We ain’t getting but 2 ten minute showers per week, cuffed and transported from one cage to another. And most of the rest of it’s 24 hours in the cell. And this is on the mainline. They fuckin’ us in 10 different ways.

We’re supposed to get at least 3 hours sunlight and exercise a week to meet the minimum life necessities. But since I been here 2 1/2 years, they are only meeting the constitutional requirements in the hole.

—a prisoner at Soledad in CA, June 2005

Broken Homes

Broken homes in an hour glass after dark sing and dance, watching the sands of my sanity slowly pass.

Laying on make believe grass, listening to the bone knocking on doors where there’s no homes.

From the inside the voices don’t hide as they’re calling out my name, I go insane and knock on the wall don’t talk back at all, the stories they could tell have broken free from this IMU cell

Soon I’ll be free if I make it mentally in a world that will not accept me.

Walking the endless streets, tripping over where I stand in this so called promised land with no shoes on my feet, hungry for the new friends and something to eat.

Homes might sing and dance yet never sleep and the feet are made of concrete

— A Prisoner in Oregon

Filth at California Medical Facility

I arrived here at the California Medical Facility three years ago from Pelican Bay State Prison and I am astounded at what I have seen and experienced here. you would think that because this is a medical facility their standards of cleanliness would surpass the standards of any other facility. That’s not so. For a hospital, this place is filthy and a breeding ground for germs and potential sickness.

Upon my arrival here at CMF I was issued a clean blanket. Three years later, I still have that same blanket. They have never offered me a chance to clean this blanket nor have they ever offered a clean blanket exchange.

There is no excuse for this. It is the responsibility of the prison administration to assure that the inmates at this institution always have clean bedding. While at Pelican Bay we had blanket exchanges, dirty for clean.

I have brought this issue to the attention of the prison COs, but they don’t seem to care.

The handling of getting clean sheets is also a problem. We hand in our sheets on one day and get new ones two days later. I’ve seen sheets handed out that were ripped up so bad you can’t possibly use them. I’ve also seen sheets so badly stained that they’re not usable. When you bring this to the attention of the COs they just blow you off and tell you that all’s they have, there are no extras. So you have to wait an extra week to see if you will back out and get a decent set of sheets.

My cell calls it the sheet lotto.

Never in my life have I been plagued with skin problems until I came here. I caught Staph infections three times already. This place is a breeding ground of filth and germs. I wonder what it will take to wake up the administration to the fact that this is a hospital and if nothing else, it should set an example of cleanliness and health for other prisons to follow.

—a California prisoner, May 2005

Casualties of War

By a Washington prisoner

From the tower shots ring out, From the heart blood flows out, and as the body hits the ground life dies out.

Killed by a police sniper for a fist fight, never had a chance in America’s Penal vortex. Government and Correctional corruption at its highest level. Civilians and convicts, brain-washed in chaos with no unity.

Plutocracy, and stolen presidential elections go hand and hand. It’s time for the third world nations, urban ghettos, indigenous natives, proletarians, lumpens to make a stand.

A Global class war is on the horizon. The struggle for human emancipation continues.

This is dedicated to the two unarmed prisoners that were shot dead at Washington State Penitentiary (WSP) in 2002, by tower prison guards, and to all the other innocent victims of police homicide.

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.S. 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.

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

Notes:
2. Ibid, 1992 report
4. Figure of 31.2 percent for state prisoners there for non-violent offenses. Abstract of the United States 1993, p. 211.

Join the fight against the injustice system

While we fight to end the criminal injustice system MIM engages in reformist battles to improve the lives of prisoners. Below are some of the campaigns we are currently waging, and ways people behind the bars and on the outside can get involved. More info can be found on our prison web site: http://www.etext.org/Politics/MIM/agency/prisons

Stop Censorship in Prison: Prisons frequently censor books, newspapers and magazines coming from MIM’s books for prisoners program. We need help from lawyers, paralegals and jailhouse lawyers to fight this censorship.

Books for Prisoners: This program focuses on political education of prisoners. Send donations of books and money for our Books for Prisoners program.

End the Three Strikes laws: This campaign is actively fighting the repressive California laws, but similar laws exist in other states. Write to us to request a petition to collect signatures. Send articles and information on three strike laws.

Shut Down the Control Units: Across the country there are a growing number of prison control units. These are permanently designated prisons or cells in prisons that lock prisoners up in solitary or small group confinement for 22 or more hours a day with no congregate dining, exercise or other services, and virtually no programs for prisoners. Prisoners are placed in control units for extended periods of time. These units cause both mental and physical harm to prisoners.

Write to us to request a petition to collect signatures. Get your organization to sign the statement demanding control units be shut down. Send us information about where there are control units in your state. Include the names of the prisons as well as the number of control unit beds/cells in each prison if that is known. Send us anti-control unit artwork.

MM’s Re-Lease on Life Program: This program provides support for our comrades who have been recently released from the prison system, to help them meet their basic needs and also continue with their revolutionary organizing on the outside. We need funds, housing, and job resources. We also need prisoner’s input on the following survey questions:

1. What are the biggest challenges you face being released from prison?
2. How can these problems be addressed?
3. What are the important elements of a successful release program?
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