

“100 Reasons Why Rashid Needs to STFU About MIM(Prisons)”

original essay by Kevin “Rashid” Johnson

titled “MIM or MLM? Confronting the Divergent Politics of the Petty Bourgeois 'Left' On the Labor Aristocracy and Other Burning Issues in Today's Revolutionary Struggle”

published 27 January 2015

at <http://rashidmod.com/?p=1125>

annotated by MIM(Prisons)

February 2015, updated June 2015

[MIM(Prisons): We encourage people to study the refuted points in depth, and not just trust us on this one. So we have listed suggestions for further reading at the end of this long polemic. Rashid provides great quotes in this essay, and we'd encourage people to study the essays for themselves (in depth and in discussion with others, or us) to gain the broadest understanding possible.

In “MIM or MLM?” Rashid poses as an authority on our organization's line, practice and history, but it should be readily apparent that he does not even have a base understanding of our organization or even of Maoism, as we hope to highlight with our annotations. It is an outrageously unscientific attack, a deceitful and slanderous piece. See for yourself.

Rashid has proven there is no point in responding to him with any depth, so we apologize for the brevity of some of our comments below. We know it's a long piece, and we assure you that it gets even more outrageous the longer it goes on. While we don't want to discourage anyone from understanding the “other side”, we also believe it is a better use of the reader's time to skim this just for proof of its dubiousness, and then go study something that has actual political value, like what's listed in the “further reading” section at the end, or the essays Rashid pulls quotes from. If you want recommended study materials on any of the points made below, just ask. MIM(Prisons) PO Box 40799 San Francisco CA 94140 or mim@prisoncensorship.info If you have a hard time distinguishing between MIM(Prisons) and the NABPP-PC, as many do, then you should study this material until the differences are obvious.

This attack is useful to use this as a teaching moment to go deeper into how to provide scientific leadership. Here we provide by no means an exhaustive outline on how to provide scientific leadership. It is a jumping off point for people studying this polemic, and for Rashid himself. Here are a few basic principles which we found severely lacking in Rashid's polemic:

1. Don't talk about stuff you don't know about. Mao taught us “no investigation, no right to speak.” Talking shit falls into the logical fallacy of “poisoning the well.” Here is an example of how this fallacy plays out.

2. Correctness of ideas must be assessed independent of who says them. Rashid defends his criticism of the labor aristocracy line by accusing MIM(Prisons) comrades of having petty-bourgeois backgrounds. MIM(Prisons) could be Satan, but that doesn't mean there's no labor aristocracy. This approach is a political bullet to the head, and is a fallacy of irrelevance. Here is an example of how a fallacy of irrelevance might play out:

If Adam tells Bob, “Chris is a fascist so do not listen to him”, then Adam has committed the fallacy of poisoning the well; if Bob takes Adam's advice then he is also a victim of the fallacy of poisoning the well. Assuming that Chris is not merely going to tell Bob that he is not a fascist then there is a fallacy because it is irrelevant to the cogency of Chris' argument(s) whether he is or is not a fascist. It is possible to be a fascist and also to have cogent arguments on some arbitrary matter, e.g. Chris may wish to persuade Bob that the Earth is not flat; being a fascist does not preclude the possibility of having a cogent argument that the Earth is not flat.

3. A lot of Rashid's article is baiting for information about MIM(Prisons). Whether intentional or not, this is pig work. We do not give out any information that the pigs could use to assess or destroy our movement. And anonymity isn't just about security, it's also about teaching people to think scientifically rather than follow the persyn with the right skin tone or haircut. We are against identity politics, which are too easily controlled by the oppressor. People who buy into identity politics also defend Obama just because he's Black.

4. Taking a scientific conclusion about a group and then applying it to individuals or small segments of that group is called an “ecological fallacy” and is a basic statistical error. During the Chinese Cultural Revolution, Maoists spent much time combatting this tendency, because people were attacking others based on their family's class background. Sociology as a science allows us to predict things with a certain probability. We can say that the petty bourgeoisie as a class has particular interests, and therefore it is very likely that an individual from that class will defend that interest. But that likelihood is less than 100%.

Our answers below to some of Rashid's baiting are vague, firstly to not give any information that the pigs could use to assess or destroy our movement, and second because most of the questions he asked of us are politically irrelevant. Sorry to anyone who's not satisfied with the details provided here. Since we live in the belly of the beast and we risk complete destruction of our movement at any time, maybe you should adopt a new method for measuring correct political orientation that doesn't center around revealing personal information.

This criticism from Rashid, as baseless as it is, does highlight the urgency of getting our interactive glossary finally available on-line, and sending it to our readers behind bars. It also underlines the importance of sending literature to our subscribers and conducting study groups, whether led by MIM(Prisons) or by USW comrades.

"MIM or MLM?" is based on our writings to/about Rashid's material, but he extrapolates these writings as the entire representation of our line. And as Rashid states, we have worked with him in the past attempting to get him to correct the NABPP-PC's class analysis of the First World.

Yet Rashid does not have easy access to our website, and he's only able to access literature from us that the prison mail room permits him to have. For most of the material which spells out our line, we have no reason to believe Rashid has received or read any of it, which is perhaps an error on our part. Here he criticizes our class definitions, and in criticizing them completely misrepresents them. Our class definitions have been made public on-line and to prisoners with most clarity in the booklet *Fundamental Political Line of the Maoist Internationalist Ministry of Prisons*. This booklet was published in March 2012 and contains all our class definitions spelled out in paragraph form. Additionally, we send a short list of these definitions to all new subscribers. It would be overkill to expect us to provide a full definition each time we use a word, as Rashid seems to require. Our last response to Rashid was written assuming he had access to definitions of our political line, perhaps another error on our part.

In our newsletter *Under Lock & Key*, we publish economic analysis, mostly regarding class relationships in the First World. We are not sure if Rashid receives or reads these newsletters, and his most recent criticism of MIM(Prisons) suggests that he does not. See the "further reading" section at the end of this document for a list of contemporary material that we would recommend to gain a better understanding of the labor aristocracy line. It's unclear to us if Rashid has read any of this contemporary material on the labor aristocracy; whether ours, Ehecatt's, or Cope's. [Update: Rashid has since published a criticism of Zak Cope's book *Divided World Divided Class* on his website. Similar to his critique of MIM(Prisons), he does not actually engage any of the evidence provided by Cope. For those who are interested in some good material on the labor aristocracy question you'd be better off reading the debate that Zak Cope had with labor-aristocracy denier Charles Post.]

In a similar vein, Rashid says MIM(Prisons) has no mass work to speak of. Well, since Rashid thinks the labor aristocracy should be our mass base, and we think they are enemies of the international proletariat, it makes sense that MIM(Prisons) would not engage in what Rashid would consider mass work. Rashid and MIM(Prisons) disagree about what constitutes mass work; that doesn't mean that MIM(Prisons) doesn't do mass work, or that Rashid would have any idea if we are doing mass work or not.

Assuming for a moment that we do agree on a mass base, how would Rashid even know what MIM(Prisons)'s practice is amongst those masses? Rashid doesn't engage in our study groups, doesn't write articles for *ULK*, and doesn't participate in USW campaigns, or any other prisoner-based projects we facilitate. He might not even receive or read our primary organ, *Under Lock & Key*. Rashid claims to criticize our organizing with prisoners as either (a) nonexistent or (b) taking advantage of a vulnerable population. If by "vulnerable" he means "not completely bought off by the spoils of imperialism" and "having a direct material interest in overthrowing imperialism and destroying Amerikkka," then yeah.

Further, for as much as Rashid is out of touch with our prisoner organizing, he is ten times as out of touch with the organizing we do outside of prisons. As a security-conscious organization, we don't publicize where, when, or how much organizing we do outside of prison. Yet Rashid claims to be an expert on our practice, and claims we have none. This sort of baseless shit-talking is another logical fallacy, as it still does not address the labor aristocracy question. Rashid spends much time trying to make us look bad, while avoiding actually having to make sound arguments against our political line.

Much of Rashid's criticism below centers around MIM(Prisons)'s presumed class background as belonging to the petty bourgeoisie. Besides being politically irrelevant, it's also not that exciting of a proposition. Here are some facts which should be no surprise to anyone: MIM(Prisons) operates in the United States. MIM(Prisons) comrades are not in prison. MIM(Prisons) comrades have time to devote to revolutionary study and work. At least some MIM(Prisons) comrades have money to donate to purchasing, publishing and mailing books and newsletters to prisoners for free. At least some MIM(Prisons) comrades are fluent in writing and reading the English language. Considering the vast majority of the U.S. population is petty bourgeois (which includes the labor aristocracy, which Rashid calls the proletariat), it doesn't take a stroke of genius to assume that at least some MIM(Prisons) comrades are likely petty bourgeois.

Class backgrounds certainly play a role in subjective political orientation, and that's where class suicide comes in. Just as we try to encourage members of the lumpen class to abandon their petty-bourgeois tendencies and align themselves (oftentimes against their immediate material interests) with the international proletariat, members of the labor aristocracy, petty bourgeoisie, and bourgeoisie should be encouraged to commit class suicide and work in favor of the international proletariat. And if they have more access to material resources which they can funnel into the movement, even better. In Rashid's studies of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China, we're surprised he didn't also pick up the principle that criticizing an individual based solely on their class background, divorced from their political work, is a textbook error.

The important question is, does our work do more to support the international proletariat, or more to support the First World classes (including the bourgeoisie, petty-bourgeoisie, and labor aristocracy)? Rashid says MIM(Prisons) comrades should commit class suicide; which based on our work to undermine the efforts of the bourgeois classes and sub-classes in the United States, we are already doing.

Rashid cites United Struggle from Within (USW) documents and says they belong to the organizational structure of MIM(Prisons). United Struggle from Within is different than MIM(Prisons). United Struggle from Within is the MIM(Prisons)-led mass organization for prisoners and former prisoners. The vast majority of USW members are prisoner activists who do not necessarily adhere to our six main points (found on page 2 of every recent issue of *ULK*), but who at least do not consciously disagree with any of them. It also includes people who agree with MIM(Prisons)'s six main points but who can't adhere to democratic centralism with MIM(Prisons) due to their condition of confinement. If we could have all our comrades freed from imprisonment and acute surveillance, we would love to have them join us in internal debates! That Rashid equates USW to MIM(Prisons) is just sloppy.

Once someone has worked out their line (like Rashid) to oppose one of our six main points than they cannot be part of the United Struggle from Within (USW), because they are not working within MIM(Prisons) leadership at that point. We do continue to work with them (and often times publish their writings and support campaigns they initiate) as prisoner activists. We still work with many comrades who are not members of USW, who we also do not consider enemies.

In reading this polemic, we have clearly established that Rashid disagrees with three of our six main points: 2. Dictatorship of the proletariat is necessary. 4. A parasitic class dominates the First World countries. and 6. The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China was the furthest advancement toward communism in history (probably the NABPP-PC would agree with this point in theory but not in practice, as evidenced in our notations below).

This document may also be printed in black and white, and you should still be able to read the notations clearly. In Struggle!

“It is inevitable that the bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie will give expression to their own ideologies. It is inevitable that they will stubbornly assert themselves on political and ideological questions by every possible means. You cannot expect them to do otherwise. We should not use the method of suppression and prevent them from expressing themselves, but should allow them to do so and at the same time argue with them and direct appropriate criticism at them. Undoubtedly we must criticize wrong ideas of every description. It certainly would not be right to refrain from criticism, look on while wrong ideas spread unchecked and allow them to dominate the field. Mistakes must be criticized and pernicious weeds fought wherever they crop up.”

- Mao Tse Tung, “On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People”

Introduction

There is a ‘Third Worldist’ line circulating within ‘First World’ Leftist circles. It claims that workers in the U.S. and other developed capitalist countries are not part of the international proletariat. It says the ‘real’ proletariat exists only in the Third World, and that First World workers are a labor aristocracy (LA) and enemies of the ‘real’ proletariat. Among those who promote this line (which we in the New Afrikan Black Panther Party – Prison Chapter call the vulgar labor aristocracy [VLA] line), are some who call themselves Maoists.

We stepped forward during latter 2013 to refute this line in our article, “Answering a Revisionist Line on the Labor Aristocracy”. There we demonstrated that the VLA line represents not a Marxist or proletarian position, but is rather revisionist and originated with the petty bourgeoisie (PB).¹ In response, the Maoist Internationalist Ministry of Prisons (MIMP), which shares the VLA line, published a polemical reply.² We now respond.

Since we were founded in 2005, the NABPP-PC has put forth considerable effort to work in unity with MIMP and its now defunct parent organization, the Maoist internationalist movement (MIM). Our cadre have worked within MIMP/MIM's prisoner study groups and “mass” organizations, we've helped keep them abreast of conditions within the Empire's prisons in support of their work to publicize such conditions, we've published some of their writings in our newsletters and have written for theirs, we've worked to help them fight

censorship of their media, etc. But unity without struggle results only in degeneration, is non-dialectical, and in political work amounts to PB liberalism.

It is therefore incumbent upon us to openly struggle against what we see to be erroneous in MIMP's theory and practice, and the PB framework within which these positions have developed. This is especially necessary because MIMP represents itself as a Maoist revolutionary leadership to many prisoners in Amerika.

While our criticisms here may be particularly sharp on some points, our aim is to build a firmer basis for greater unity with MIMP, by struggling with them to identify and correct positions we see as ideologically and politically divergent from a genuine Maoist line. The same applies to other Leftists who share some or all of MIMP's positions, especially on the LA question. Most of whom are also PB. **[MIM(Prisons): Here Rashid is equating "a genuine Maoist line" to dogmatism.]**

In this response we will not only answer MIMP's polemic, but will critique their claim to represent the Maoist line. We will also address their PB origin and resultant revisionist politics, and tackle related questions of fundamental importance to genuine proletarian revolutionaries, such as who are our real friends and enemies and how we correctly identify them, the determinative role of class and class analysis in correctly resolving these questions and so on.

[MIM(Prisons): We would be curious to read Rashid's position paper on other groups claiming to uphold Maoism in this country.]

There is Only One Revolutionary Class

Karl Marx was the first to scientifically apply political-economy to make a thorough analysis and study of human society and its stages of development. Subsequently, V.I. Lenin and Mao Tse Tung respectively advanced Marx's political-economy, philosophy (Dialectical Materialism) and principles of scientific socialism, which we now call Marxism-Leninism-Maoism (MLM) or simply Maoism.

Through his political-economic analysis Marx in collaboration with Frederick Engels, identified the fundamental component of capitalist production (namely the commodity) and the principal human relationship and class struggle that forms the basis of commodity relations in capitalist society, namely the struggle between the class of productive wage laborers (the proletariat) and the employing capitalist class (the bourgeoisie). As Mao observed, "[b]eginning with the commodity, the simplest element of capitalism, [Marx] made a thorough study of the economic structure of capitalist society. Millions of people saw and handled commodities every day but were so used to them they took no notice. Marx alone studied commodities scientifically."3 And from this study Marx, "went on to reveal the relations among people hidden behind commodities."4

Marx set out these studies in his classic works Capital and Wages, Price and Profit. There we find his identification of the proletariat who must sell their labor power at less than its actual value to the bourgeoisie in order to survive, and the bourgeoisie who in turn sells the commodities produced by the proletariat on the market at their actual value and pockets the surplus as profits to become immensely wealthy.

This inherently exploitative relationship leaves the proletariat producing everything that sustains society while owning little to nothing, whereas the bourgeois produces nothing yet owns the entire productive system and means of production, including productive land, factories, transportation infrastructure, machinery, communication systems, etc.

[MIM(Prisons): We agree with these definitions.]

Marx therefore recognized that the proletariat is the only class whose interests are in diametrical opposition to the bourgeoisie's, and is therefore the only class with nothing to lose and everything to gain by overthrowing the capitalist class and system. In the Communist Manifesto he and Engels therefore metaphorically characterized the proletariat as the only class with "nothing to lose but its chains," and consequently the only genuinely revolutionary class existing under capitalism.

[MIM(Prisons): Mao organized peasants and lumpen to overthrow Japanese imperialism.]

He established that a higher and more perfect productive system would come after capitalism, namely communism, which would eliminate class divisions and exploitative human relations. He demonstrated that this was bound to come to pass because all previous phases of human social-historical and technological development prepared the basis for it.

Communism would come about through political-economic revolutions where the proletariat overthrew the bourgeoisie, destroying its old state system and creating in its place proletarian states through which the workers in alliance with other previously oppressed sectors would exercise its own class dictatorship over the bourgeoisie in all spheres – ideological, economic, political, military and cultural. This process would advance societies through "the abolition of class distinctions generally, to the abolition of all the relations of production on which they rest, to the abolition of all social relations that correspond to these relations of production, to the revolutionizing of all the ideas that result from these social relations."5

With the exception of the short lived Paris Commune of 1871, it wasn't until after Marx and Engels' lifetimes that the proletariat began seizing state power and transforming society as they'd predicted. This was during the stage where capitalism developed in several advanced capitalist countries into its final and highest stage, namely imperialism. In his pamphlet, "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism," Lenin thoroughly studied and described this development. He went on to prove in his polemical struggles against various Marxist revisionists that imperialism did not change the basic class contradictions of capitalism nor Marx's basic theory of political economy, but only raised them to a higher level. He also showed that the rise of imperialism marked the dawn of the proletarian revolutions that Marx had foretold. It was with these understandings that Lenin was himself able to lead the Russian proletariat in making the first successful proletarian revolution just as Marx had predicted.

Although imperialism has not changed capitalism's fundamental contradictions, we have seen a steady change in its tactics and the consequent conditions of crisis, chaos and human suffering it has unleashed across the world in its constant ruthless drive for profits and in its continuous life and death struggle to maintain world hegemony over the proletariat and other oppressed sectors.

Having established in Marxist terms that the proletariat is the only revolutionary class under capitalism, we now turn to the PB or literally the 'little bourgeoisie'. As our quote from Mao at the top of this paper makes plain, **the PB is not a revolutionary class**, does not present a revolutionary ideological or political line, and we must not allow their pretensions to go unchallenged.

[MIM(Prisons): What is the context here? Petty bourgeoisie can be revolutionary in transition from feudalism to bourgeois democracy, as in China during the time Mao was discussing in the essay quoted above.]

The PB is an intermediary class that lies between the capitalist ruling class (the 'big' bourgeoisie) and the proletariat. As such it tends to muddle and vacillate between the opposing class interests and values of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. As Marx described it, "the petite bourgeois ... is a transition class, in which the interests of two classes are simultaneously mutually blunting."6 Hence they are literally the 'middle class'.

As noted above, our earlier article refuting the VLA line pointed out its PB origins. In their polemical reply MIMP stated they felt our article was directed at them among others. **A clear admission of their PB identity(1)**, on top of the fact that they never denied being a PB group. And why? Because they can't. In fact by their own class analysis of Amerika, **they admit themselves and by extension, their views and ideology to be firmly PB(2)**. This is why while they endlessly disparage First World workers as an overall counter-revolutionary class, they never apply a critical class analysis to themselves. And they've always placed the highest premium on hiding their identities from even their own followers, a point we'll return to.

[MIM(Prisons): 1. We don't understand this logic. 2. Anti-Maoist line on relationship between class and ideology. We must disagree on the lessons from the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and its historical significance.]

But as we've made clear and is the very basis of our critique of the VLA line, we in the NABPP-PC completely reject MIMP's class analysis as anti-Marxist. Yet even **when a genuinely Marxist analysis is applied to MIMP they still prove to be PB**. So, however one looks at it MIMP lacks the class identity and consciousness to proclaim itself and its positions to be revolutionary. And this, as we will thoroughly demonstrate, is why they produce all manner of revisionist and anti-Maoist positions, including the VLA line.

[MIM(Prisons): Really? What's the "Marxist analysis"? All we see here is speculation and baiting.]

And so, our readers can be the judge, we will refute MIMP's positions and claims to Maoist practice using none other than the founders of MLM, namely Marx, Engels, Lenin and Mao, as well as Joseph Stalin, whom they also claim to uphold and cite as an authority for positions they take. This will allow their imprisoned students **who haven't had the means to broadly study and contrast the voluminous works of these Marxists with the MIM line**, to determine who indeed are the "revisionists" of MLM.

[MIM(Prisons): Neither has Rashid done this. And we encourage people to get free books and study materials from us, rather than just trust Rashid's (or anyone's) cult of persynality. Our comrades in prison are quite well-read in the classics and use them in developing their theory.]

What Class is MIMP Reppin'?

MIMP opened their polemic against us with the observation – correct in this instance – that it is a first priority that Communists (which in Marxist terms means advanced class-conscious proletarians) correctly distinguish between real friends and enemies. Failure to do this and relate to people accordingly can only result in our pushing allies into the enemy's arms and ourselves embracing poisonous vipers.

[MIM(Prisons): Above Rashid equates communists and proletarians. Nope. And Rashid is not a proletarian anyway, so by his own logic, why should anyone listen to him, since he doesn't belong to the "only" revolutionary class? Rashid is removed from the means of production, making him in the lumpen class. To clarify, MIM(Prisons) finds the lumpen to be a potentially revolutionary force in the United States.]

Mao taught us that the Communist method of distinguishing between real friends and enemies is by **analyzing their class origin(1)**, stand and practice.7 This because, as he observed, "[i]n class society everyone lives as a member of a particular class, and every kind of

thinking, without exception, is stamped with a brand of class.”⁸ Meaning that everyone, based upon their social-economic conditioning, sees things differently and live, think and act according to their own class values, interests, influences and aspirations(2). This reality is based firmly in what Marx described as the “guiding principles” of his studies.

[MIM(Prisons): 1. No, Mao did not teach this. This was the line the Maoists opposed during the GPCR. 2. This is typically true of a persyn or group prior to developing class consciousness, but not necessarily so after developing it. That's why students and intellectuals were encouraged to work in the countryside in China, and how classes who are not proletarian (i.e. peasantry, petty-bourgeois intellectuals/students, lumpen) can be significant revolutionary forces. This is basic history.]

“In the social production of their existence [people] enter into definite, necessary relations, which are independent of their will, namely relations of production corresponding to a determinate stage of development of their material forces of production. The totality of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation on which there correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the social, political and intellectual life-process in general. It is not the consciousness of [people] that determines their being, but on the contrary it is the social being that determines their consciousness.”⁹

[MIM(Prisons): Class origin is independent of someone's will. But political work is under their control. Of course political orientation is affected by one's class origin, which is why we uphold the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and criticism/self-criticism as methods of combating bourgeois indoctrination. We posit, which is worse, the self-aware petty-bourgeoisie, or the petty-bourgeoisie who thinks they're proletarian? Rashid is also not talking about an entire class, he is criticizing a relatively small organization.]

So when we hear anyone – including MIMP – claiming to give revolutionary leadership, we must look closely at their class origin and orientation. Otherwise, as Lenin warned, we set ourselves up to be misled. “People”, he said, “always were and always will be the foolish victims of deception and self-deception in politics until they learn to discover the interests of some class behind all moral, religious, political and social phrases, declarations and promises....”¹⁰

[MIM(Prisons): Did Lenin not talk about the role of intellectuals in building the party? Here Rashid fails to comment on the class origin of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Mao. When we talk about distinguishing friends from enemies we are talking about analyzing groups, not focusing on individuals.]

Like Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, Mao maintained that the role of revolutionary leadership lies exclusively with the proletariat. Mao noted, “anything that is truly of the masses must necessarily be led by the proletariat,” and “we must necessarily take the class stand of the proletariat and not that of the petty bourgeoisie.”¹¹ Lenin similarly cautioned, “even the most revolutionary petty bourgeoisie cannot want what the class conscious proletariat does want....”(1)¹² He added, it is “that petty bourgeois diffusiveness and instability, that incapacity for sustained effort, unity, and organized action, which if encouraged, must inevitably destroy any proletarian revolutionary movement.”(2) Because “through their ordinary everyday, imperceptible, elusive and demoralizing activities, they produce the very results which the bourgeoisie need....”¹³

[MIM(Prisons): We agree with the point above, and we call out the NABPP-PC as having a petty-bourgeois class stand. 1. This is precisely why we don't encourage petty-bourgeois individuals to go to the Third World to live amongst the proletariat, as Rashid implicitly suggests MIM(Prisons) should do. 2. This is precisely why we don't focus our organizing work on the petty bourgeoisie (who Rashid insists are proletarian), although if we had resources to do so we certainly would attempt to work with them.]

Lenin's words have proven almost prophetic in the constant subversion and derailment of the proletarian movements in First World countries by PB 'left' groups and individuals and their revisionist politics, which includes those embracing the MIM line.

So it is abundantly clear that the genuinely MLM line holds that the PB is per se not a revolutionary class nor suited to give revolutionary leadership. Rather this role lies only with the revolutionary proletariat, who must avoid becoming tainted by the PB atmosphere which “permeates and corrupts the proletariat and constantly causes among the proletariat relapses into petty bourgeois spinelessness, disunity, individualism, and alternating moods of exaltation and dejection.”¹⁴

[MIM(Prisons): As a class, of course.]

Which brings us again to MIMP's class character, which, if it is indeed PB, means its claims to give authentic revolutionary leadership are, in Lenin's words, pure deception.

As we've already pointed out, by their own class analysis of Amerika MIMP classifies itself as PB.(1) Indeed their essential argument against us is that there is no proletariat in Amerika (which is where MIMP is based), but only a homogeneous LA which they say “form a new petty bourgeoisie.”(2)¹⁵ The only other class and sub-class they recognize as existent in the First World countries are the bourgeoisie and what they call the “First World lumpen”.

[MIM(Prisons): 1. Or lumpen, or bourgeoisie, or big imperialist capitalists (gasp!), or labor aristocracy, or semi-proletariat... how does our class analysis classify MIM(Prisons) as petty bourgeois? It doesn't take a detective to posit that MIM(Prisons) comrades likely have petty-bourgeois class backgrounds, but that doesn't mean that it's true, and either way it doesn't matter. 2.

MIM(Prisons) is based in the United States, not Amerika (Rashid does not seem to understand the difference). We do not say Amerika is a homogeneous labor aristocracy, but that the documented wage-earning workers in the United States could vastly be considered labor aristocracy. At a group level, this would be a fair classification. See *Fundamental Political Line of MIM(Prisons)* for more depth.]

MIMP maintains the position that there is **no First World proletariat as one of their “cardinal points” and declares anyone who even “consciously disagrees” with it their enemy.(1)**16 Which is problematic and anti-Maoist on several points. First it demonstrates that MIMP determines friends and enemies not by class but rather by one’s willingness to blindly and uncritically accept whatever they say. And not only must one not speak out in disagreement, they must not even disagree in conscious thought. Even the liberal bourgeois doesn’t take thought policing this far! The U.S. constitution is even interpreted by its bourgeois courts to protect one from **punishment for their beliefs(2)**. We need only go as far as the quote at the beginning of this article to see that Maoists don’t repress contrary views, not even those of actual enemies and reactionaries(3). But MIMP opened their polemic contending that they **“cannot forgive”(3)** us for daring to disagree with their class analysis of Amerika and VLA line. But let’s look at the PB.

[MIM(Prisons): 1. No, this is a lie. See the note number 16, and please tell us where is the word “enemy.” Rashid is looking at the criteria to join the United Struggle from Within, and extrapolating that to who we consider enemies. 2. Whoa, MIM(Prisons) is PUNISHING people for their beliefs? That's amazing! Maybe instead of punishing prisoners we should start punishing the mailroom staff who censor our materials for being “gang related.” Or maybe we should start punishing the cops who shoot oppressed nation people dead in the streets. To say we have the power to punish anyone is ridiculous. This is liberal anti-communist propaganda. 3. Did we hurt your feelings? What is the punishment we are exacting on you?]

The PB or middle class consists of educators, doctors, intellectuals, lawyers, small business owners, middle and lower management and so on. Essentially those professionals who live by mental labor and individual achievement rather than working as collective manual laborers and in the service trades and industries. What distinguishes them from the proletariat is their mental as opposed to manual labor, and their lack of ownership of the means of production distinguishes them from the big bourgeoisie. But what they have in common with the proletariat is their **being compelled to sell their labor power for a wage to survive**, and they have reliance on individual achievement and specializing in mental labor in common with the big bourgeoisie. Hence, based on their social-economic practice their thinking and practice fluctuates between and muddles the mutually contradictory interests of the proletariat on the one hand and the bourgeoisie on the other.

[MIM(Prisons): Not the case if you own a business, like many people in the petty bourgeoisie do. Traditional petty bourgeoisie don't sell their labor power.]

This conditioning generates in the PB an outlook that is inconsistent, individualistic, idealistic, opportunistic, disparaging of manual labor, and a tendency to elevate intellectual work (and the role of ideas) above manual work (and the role of practice). This is why even among the ‘radical’ PB we see a tendency toward intellectualizing and endlessly theorizing political struggle as opposed to bringing it down to the level of solving problems through practical application and joining the ranks of the manual laborers.

MIMP’s members fall firmly in the class of PB intellectuals and blatantly exhibit PB prejudices.(1) They also prove absolutely **unwilling to and incapable of solving real world problems in their approach to political ‘work’.** They excel at talking shit(2) but fail miserably at practice. And their approach to political organizing is distinctly PB and anti-Maoist. Rather than practice the Maoist Mass Line they operate within a small closed circle intellectual-oriented clique that is divorced from playing an active role in any proletarian struggle, and indeed remains alienated, aloof and self-isolated from the broad masses. Whereas, conversely every revolutionary Marxist – with examples set by **Marx, Lenin and Mao – lived amongst and based their political work and organizations firmly within the broad masses of proletarian and poor non-proletarian workers. And all at great personal sacrifice and danger.(3)**

[MIM(Prisons): 1. What is this accusation based on? 2. Are you going to explain this? In this essay we were unable to find a criticism of our actual practice. This essay is the definition of talking shit. 3. So if using our own class definitions, Rashid would like us to live in prison, or to move to migrant laborer shanty towns? But how Rashid misunderstands our class definitions, he is actually here saying that we should move to the Third World to organize the proletariat there. Even if that were our class analysis (which it isn't), we'd recommend *False Nationalism, False Internationalism* by Tani and Sera for more on First World chauvinism in Third World liberation movements.]

Once we recognize MIMP’s PB character, their embracing the VLA line becomes an obvious expression of their class tendency to generate division within the ranks of the proletariat, and to avoid practicing the Mass Line and integrating with the proletariat by claiming there is no proletariat in Amerika where they live to do mass work amongst. Furthermore, they demonstrate that **“spinelessness” that Lenin observed(1)** is typical of the PB in their admitted terror of government repression **if they ever tried to do mass work(2)**, citing the experiences of the Black Panther Party (BPP).

[MIM(Prisons): 1. Lenin did not use his real name, wore disguises, and hid in exile for years. 2. Rashid really considers NONE of our public work to be mass work? Well, he also doesn't know the contents of our public work, so what's the point of asking what he thinks about it.]

Contrary to these PB excuses, we have demonstrated in our prior article and will further show herein that a sizable proletariat does exist in Amerika, and while the BPP did in fact suffer extensive government repression they persevered; and Lenin, Mao and their comrades led successful revolutions in the teeth of repression vastly worse than the BPP experience.

Apart from their mass style, what set Lenin's and Mao's Parties apart from MIMP and similar 'Leftist' groups was first their proletarian class stand and loyalty, and secondly their tactical ingenuity, fearless audacity and flexibility. Although the BPP was audacious and had a mass style, which is largely what sustained it despite constant official attack, it left much to be desired in these other areas.

And unlike MIMP, Lenin and Mao recognized the indispensable role and need of the vanguard revolutionary Party(1) to politically awaken, unite and organize the proletariat and other oppressed sectors. They didn't pretend as MIMP does that the masses could accomplish this on their own, and upon their failure to do so and falling under sway of bourgeois influence, **denounce them as an unredeemable and bourgeoisified LA(2)**. Nor did they look for excuses nor cite fear of repression to justify sitting on their hands in trepidation.

[MIM(Prisons): 1. This is a lie about our line. We are clear on the need for a vanguard party. It's a straw man argument; no one in MIM or MIM(Prisons) said we don't need a vanguard party. 2. Another misrepresentation of our line. We do not think the labor aristocracy (who Rashid calls the proletariat) will accomplish the overthrow of capitalism on their own, although this is more likely to manifest in oppressed nation labor aristocracy than the Amerikan labor aristocracy. We do not denounce the labor aristocracy as unredeemable, but their present material interests definitely are not conducive to building for socialist revolution.]

They knew the masses couldn't make revolution alone, and if left to their own spontaneous activism would pursue nothing more than economic and such like trade union benefits, and be misled and corrupted by bourgeois and PB misdirection. Just as U.S. workers have done in their decades-long absence of a mass-based revolutionary Communist Party. This was the entire purpose behind Lenin's struggle to develop the revolutionary Party to lead the proletarian revolution. As he observed, "[without] a party of iron that has been tempered in the struggle, a party enjoying the confidence of all honest people in the class in question, a party capable of watching and influencing the mood of the masses, such a struggle cannot be waged successfully."17 Likewise, Mao stated:

"If there is to be a revolution, there must be a revolutionary party, without a revolutionary party, without a party built on the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary theory and the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary style, it is impossible to lead the working class and the broad masses in defeating imperialism and its running dogs."18

Yet MIMP turns things on their head, blaming instead US workers for lack of revolutionary consciousness and struggle, while proclaiming itself to be a revolutionary leadership, that is a revolutionary vanguard which explains the lack of any revolutionary movement in Amerika. As Mao often pointed out, "when revolution fails it is the fault of the vanguard," not the masses.

[MIM(Prisons): What revolution has MIM or MIM(Prisons) led that failed? And who are the masses that Rashid is pointing to, who we have failed? All this misses the point that we have analyzed the workers in this country and those who are citizens clearly fall in the petty bourgeoisie. It's not about whether or not they have led themselves successfully in revolution. We don't cite their failure to organize as the evidence of their petty-bourgeois status.]

Furthermore, Lenin said **those who flee the real revolutionary movement for fear of repression** are to be pitied and counseled, but as for those who try to blame the workers and portray their flight as politically principled, he denounced them as "apostates" and "disgusting renegades," stating "[t]hese runaways then becomes the worst advisors for the working class movement and therefore its dangerous enemies."19

[MIM(Prisons): Another straw man argument; we don't tell people to flee political work, and in fact we do everything within our power to struggle with solid comrades in an effort to keep them from succumbing to our society's bourgeois pressures.]

And while MIMP is fond of calling anyone who disagrees with them 'revisionists', every serious student of Lenin knows it was against PB "revisionists" who distorted Marxism that he and Marx before him, waged most of their polemical struggles. This was because once they had soundly discredited the openly bourgeois theories and their proponents (bourgeois and PB alike), these elements had to resort to the sneakier tactic of trying to revise Marxism from within **to conform to their own class interests**. This is why they were called "revisionists". Even in Lenin's day the struggle against revisionism was of long duration. As he pointed out, "the second half-century of the existence of Marxism began (in the [1890s]) with the struggle of a trend hostile to Marxism within Marxism itself."20 He also observed that a first and key Marxist principle the revisionists try to revise is scientific political economy, which as we showed in our previous article and will further demonstrate below, is exactly what MIMP has tried to do.

[MIM(Prisons): Based on different class analyses (if Rashid's class definitions can be called an analysis). Rashid sees us as dividing the proletariat (what we would call in the United States the petty bourgeoisie and their sub-classes) to undermine the international proletarian struggle. We would say Rashid is lumpen (a vacillating class) and he's partnering up with the petty bourgeoisie and labor aristocracy to undermine the Third World proletarian struggle (for a larger portion of the imperialist pie – which can be the only result of organizing the labor aristocracy around their own material class interests).]

Mao likewise struggled ceaselessly against PB revisionists, characterizing them as those who “wave the red flag in order to attack the red flag”, and declared theirs as a most dangerous tendency which Marxists must unceasingly combat.

[MIM(Prisons): Yes, and petty-bourgeois revisionists try to claim that the petty-bourgeoisie is actually the proletariat.]

Consider now MIMP’s revision of Marxist political economy with their totally invented class definitions using abstract metaphors like people who wear “rags”(1) (which is how they define what they call “First World Lumpen”(2)), and “those who have nothing to lose but their chains”(3) (which is how they define the proletariat).²¹ They actually had to resort to such metaphors(4) because the instant Amerikan classes are analyzed using Marxist political economy, everything MIMP professes politically collapses like a house of cards in a windstorm.

[MIM(Prisons): 1. “Rags” is a translation of “lumpen,” not our definition of the class. We only mentioned this in our last polemic to Rashid because he claims “lumpen” means “broken” and then uses this mistranslation to try to prove a connection between the First World lumpen and the proletariat. 2. To the best of our knowledge, Rashid has never received material which contains our class definitions. We don't even know if he has received MIM's base literature on the labor aristocracy, *MIM Theory 1: A White Proletariat?*, *MIM Theory 10: Labor Aristocracy*, or our booklet released in 2012, *Fundamental Political Line of the Maoist Internationalist Movement*. 3. This metaphor is from the *Communist Manifesto*, which Rashid quoted above. 4. We had to resort to metaphors in our last polemic to Rashid because he was not understanding or accepting our data or material analysis. He is criticizing us as anti-scientific in our definitions but not addressing the copious evidence we have produced.]

Indeed, that they defined objective conditions or things with abstract metaphors is per se contrary to Marxism. Mao explained:

“We are Marxists and Marxism teaches that in our approach to a problem we should start from objective facts, not from abstract definitions, and that we should derive our guiding principles, policies and measures from an analysis of these facts.”²²

[MIM(Prisons): Yeah... our definitions are not abstract, you've just never bothered to read them. They are based on what someone is paid versus the value of their labor, and they are constructed using numbers.]

This is why Marx made a thorough and scientific study of core objective productive relations in order to identify and define classes, and didn’t base that determination on abstract and arbitrary metaphors like “chains” and “rags”.

[MIM(Prisons): This criticism is obviously only responding to our one public letter directed at Rashid. How can he then be an authority on our line? We'd recommend *Imperialism and its Class Structure in 1997* for more on our study of objective productive relations.]

Lenin identified as one of the main “tendencies of petty-bourgeois revolutionism” against which his Bolsheviks waged “ruthless struggle” was the anti-Marxist tendency that, like MIMP, “refused (or, it might be more correct to say: was unable) to understand the need for a strictly objective appraisal of the class forces and their alignment, before taking any political action.”²³

But what’s most problematic with the MIM/MIMP’s use of abstract metaphors to define class, is this is something they opportunistically invented as a result of their inability to prevail in past debates with us where we took on their VLA line. Here is what happened.

In 2006 MIM opened a dialogue with NABPP-PC following their reading an issue of our Right On! Newsletter where we made reference to the U.S. proletariat. Of course they argued that the U.S. has no proletariat. In a letter dated February 26, 2006, MIM wrote to us: “A proletarian is a wage earner who is getting paid less than the value of their labor.” Our readers should note that this was a genuinely Marxist economic-based definition of the proletariat, not the metaphor they later adopted(1). MIM went on to say, “I challenge you to show” that workers in Amerika (New Afrikan workers in particular) “are paid less than the value of their labor or in other words that they produce surplus value.” This is exactly what we showed in our prior article.²⁴⁽²⁾ So as a result MIMP abandoned the Marxist definition of the proletariat and said they now “prefer” to use an abstract metaphor of those in “chains” to describe the proletariat.

[MIM(Prisons): 1. Are you serious? Breaking something down into simpler terms is not the same as adopting a metaphor as the entirety of our class analysis. 2. The NABPP-PC has not demonstrated their point or shown this point. In the prior article, they used made up numbers. Here is Rashid's circular logic broken down: Rashid wants a class analysis from us, and claims we have none. Does not read or study our class analysis that is published. When has access to portions of it, doesn't understand it, refutes with made-up numbers. When we dumb it down, Rashid says we changed our line and class definitions, and then asks us again for a class analysis. If Rashid were being scientific he would have studied the numerous journals and books that are the basis of our line on the labor aristocracy before attempting to critique it.]

Furthermore, MIM also recognized a U.S. lumpen proletariat, conceding as much in several letters to us, including on April 28, 2006, where they wrote, “Huey [P. Newton] spoke of the growing lumpen proletariat in the US that will be the force for revolution in this country. We are friendly to this line.” In turn we pointed out that lumpen simply means “broken” proletariat. To be broken means this strata had to first belong to an actual “whole”-proletariat. A point we also made in our prior article. It was with this that MIMP opportunistically abandoned recognizing a “lumpen proletariat” and invented the abstract term “First World Lumpen”. In fact, they admit

this in their polemic, stating, “ We completely agree with Rashid’s logic here. And that’s why MIM (Prisons) started using the term ‘First World Lumpen’ to distinguish from ‘lumpenproletariat’.”

[MIM(Prisons): How is this abstract? We define classes as they relate to the means of production and distribution.]

So we see that when their line is shown to run afoul of genuine Marxism, MIMP will abandon the Marxist line and invent abstract concepts to justify holding on to erroneous positions. This is pure PB opportunism.

So MIMP’s social-economic status, objective practice (or lack thereof), and class analysis all run counter to the revolutionary proletarian line of Maoism, and reflect the PB “revisionism” that Marx, Lenin and Mao fought against. And that MIMP calls itself MLM despite their stark deviations from this line in no way contradicts their revisionism. It actually comports with it. As Lenin recognized, “[t]he victory of Marxism in the realm of theory forces its enemy to pose as Marxist. This is historical dialectics.”

Remolding the PB

Before MIMP, MIM and its cadre also **refused to base their cadre and to do political work among the masses.(1)** Instead of practicing the mass line they **hid out on college campuses(2)** (**amidst the nascent intellectuals(3)**), and now, upon MIM’s demise, MIMP is a small cell that focuses on prisoners.

[MIM(Prisons): 1. Not sure what you're talking about. 2. Who did MIM hide from? It's easy to talk shit about a communist organization from an isolation cell. The pigs must love it. 3. Not sure if this is supposed to be a criticism, as many revolutionary movements have originated with intellectuals and in universities. Especially in the context of living in an exploiter country, it takes an intellectual (class conscious) understanding of communism to overcome the pressure of one's own material interests.]

MIMP admits choosing prisoners because they prove most receptive to its ‘leadership’ which in essence means MIMP has latched onto a particularly **vulnerable and desperate social group(1)**, an isolated group whose severely miserable predicament leaves them **desperate(2)** for any sympathetic ear and tending to be less critical of those who present themselves as sympathetic. Also **prisoners generally lack political awareness and training and access to the voluminous Marxist and relevant works. So they are least suited to critically challenge MIMP’s Maoist representations.(3)**

[MIM(Prisons): 1. Patronizing. 2. Desperate for change. How is the proletariat better than this? 3. We distribute these materials for free to any prisoner in the United States who is genuinely interested. Our work-trade standards are just to help us determine who will make the best use of these resources, so we aren't sending them to people who will just throw them in the trash. Send us work (art, article, organizing report, etc) and engage with us and we'll send you plenty of free study materials with no strings attached. So to say we try to keep prisoners in the dark so that they can't criticize us is just bullshit.]

Furthermore that MIMP is based in society while prisoners are confined (and MIMP refuses to allow prisoners to join its group), provides MIMP the perfect excuse for not physically basing itself amongst its targeted base. They can therefore always **avoid the direct challenges and dangers of actually participating in the day to day struggles of that base** as the Maoist Mass Line demands of revolutionary leadership. This is why we in the NABPP-PC live and **struggle right alongside those we aspire to lead**, and lead not by preaching but rather by example.

[MIM(Prisons): Again this is based in different class definitions. The NABPP-PC doesn't even live amongst the “proletariat” that they hope to lead; they live amongst the lumpen. We rely on our prisoner correspondents to tell us what is going on in prisons, which we consolidate into mass line and test out in practice via our campaigns and organ (Under Lock & Key) – a.k.a. doing mass work! Rashid, do you oppose people outside of prison working with prisoners?]

MIMP obviously recognizes that prisoners are one of the only sectors that they can easily convince that their teachings are genuinely Maoist. **In fact no other Maoist group or movement (especially in the Third World where MIMP says the proletariat is located) takes the MIM line seriously.(1)** This is why MIM/MIMP has always **disparaged every modern Maoist leader and group as revisionist(2)** – that is every one of them except MIM and MIMP and their offshoots.

[MIM(Prisons): 1. Interesting “fact,” could we get a citation for this, or recommended further reading? 2. Lie. This whole paragraph is factually untrue misinformation.]

Also Mao specifically denounced MIMP’s PB form of political organization as “closed doorism” and “sectarian”. He said as to Communist groups, “we are not a small opinionated sect and must learn to open our doors and cooperate democratically with non-Party people, and how to consult with others.”²⁵ In this talk he rejected Communists organizing in “small sects or cliques” typical of PB groups like MIMP.

[MIM(Prisons): What do we do that is sectarian? We have dividing line questions and we build united fronts with many who do not agree with us on those questions. But political organizations must have clear political line. Lenin said better fewer but better.]

But there is hope for MIMP. However that hope lies in doing exactly what they have not done, refuse to do, and admittedly fear. That being to remold their class consciousness from that of the PB to the proletariat by **integrating themselves with the masses and taking up**

their struggles and lifestyle as its own. Mao explained this difficult process of committing “class suicide,” which he underwent himself: **[MIM(Prisons): We already live amongst the people Rashid calls the proletariat, so we do not follow this logic.]**

“If you want the masses to understand you, if you want to be one with the masses, you must make up your mind to undergo a long and even painful process of tempering. Here I might mention the experience of how my own feelings changed. I began life as a student and at school acquired the ways of a student. I then used to feel it undignified to do even a little manual labor.... At that time I felt that intellectuals were the only clean people in the world, while in comparison workers and peasants were dirty. I did not mind wearing the clothes of other intellectuals, believing them clean, but I would not put on clothes belonging to a worker or peasant, believing them dirty. But after I became a revolutionary and lived with workers and peasants and soldiers of the revolutionary army, I gradually came to know them well, and they gradually came to know me well too. It was then, and only then, that I fundamentally changed the bourgeois and petty bourgeois feelings implanted in me in the bourgeois schools. I came to feel that compared with the workers and peasants the unremoulded intellectuals were not clean and that, in the last analysis, the workers and peasants were the cleanest people and, even though their hands were soiled and their feet smeared with cow-dung, they were really cleaner than the bourgeois and petty bourgeois intellectuals. That is what is meant by a change in feelings, a change from one class to another.”²⁶

[MIM(Prisons): Sadly most of our masses are locked in state housing (i.e. prisons!) and isolation cells. As for the lumpen outside of prison, how does Rashid know our relationship to that class, whether we belong to it or not, whether we “live amongst” it or not? If the state didn't lock up the lumpen in prisons and isolation cells, we would love that. How would we still be useful as a political organization providing leadership, resources and materials, if we were locked up in prison? Obviously a revolutionary political organization should not volunteer to go to prison....?]

Lenin likewise recognized that the PB “can (and must) be transformed and re-educated only by means of very prolonged, slow and cautious organizational work.”²⁷

MIMP clearly has not undergone any such remolding process. First, because it refuses to base itself amongst US workers whom it declares to be entirely non-proletarian. Second, because they don’t live in the Third World where they claim the only real proletariat exists, and in their polemic they make clear that they have no intention of moving there either.

[MIM(Prisons): What is Rashid's analysis of the lumpen class's role in revolution?]

So overall it is no mystery why MIMP admittedly lacks the resources to do any really revolutionary work, and functions as nothing more than a tiny sectarian “prison focused cell”.²⁸ And this despite that its members have had decades of prior experience and failure of the same sort under MIM. Again, it is due to their PB line and practice which shuns the masses and the genuinely Maoist proletarian Mass Line. With Maoists, proof is in the product. As Mao explained and demonstrated: “[t]he correctness or incorrectness of the political and ideological line determine everything. With the correct line the party will gain everything; even if one has not a single soldier at first, there will be soldiers; if one has no guns, there will be guns; and even if there is no political power, political power will be gained. With an incorrect line everything will be lost.” Hello MIM?

[MIM(Prisons): We're curious what is the product that the NABPP-PC has produced? They have political power, guns, and soldiers?]

In “Mastering Bolshevism” (March 3, 1937) Stalin made a similar observation, especially concerning the strength of a revolutionary Party lying in its remaining based in the working masses and its willingness to listen to their criticisms. He sounds to speak as if directly to the MIM line.

“In order to guide correctly, the experience of the leaders must be supplemented by the experience of the party masses, by the experience of the working class, by the experience of the toilers, by the experience of the so-called ‘small people’.

“And when is this possible?

“It is possible only if the leaders are closely connected with the masses, if they are bound up with the Party masses, with the working class, with the peasantry, with the working intellectuals.

“Contacts with the masses, the strengthening of these contacts, readiness to listen to the voices of the masses – in this lie the strength and impregnability of Bolshevik leadership.

“It may be taken as a rule that so long as Bolsheviks keep contacts with the broad masses of the people, they will be invincible. And, contrariwise it is sufficient for Bolsheviks to break away from the masses and lose contact with them, to become covered with bureaucratic rust, for them to lose all their strength and become converted into nonentities.

“In the system of mythology of the ancient Greeks there was one famous hero, Antaeus, who, as mythology declares, was the son of Poseidon, the god of the sea, and Gaea, the goddess of the Earth. He was particularly attached to his mother, who bore him, fed him and brought him up so that there was no hero whom this Antaeus did not vanquish. He was considered to be an invincible hero. Wherein lay his strength? It lay in the fact that every time he was hard-pushed in a struggle with an opponent, he touched the earth, his mother, who had borne him and fed him, and thus regained new strength.

“But nevertheless, he had a weak spot – the danger of being separated in some way from the earth. His enemies took account of this weakness of his and waited for him. And an enemy was found who took advantage of this weakness and vanquished him. This was Hercules. But how did Hercules defeat him? He tore him from the earth, raised him in the air, deprived him of the possibility of touching the earth, and thus throttled him in the air.

“I think that Bolsheviks remind us of Antaeus, the hero of Greek mythology. Like Antaeus, they are strong in keeping contact with their mother, with the masses, who bore them, fed them, and educated them. And as long as they keep contact with their mother, with the people, they have every chance of remaining invincible.

“This is the key to the invincibility of Bolshevik leadership.”

Contrary to Stalin’s admonition, MIMP neither has its feet planted within the masses, nor is it willing to “listen to the voices” of its followers, or anyone else for that matter. A point we should look at closer, from a Maoist standpoint.

[MIM(Prisons): What is the evidence that we don't listen to our followers? We definitely don't listen to the enemy class, as that is not the masses. We don't aim to organize the labor aristocracy but we are in very close contact with lumpen masses. The only “evidence” Rashid presents in this essay to prove that we don't listen to the lumpen are (a) that we don't accept his “class analysis” of classes in the United States, and (b) that we removed someone from our study group because they had clear dividing line differences with us that were not going to change, see below. These are two people we tried to struggle with at length and determined to have dividing line differences with us. We continue to struggle with the lines represented by these two entities (Rashid and Ruin) continuously in the pages of *Under Lock & Key*, which is more efficient than one-on-one struggle, especially in this case. And they are more than welcome to keep writing to us and keep receiving *ULK* for free forever. But no, we're not likely going to renege on our six main points which define our organization.]

Maoists Embrace Criticism, MIMP Doesn't

As already noted, to even “consciously disagree” with MIMP means being declared an enemy by them. Such intolerance of being criticized is one of MIMP’s most telling PB characteristics, and a tendency that Mao rebuked so often and in so many ways, we could compile a book of his writings on this subject alone.

[MIM(Prisons): Lie about our line. To consciously disagree with any of our six main points will bar someone from admission into MIM(Prisons) or United Struggle from Within, but we do not consider these people enemies, and we continue to work with them on campaigns, as we would with Rashid.]

And to show the consistency of MIMP’s aversion to being disputed, let’s take a few more documented examples, because they’re certain to argue that they actually invite criticism.

[MIM(Prisons): We've actually publicly published self-criticisms. Have you? See further reading.]

In addition to their statement that they “cannot forgive” us for disputing their VLA line, in reply to a subsequent letter from us MIMP contended that they wouldn’t have criticized us in their polemic if we hadn’t written our critical article first.²⁹

[MIM(Prisons): What's your point? How does this “prove” that we don't welcome criticism? No, we can't forgive (let it slide) your bad political line just because you're famous. That would be liberalism. We can't forgive you because you have dogmatically held onto this line for nearly a decade without any serious refutation. NABPP-PC and Rashid will always have this history attributed to their political legacy.]

That such a position is blatantly anti-Maoist and smacks of PB liberalism is made clear by Mao’s article “Combat Liberalism”. There he pointed out that Communists have a duty to speak up whenever they hear erroneous positions advanced by proclaimed revolutionaries, and our failure to do so for whatever reason including to stay in good favor with others, is to practice PB liberalism. Yet MIMP says one must not disagree with them if one expects to stay in their good graces. Their stated position with us (a dressed up version of “you hit me first ...”) also reveals their use of criticism not to identify and correct errors in a principled manner, but rather as reprisal against those whom they feel have criticized and disputed them. But while they seek to discourage and avoid criticism, anyone who’s read their publications cannot but note that MIMP spares no opportunity to critique and dispute everyone else.

Mao described such people as liberals who “look upon the principles of Marxism as abstract dogma. They approve of Marxism, but are not prepared to practice it or to practice it in full; they are not prepared to replace their liberalism by Marxism. These people have their

Marxism, but they have their liberalism as well – they talk Marxism but practice liberalism; they apply Marxism to others but liberalism to themselves. They keep both kinds of goods in stock and find a use for each. This is how the minds of certain people work.”³⁰ And those ‘certain people’ he identified are the PB in particular.

But MIMP doesn’t practice criticism as Mao proposed, to identify and correct errors and solve problems that affect the struggle, but rather they use criticism to belittle and disparage. They are both **persecutory and hyper-critical**. Indeed, we know of not just a few comrades who have in their own words, grown weary and quit MIMP groups because of its endless vitriolic criticisms of everyone and everything else, despite its own abject failure to produce any practical solutions to any problems.

[MIM(Prisons): Are we liberal, or hyper-critical?]

Furthermore, MIMP kicks prisoners out of its study groups who dare to disagree with them. One example appeared in the April 2013 issue of *Turning the Tide* newspaper, which published a letter from MIMP expelling an anti-imperialist prisoner from one of their study groups because he voiced disagreements with them.

He was rebuked for speaking out. MIMP wrote, **“It’s a waste of our time to study with people who consistently disagree with us.”**(1) and told him “if you would like to study with us again, please send us a self-criticism and we will consider the prospect.” Mao specifically and sharply condemned such **efforts to silence people and coerce them**(2) to accept one’s views as contrary to Communist principles. Here are just a few examples:

[MIM(Prisons): 1. No investigation, no right to speak. How does Rashid know anything about Ruin's participation in the study group? The individual in question (Ruin) devoted hself to attacking the MIM line in all ways. They were not thinking critically, but dogmatically criticizing it without responding to our lengthy attempts to engage. Ruin attempted to hijack the study group and turn it into an anti-MIM(Prisons) polemical struggle, without addressing the many points we raised in our responses to their criticisms. It's a waste of time for us to repeatedly respond to Ruin in the study group in the same way it's a waste of time for us to repeatedly rehash the labor aristocracy debate with Rashid, where in both cases the persyn in opposition to our line does not refute to the points we raise and does not appear to study what we have already said on the topic with any depth. 2. Obviously we didn't silence h, just like we didn't punish h. Their voice was published in *Turning The Tide*. Our study groups and publications are not the end all be all medium for prisoners to engage in public political debate, although we do appreciate Rashid's compliment. :) We are glad Ruin found welcome arms with *TTT*. People who agree with each other should work together, and let's let history decide who's most correct.]

“[T]here are some comrades who are afraid of the masses initiating discussion and putting forward ideas which differ from those of the leaders and leading organizations. As soon as problems are discussed they suppress the activism of the masses and do not allow others to speak out. This attitude is extremely evil.”³¹

“The only way to settle questions of an ideological nature or controversial issues among the people, is by the democratic method, the method of discussion, criticism, persuasion and education, and not by the method of coercion or repression.”³²

“Our comrades must understand that ideological remolding involves long-term, patient and painstaking work, and they must not attempt to change people’s ideology which has been shaped over decades of their life, by giving a few lectures or by holding a few meetings. Persuasion, not compulsion is the only way to convince them. Compulsion will never result in convincing them.”³³

“There are some comrades who cannot bear to listen to ideas contrary to their own and cannot bear to be criticized. This is very wrong.”³⁴

He rejected the practice of those who create an atmosphere where people fear to speak openly in opposition to their views as MIMP practices, stating, “when this kind of atmosphere is engendered and people don’t dare to speak in your presence then it is up to you to keep away.”³⁵ So according to Mao, **it wasn’t the critical thinking prisoner who should have been eliminated from the study group, but rather MIMP**. But there’s more.

[MIM(Prisons): Not sure how this would play out in real life? We agree that prisoners should run their own study groups, and we provide literature and study packs for just about anyone who is running a study group. The requirements to receive this study material do not include agreeing with our line, and most of the time we are not even aware of the debate that happens in these study groups. We support them because we understand the importance of deep political understanding. Maybe the NABPP-PC should make an educational institution to provide resources for this type of work. Maybe they already do, how would we know. But we're not going to criticize them and say that they DON'T do this type of work just because we are ignorant to it. If it's pushing IWW line then probably it won't be that useful to the international communist movement, though.]

“Communists are duty bound to **co-operate with people outside the Party who are against [the imperialists]**, and have no right to shut them out. This principle means that we should listen attentively to the views of the masses, keep in close touch

with them and not be alienated from them ... Communists should cooperate devotedly with non-Party people and must not act arbitrarily or keep everything in their own hands ... Communists must listen attentively to the views of people outside the Party and let them have their say. If what they say is right, we ought to welcome it, and learn from their strong points; if they are wrong, we should let them finish what they are saying and then patiently explain things to them. A Communist must never be opinionated and domineering, or think he is good in everything while others are good in nothing; he must never shut himself up in his little room or brag and boast and lord it over others. Apart from die-hard reactionaries who are in league with the [imperialists] and with the traitors and are sabotaging resistance and unity, and who of course have no right to speak, everyone is entitled to freedom of speech, and it doesn't matter even if what he says is wrong ... Hence Communists have the duty to co-operate devotedly with non-Party people and have no right to exclude them and monopolize everything.”³⁶

[MIM(Prisons): Here Rashid implies that Ruin was anti-imperialist. How would he know that? If you read the letter from Ruin that was published in *Turning The Tide* (Vol 6 No 2 April 2013), there is nothing proving their practice as an anti-imperialist, they're just complaining about being kicked out of our study group. Ruin does offer to “send you more information regarding my resistance activities, my writings and art, or anything else I can tell you” and then goes into details of their imprisonment credentials. Instead, MIM(Prisons) takes self-reporting like this with a grain of salt, knowing it could be easily made up by any pig who wants to gain our trust. We prefer to measure a potential comrade's political orientation (whether they're anti-imperialist or not) based on the work they contribute to the anti-imperialist struggle. Rashid may be relying on insider information, which isn't helpful to us in this debate. If Ruin had actually published a great anti-imperialist essay in *TTT*, that would be a different story. A mock criticism of us does not count as anti-imperialist work, unless you consider MIM(Prisons) pro-imperialist I guess.]

Stalin held likewise: “It is generally recognized that no science can develop and flourish without a battle of opinions, without freedom of criticism.”³⁷

Not only is MIMP intolerant of being criticized and disputed, we have seen few if any instances where they – and MIM before them – didn't name-call or hurl insults at those who dispute them or don't conform to their views. It is there M.O. even, to denounce their critics or non-conformists as First World chauvinists, Trotskyist, crypto-Trotskyists, anarchist, fascist, pigs and/or pig agents. Matter of fact in their polemic, they slyly classified us as amongst the “anarchists and crypto-Trotskyists” with whom they've “drawn a line of distinction.” Yet another tendency Mao disapproved of – namely, putting labels on, name-calling and insulting people.

“We must never ... permit the bad old habit of ‘sticking labels’ on people to continue.”³⁸

“Lu Hsun once said in criticism of such people, ‘Hurling insults and threats is not fighting.’ What is scientific never fears criticism, for science is truth and fears no refutation. But those who write subjectivist and sectarian articles and speeches in the form of Party stereotypes fear refutation, are very cowardly and therefore rely on pretention to overcome others, believing that they can thereby silence people and ‘win the day.’ Such pretentiousness cannot reflect truth but it is an obstacle to truth. Truth does not strike a pose to overcome people but talks and acts honestly and simply.”³⁹

[MIM(Prisons): Yes Mao condemned revisionists, and led campaigns against people like Liu Shaoqi. In this article Rashid labels MIM(Prisons) as petty-bourgeois over and over, yet he says “sticking labels” on people is fundamentally wrong. So which is it? We only use labels to identify political line. Rashid seems to think he is doing this by speculating about MIM(Prisons)'s class background. So apparently using labels is correct for Rashid to do, but not for MIM(Prisons)?]

And here's Mao speaking to the absolute futility of those who like MIMP try and compel people to keep silent as though everyone can be intimidated.

[MIM(Prisons): No, we tell them to keep talking but we don't necessarily need to engage with every pro-imperialist line to refute it when it's a position we have already published copious material on. Instead we might just offer references to that material. Or we might choose to focus our energy on people who are actually interested in anti-imperialism and studying our material. That's not telling people to keep silent, in fact we encourage them to find folks they agree with and get involved in a practice rather than just talking theory with no practice.]

“Those of you who ... do not allow people to speak, who think you are tigers, and that no one will dare touch your arse, whoever has this attitude, ten out of ten of you will fail. People will talk anyway. You think that no one will really dare to touch the arse of tigers like you? They damn well will!”⁴⁰

[MIM(Prisons): We have plenty of examples of friendly struggle on our website and in *ULK*, which is very different than struggle against enemy lines.]

On many occasions Mao explained that Communists must give full play to democracy among the people, which means allowing them to openly and freely express any and all criticisms and disagreements they have. That refusing to do this is to practice commandism and

dictatorship, which is unacceptable against the people. Those who don't permit full democracy he criticized as those who want **all unity and no struggle(1)**. Which is non-dialectical and completely contradicts basic Marxist philosophy. As we've noted **he rejected tendencies to try and shut people up (even our enemies)(2)** or force **ideas on the people that they don't yet grasp(3)**, because this alienates them, violates their right to voluntarily and intelligently accept Communist leadership, and reflects PB impetuosity.

[MIM(Prisons): So on one hand we are liberal for failing to take up criticism enough, and on the other hand we are commandist for criticizing incorrect ideas wherever we see them. 1. All unity and no struggle would probably look like keeping Ruin in the study group and saying "it's okay if we disagree, let's only talk about stuff we agree on." Obviously we didn't do that, we don't need unity with people who push enemy line. 2. People were imprisoned for being enemies, and during the GPCR people were killed (although Mao criticized this as ultra-left errors of the masses) for acting on enemy lines. Not sure what Rashid is talking about here. Seems like he's confusing "people in the party" with "enemies." 3. Ideas that are not yet grasped are different than worked out lines.]

And he didn't encourage the people to criticize us as a mere formality. He meant that we take and ponder those criticisms seriously. Here's Mao once more.

"If we are to promote democracy, we must encourage others to criticize us and listen to their criticisms. To be able to withstand criticism we must first take measures to carry out self-criticism. We must examine whatever needs examining for an hour or at most two hours. If everything is to be brought out in the open, it will take as long as that. If others consider we have not done enough, then let them say so. If what they say is right, we will accept their opinion. When we allow others to speak, should we be active or passive in our attitude? Of course it is better to be active. What can we do if we are forced onto the defensive? In the past we were undemocratic and so we find ourselves on the defensive. No matter. Let everybody criticize us. As for me, I will not go out during the day; I will not go to the theater at night. Please come and criticize me day and night (laughter from audience). Then I will sit down and think about it carefully, not sleep for two or three nights, think about it until I understand it, and then write a sincere self-explanation. Isn't that the way to deal with it? In short, let other people speak out. The heavens will not fall and you will not be thrown out. If you do not let others speak, then the day will surely come when you are thrown out."⁴¹

And here is yet another example of MIMP's efforts to evade having their positions openly disputed, and presenting such efforts as politically principled. And again they are directly contradicted by the Marxist line.

In December 2013 we proposed that MIMP publish both sides of our ongoing debates in their prisoner-based newsletter Under Lock and Key. They refused stating, "we don't have space to spare ... for articles that are so off the mark," speaking of our side of the polemics. But conversely they said they were looking to enlarge their newsletter to fit in more articles that reflect their own views. Lenin's position totally refutes them. "We shall", he said, "gladly afford space in our paper for articles on theoretical questions and we invite all comrades openly to discuss controversial points."⁴²

[MIM(Prisons): We do not find the labor aristocracy line to be controversial. Does Rashid have no standards for publication? If a Nazi group wants to print something fascist in their publication, should they afford the space to encourage the debate?]

He furthermore contended that Communist papers become bland and lose their combative edge and mass interest when they don't publish such polemics. He rebuked the editors of his Bolshevik Party's paper thusly when they did exactly what MIMP promotes.

"You complain about monotony....By avoiding 'painful questions', Pravda and Zvezda make themselves dry, monotonous, uninteresting, uncombative organs. A socialist organ must conduct polemics"⁴³

When we recognize that MIMP, consistent with its PB class tendency, fears being contradicted by the common people, whereas, as Mao pointed out, the masses will still speak out, it becomes apparent why MIMP refuses to integrate itself and its work within a mass base whose voices they cannot readily **censor and control as they can with prisoners**. And dogmatic lines like the VLA line serve only to falsely justify refusing to base itself and its 'work' within the broad masses in society.

[MIM(Prisons): Please tell us who does more than MIM(Prisons) to fight the censorship of prisoners' voices? Besides our anti-censorship work, Under Lock & Key is mostly written by prisoners. And many of the articles authored by MIM(Prisons) are summing up reports from prisoners. ULK isn't just to spread our own ideas, although we do try to provide leadership and consolidate mass line.]

Again on the Labor Aristocracy

Returning now to the LA question and who the proletariat are and who are its friends and enemies, we must begin again with the fundamentals of class.

In our earlier article we elaborated in Marxist political economic terms, that the proletariat is that class which must sell its manual labor

power to the bourgeoisie for a wage at less than its actual value in order to survive. That the bourgeois expropriates and pockets the surplus value as profit, which is value realized in the production of commodities for which the worker is not paid. We pointed out that labor power is also itself a commodity. Citing Marx's Wages, Price and Profit we explained that workers in Amerika are subject to stolen surplus value just as are Third World workers and **are no less proletarians even though they earn higher wages than their Third World counterpart.(1)** We went on to explain that the difference in wage scales is the result of **different standards and costs of living in different countries(2)** based upon the **uneven levels of development under capitalist imperialism.(3)** And that of course the cost, standard and quality of goods and services in the developed First World imperialist countries like Amerika are simply much higher than in the less developed Third World countries. While we do recognize other factors are also at play in the existence of greater wealth in the First World countries versus the Third World, which are fundamental to the imperialist system, they do not change the fact that **workers in the imperialist countries produce surplus value(4)** and are thus proletarians.

[MIM(Prisons): This is gold. 1. LOL. 2. This position is bullshit. See the article "Raise the Minimum Wage to \$2.50" published online and in ULK 36. 3. Where does Rashid think these uneven levels of development come from? Amerikan ingenuity? No, it comes from colonialism, neo-colonialism, and imperialism, all of which point to the validity of the labor aristocracy line. 4. See MIM Theory 1 and 10.]

MIMP disputed us, denying that US workers are proletarians simply because they receive higher wages. **MIMP did concede however that we were in fact correctly applying basic scientific principles of Marxist political economy.** But to avoid these principles, MIMP denied that proletarians are those who must sell their labor power for a wage, stating instead that they "prefer Marx's definition that the proletarian are those who have nothing to lose but their chains."

[MIM(Prisons): No, we did not. We said we prefer Marx to Rashid. We prefer the definition that the proletariat is exploited. Workers are not proletarian if they are earning more than the value of their labor. Just selling labor in itself is not enough. Please tell us where we made this concession.]

As we've already pointed out, Marx did not use the "chains" metaphor to define the proletariat, but rather figuratively to make the point that under capitalism the proletariat is the only class that has nothing to lose and everything to gain by overthrowing capitalism.

MIMP's revisionism has gone to totally redefining the most fundamental question to every Marxist, namely how classes are constituted and how identified. If one cannot correctly identify who is the proletariat, everything else they advance in the way of struggling against capitalism must necessarily be wrong. As we made clear, for the Marxist, the proletariat forms the social base of any such struggle. It is this very class which we necessarily aim to organize to seize and exercise political power and establish its own class dictatorship over the bourgeoisie. Any line that deviates from this is necessarily one that advances the bourgeois.

[MIM(Prisons): Eye roll. We've already addressed this whole metaphor issue earlier in our notations.]

Classes, as Marx scientifically demonstrated, are determined by objective relations people enter into within the productive system. One cannot objectively show how the abstract concepts of wearing "rags" or existing in "chains" reflect actual relations to commodity production and the capitalist system. In this context such concepts are abstract at best and absurd. This is revisionism in its most literal sense.

But we realize that **MIMP had to dodge Marx's actual economic based definition of the proletariat,** because under that definition US workers fall firmly into the proletarian class as our prior article demonstrated. And to acknowledge that First World workers are indeed proletarians would deny MIMP its false justification for refusing to base themselves among them, committing class suicide, and doing real revolutionary work. As Lenin stated, "Marx's economic theory alone has explained the true position of the proletariat in the general system of capitalism."⁴⁴ And as he observed, the advent of imperialism did not change the class basis of capitalism, although the PB has always tried to revise Marxist political economy and proclaim its principles obsolete. Lenin stated the case clearly:

[MIM(Prisons): Lie.]

"Hitherto the doctrines of Marx and Engels were considered to be the firm foundation of revolutionary theory, but voices are now being raised everywhere to proclaim these doctrines inadequate and obsolete ... We take our stand entirely on the Marxist theoretical position"⁴⁵

MIMP, however, claims Marxist political economy is outmoded(1), rendered obsolete by imperialism and its transfer of immense wealth to the First World (a condition that has always been a fundamental component of imperialism and even the primitive accumulation of capital during Marx's time), and **dismissed its fundamental principles that we cited to demonstrate that US workers are proletarians as "numbers" made "just for show" and "empty numbers"(2)** which they presumed to counter by promoting a PB 'economist' solution (we'll address MIMP's PB Economism below). But as we quoted earlier, Mao held firmly that "we are Marxists."

[MIM(Prisons): 1. Lie. 2. Yeah, they were made up numbers.]

And like Lenin, Mao upheld, "[t]he three basic constituents of Marxism [which] are scientific socialism, philosophy [dialectical materialism], and political economy. The foundation is social science, class struggle." And that struggle being "between the proletariat

and the bourgeoisie.”⁴⁶ So Mao also upheld Marxist political economic analysis of classes (specifically of the proletariat) and this is why he, like us, and like Lenin and Stalin, recognized that there is indeed a First World proletariat (including a white proletariat – which MIMP vigorously denies). And all of them recognized the need for unity of struggle between this First World proletariat and the super-exploited Third World as essential to toppling the imperialist system. In fact Lenin, Stalin and Mao recognized the existence of a proletariat versus bourgeois class struggle within the First World countries as one of the three fundamental components of the imperialist system. Yet **MIMP claims there has never been a proletariat in Amerika and especially no “white” proletariat(1)**, and used revising what constitutes the proletariat as a class invoking **abstract metaphors(2)** and citing **different wage levels(3)** to speciously validate this position.

[MIM(Prisons): Not “especially.” “Only” would be the correct word here. Rashid seems to equate Amerika with the United States, which we do not do. Please read *Settlers: The Mythology of the White Proletariat* by J. Sakai and *MIM Theory 7: Proletarian Feminist Nationalism*. 2. Abstract metaphors like land ownership? 3. a.k.a. real data.]

Now let’s look at how Lenin, Stalin and Mao compare to MIMP on the question of the existence of a First World proletariat. Mao didn’t lump everyone in Amerika into a homogenous oppressor Labor Aristocracy (LA). He specifically made a distinction between the US ruling class as the oppressor class and the masses as both the oppressed and as allies of the internally oppressed nationalities. He stated, “It is the reactionary ruling circles among the whites who oppress the Negro people. They can in no way represent the workers, farmers, revolutionary intellectuals and other enlightened persons who compose the overwhelming majority of the white people.” Nor did he characterize US whites as overall exploiters of the Third World. “At present, it is the handful of imperialists headed by the United States, and their supporters, the reactionaries in different countries, who are inflicting oppression, aggression and intimidation on the overwhelming majority of the nations and peoples of the world.”⁴⁷

[MIM(Prisons): A) It was written 50 years ago. B) Mao was not in the USA and relied on U\$. communists for perspective. C) This is one of the few errors we find in Mao's positions. D) We aren't dogmatists, so not buying this position of Mao's does not make us not Maoists.]

As for Lenin and Stalin, in his definitive work, “The Foundations of Leninism”, Stalin in part elaborated Lenin’s analysis of imperialism and its practical purposes in the struggle to defeat it.⁴⁸ There he wrote:

“Leninism grew up and took shape under the conditions of imperialism, when the contradictions of capitalism had reached an extreme point, when the proletarian revolution had become an immediate practical question, when the old period of preparation of the working class for revolution had arrived at and passed into a new period, that of direct assault on capitalism.

“Lenin called imperialism ‘moribund capitalism’. Why? Because imperialism carries the contradictions of capitalism to their last bounds, to the extreme limit, beyond which revolution begins of these contradictions, there are three which must be regarded as the most important.”

He identified the first and most important of these contradictions as “the contradiction between labor and capital,” that is between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie within the imperialist countries. The second contradiction was that between the imperialist forces that is “the contradiction among the various financial groups and imperialist powers in their struggles for sources of raw materials, for foreign territory.” The third contradiction was that “between the handful of ruling, ‘civilized’ nations and the hundreds of millions of the colonial and dependent peoples of the world,” that is between the First World imperialist powers and the Third World. These being the three fundamental contradictions that make up the phenomenon of capitalist imperialism and exist till today. Lenin, Stalin and Mao always maintained this understanding of what constitutes imperialism. Yet **MIMP proclaims the first and principal contradiction of imperialism, namely the existence of proletarian versus bourgeois class struggle within the imperialist countries, does not exist(1)** and has never existed. But that rather there is a reconciliation between the bourgeoisie and **what they call a LA(2)**. So MIMP has revised the MLM understanding of what constitutes imperialism. They have transformed imperialism into a new and different sort of capitalism. Either we accept this absurd notion and that Lenin, Stalin and Mao (and even Marx) were dead wrong in their political economic analyses or that MIMP is revisionist. In either case it’s not possible to call MIMP Marxist, Leninist or Maoist **since they clearly do not follow the fundamental teachings, studies or practice of any of them.(3)**

[MIM(Prisons): 1. Lie. We don't say the contradiction between labor and capital within imperialist countries never existed. We say imperialism has advanced since the days of Lenin. On the one hand, Rashid says we must accept criticisms and be open to changing our line. On the other hand he says it is undebateable to think that imperialism has changed since the days of Marx. 2. What Lenin also called the labor aristocracy. 3. Since we clearly are not dogmatists.]

What’s more, in blatant contradiction of MIMP, Lenin, Stalin and Mao saw the unity of the First World proletariat with the Third World as essential to the success of the struggle against imperialism. Here’s Lenin:

“the socialists of the oppressed nations must in particular, defend and implement the full and unconditional unity, including organizational unity of the workers of the oppressed nation and those of the oppressor nation. Without this it is impossible to defend the independent policy of the proletariat of other countries in the face of all manner of intrigues, treachery and

trickery on the part of the bourgeoisie.”⁴⁹

And here again is Stalin.

“The victory of the working class in the developed countries and the liberation of the oppressed peoples from the yoke of imperialism are impossible without the formation and the consolidation of a common revolutionary front;

“The formation of a common revolutionary front is impossible unless the proletariat of the oppressor nations renders direct and determined support to the liberation movements of the oppressed peoples against the imperialism of its ‘own country’, for ‘no nation can be free if it oppresses other nations’ (Engels)”⁵⁰

Moreover, Stalin held the First World proletariat to be the Soviet Union’s key ally! He stated:

“The first ally, our principal ally, is the proletariat in the developed countries. The advanced proletariat, the proletariat in the West is an immense force, and it is a most faithful and most important ally of our regime. But unfortunately, the situation, the state of the revolutionary movement in the developed capitalist countries, is such that the proletariat in the West is unable to render us direct and decisive assistance at the present moment. We have its indirect moral support, and this is so important that its value cannot even be measured, it is inestimable. Nevertheless, it does not constitute that direct and immediate assistance that we need now.”⁵¹

[MIM(Prisons): See MIM Theory 10 for Lenin and Stalin on the labor aristocracy.]

Lenin, Stalin and Mao all maintained these positions while recognizing that **the First World countries reaped massive wealth as a result of the super-exploitation of the Third World to the general social-economic benefit of the developed countries.** Yet they clearly did not characterize their workers as a LA and enemy of the workers of the underdeveloped countries as MIMP does.

[MIM(Prisons): This points to the validity of the labor aristocracy line.]

MIMP also cites the existence of bourgeois views and values, and attitudes of national and racial chauvinism on the part of US workers as grounds for characterizing them as a LA and enemy of oppressed nationality and Third World workers. Yet another bogus anti-Marxist view. Marxists recognize that when the bourgeoisie is the ruling class it perpetuates its values across the other social classes through dominating the cultural institutions. This is why the revolutionary Party is needed to perpetuate a revolutionary proletarian culture to combat the prevailing bourgeois culture. As Marx observed in 1845 “The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas, i.e. the class which is the ruling material force of society is at the same time its ruling intellectual force.”

Recall it wasn’t until after Marx and Engel’s day that Lenin first devised a workable program for developing the revolutionary Proletarian Party. So it is no wonder that as capitalism strengthened its hold in England, Engels saw an increasing bourgeoisification of the English proletariat, which is inevitable in the absence of a revolutionary Party to organize and lead them. We see the same trend here in Amerika in the absence of a mass based revolutionary Party. In fact bourgeois ideas predominate even under socialism minus a persistent series of cultural revolutions to root them out. Mao was the first to recognize this and combatted it with the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China which he led from 1966 until his death in 1976.

Even before he came to terms with this reality, he recognized and confronted the phenomenon of the masses entertaining national and racial chauvinist and overall bourgeois ideas even after the bourgeoisie had been overthrown. The cure he realized was that the Party educate the masses in Marxism, he said, “bourgeois ideas dominate the minds of those comrades and people who have had no Marxist education and have not grasped the nationality policy of the [Communist Party].”⁵² **So another argument of MIMP** in support of their VLA line falls flat and is defeated by the words of the very authorities they claim to uphold.

[MIM(Prisons): What is our argument that is falling flat? That bourgeois culture dominates in the United States? We never said that wasn’t true. We said the labor aristocracy has a material interest in maintaining imperialism and it’ll be very unlikely to win them over. Every group that has potential to be organized around a Maoist platform should be targeted. But right now since our movement is very small, it would be most efficient to focus on the group(s) that have the most to gain from socialism – the lumpen, and the youth. Even when organizing the labor aristocracy, we should not organize them for their own economic interests (i.e. ending their supposed exploitation) but instead for other material gains, such as an end to environmental destruction. We only have so many resources to go around and need to choose our strategy. That doesn’t mean we oppose all other organizing work.]

Finally, we come to their main argument that by merit of higher pay the upper strata of workers are an inherently counter-revolutionary LA. Wrong again! Actually Lenin recognized the higher paid workers to be the most potentially revolutionary and the vanguard strata of the working class. Lenin:

“The history of the working class movement in all countries, shows that the better-situated strata of the working class respond to the ideas of socialism more rapidly and more easily. From among these come, in the main, the advanced workers

that every working class movement brings to the fore, those who can win the confidence of the laboring masses, who devote themselves entirely to the education and organization of the proletariat, who accept socialism consciously, and who even elaborate independent socialist theories.”⁵³

[MIM(Prisons): Where is the science that demonstrates exploitation of documented workers in the United States? Lenin was talking about the better-situated yet still exploited workers. He wasn't talking about people earning \$50,000 a year like the people Rashid is calling the potentially revolutionary labor aristocracy. (Also later Rashid admits to a small minority of workers being labor aristocracy, but says they are not a revolutionary force.)]

And while MIMP promotes the “lower strata” of workers as the more advanced proletarians, Lenin maintained the importance of the “upper strata” as the leadership of “the mass that constitutes the lower strata of the proletariat [who] it is quite possible that a socialist newspaper will be completely or well-nigh incomprehensible to...”⁵⁴ This is why Stalin saw the proletariat of the developed countries as the key allies of Socialist Russia.

[MIM(Prisons): This is patronizing bullshit.]

It is telling that the very strata of workers that these Marxist leaders recognized to be the more advanced and receptive to revolutionary leadership, MIMP denounces as a counter-revolutionary enemy of the proletariat. It simply proves Lenin was right, to allow the PB to lead the proletariat will “inevitably destroy any revolutionary movement” as they “produce the very results which the bourgeoisie need.”

[MIM(Prisons): We do not agree with every sentence or utterance of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, or Mao. Two sentences should not cause us to throw out materialist analysis.]

Lenin and company understood, as do we, that the LA is not the higher paid workers per se as MIMP claims. But it is rather those among this upper strata who as leaders within the working class movement (recall Lenin identified the labor traitors as “the labor leaders and the upper stratum of the labour aristocracy”) have allowed themselves to be bribed by the bourgeoisie. And they are not bribed with mere higher wages. Lenin noted they are bribed “in a thousand different ways, direct and indirect, overt and covert.”⁵⁵ Clearly the LA are those upper strata of workers who were politically conscious and active leaders in the labor movement and organizations who were granted benefits and privileges by the bourgeoisie(1) to – again in Lenin’s own words – serve as “the real agents of the bourgeoisie in the working-class movement, the labor lieutenants of the capitalist class, real vehicles of reformism and chauvinism.”⁵⁶ So they aren't merely backward-thinking and unconscious workers who inevitably become bourgeoisified in the absence of a proletarian Party(2) but instead they are conscious workers who deliberately betray the working class and serve the bourgeoisie to mislead the other workers. Which describes precisely the bureaucratic and conciliatory labor union and labor movement leadership and neo-colonial agents who have served to misdirect the workers and oppressed internal nationalities and integrate these oppressed sectors' so-called labor Parties and unions into the mainstream political structures in the developed capitalist countries.(3)

[MIM(Prisons): This above paragraph is Trotskyist and conveniently leaves out Lenin's words on the labor aristocracy. 1. Classes are not defined by their consciousness. They are defined by their material relationship to the means of production. This is metaphysics. 2. Weird because elsewhere in this polemic Rashid says the reason the “proletariat” in this country isn't revolutionary is because they are lacking revolutionary leadership. So which is it? Are they not revolutionary because of material incentives, or because they're lacking leadership? We say material benefits. Again Rashid is make a metaphysical analysis, talking about choice and consciousness as determining one's class. 3. There are material reasons why these union leaders have been so successful. It's not all bourgeois brainwashing. They're successful in their organizing because they actually serve the class interests of the labor aristocracy!]

And what MIMP does in effect is to try and divide the proletariat by race and nationality by emphasizing “whiteness” and whether one is a First World worker versus a Third World worker in classifying who is a proletarian or an enemy thereof. This is one of the very reasons Lenin founded the Comintern(1), namely to combat the PB revisionists who were, as MIMP promotes, advocating splitting the proletariat based upon nationality(2) so they would be effectively pitted against each other in imperialist world wars in service to ‘their own’ bourgeoisie.

[MIM(Prisons): 1. See MIM Theory 10 for more on the Comintern's line on the labor aristocracy. 2. Ridiculous argument, as we defend all national liberation struggles of the oppressed and the right of all nations to self-determination. We merely oppose struggling for the advancement of oppressor nations. Please see Stalin on national liberation in “Marxism and the National-Colonial Question.” For more on oppressor nations co-opting oppressed nations struggles see False Nationalism, False Internationalism.]

Then MIMP contended that we “made” the most common strawperson argument of the revisionists that the MIM line is wrong because Marx and Lenin never abandoned organizing among Europeans and Americans.” That’s not what we said. We said not only did they never abandon the imperialist country workers, but that Marx and Lenin banked the very success of the world proletarian revolution on the proletariat of these First World countries. That is was in fact in these countries that Lenin formed the Comintern to organize Communist Parties to give First World leadership to these countries’ workers and the world Communist movement. And as we’ve already shown Lenin, Stalin and Mao clearly saw the First World proletariat as a proletariat and indispensable to the struggle of the Third World workers against imperialism.

[MIM(Prisons): So why did Stalin dissolve the Comintern?]

So Lenin and company totally discredit MIMP's claims that 1) **there is not and never has been a proletariat in the imperialist countries(1)** 2) **there is no need or basis for unity between these workers and those in the Third World(2)**, 3) we are revisionist for contending that Marx and Lenin always recognized a First World proletariat, and 4) **we are First World chauvinists for holding that this upper strata of workers could or should give working class leadership or support to the lower strata of workers, etc.(3)**

[MIM(Prisons): 1. Not our line. 2. Our whole organizing platform is to make the transition from capitalism to communism as easy as possible in the First World. 3. Yes, you are. See *False Nationalism, False Internationalism.*]

From here MIMPs anti-Maoist PB revisionist positions only became more apparent.

MIMPs Petty Bourgeois Economism

MIMP went on to say, "If Americans are exploited, then to end exploitation would mean they need to get paid more money." No Marxist would make such a statement. To end the exploitation of workers they'd need to be united and organized to overthrow their oppressor capitalist class, to seize state power, and build a socialist society which means for them to exercise all round proletarian dictatorship over the bourgeoisie. As Engels stated, "The only means" of ending exploitation "is political domination of the proletariat."⁵⁷

[MIM(Prisons): Seriously missing the point of how we calculate exploitation here. So is there no increase in wages in Rashid's mind that would make someone not proletariat? We can end exploitation of some groups by raising wages, hence the labor aristocracy. But we agree that it takes socialist revolution to end exploitation worldwide. Exploitation was transferred from workers in the United States to Third World works, raising wages and increasing the "standard of living" for those in the First World.]

MIMP's promoting higher wages as an answer to capitalist exploitation of the workers is one that every Marxist beginning with Marx himself denounced as a PB position and one Lenin specifically fought as PB "economism". As said, beginning with Marx such an 'answer' has been long rejected. He said, the PB

[MIM(Prisons): Eye roll.]

"far from wanting to transform all of society in the interest of the revolutionary proletariat only aspire to make the existing society as tolerable for themselves as possible.

[MIM(Prisons): Even more substantiation of the labor aristocracy line, because that's the popular movement in this country. The labor aristocracy doesn't care about ending exploitation worldwide, they just want their lives to be as leisurely as possible.]

"...As far as the workers are concerned one thing above all is definite: they are to remain wage workers as before. However, the democratic petty bourgeois want better wages and security for the workers; in short they want to bribe the workers...."

Lenin stated when the workers' struggle becomes one for only economic gains while revolutionaries refrain from "explain[ing] to them the socialist aims and the political tasks of the movement as a whole" the inevitable result is that "the working-class movement becomes petty and inevitably becomes bourgeois [in ideology]. In waging only the economic struggle, the working class loses its political independence, it becomes the tail of other parties and betrays the great principle: 'the emancipation of the working class must be conquered by the working classes themselves.'"⁵⁸ In his essay "What is to be Done?" Lenin pointed out that left to its own

"spontaneous development ... the working class movement leads to its subordination to bourgeois ideology, to its development along the lines of the Credo programme; for the spontaneous working-class movement is trade-unionism, is Nur-Gewerkschaftlerei, and trade-unionism means the ideological enslavement of the workers by the bourgeoisie.

"Hence, our task, the task of [communists], is to combat spontaneity, to divert the working class movement from this spontaneous trade-unionist striving to come under the wing of the bourgeoisie, and to bring it under the wing of revolutionary [communism]."

So we have Lenin here explaining that the workers inevitably become bourgeoisified when they are not led by a revolutionary vanguard to understand and pursue the political and class struggle and not merely economic gains. Compare this to MIMP's revisionist position that says they are justified in **refusing the workers revolutionary leadership and to denounce them as enemies because, in the absence of such leadership, they are bourgeoisified(1)**, and even if they are exploited **the solution is to pursue purely economic struggle (for more money) (2)**. The MIMP line is the exact position Lenin rejects. In fact it is economism.

[MIM(Prisons): We never said pursuing economic struggle was the solution to exploitation. We are trying to demonstrate that the workers are not exploited. If they are not, then all this argument is wrong. 1. Not sure how making all our material freely

available on the internet constitutes refusing workers in the United States leadership. Rashid is blaming all the bourgeois tendencies of the labor aristocracy (who he calls the proletariat) on the lack of communist leadership and says it has nothing to do with their economic status. The difference is Rashid looks to metaphysical explanations, and we look to material explanations. 2. This is not our line. Curious what material struggles Rashid chooses to organize the labor aristocracy (who he calls the proletariat) around. What works with them? We can imagine a couple organizing platforms (environment, gender...) but wonder what Rashid uses.]

Economism was an opportunist line that wanted workers to confine themselves to the purely economic struggle for higher wages, better work conditions, etc. and to allow the liberal PB to lead the political struggle (the exact position MIMP practices and promotes – it only pays lip service to proletarian struggle). Lenin denounced economism as a liberal bourgeois line in the workers' movement and through his Iskra newspaper waged continued struggle against it. But it was in his essay "What is to be Done?" that he decisively demolished economism and elaborated his perspective on the need and role of the revolutionary party in leading the workers movement into a successful revolutionary seizure and exercise of political power. As Stalin was to observe, "[t]he fight of the old Iskra and the brilliant criticism of the theory of 'kvostism' in Lenin's pamphlet What is to be Done? not only smashed so-called 'Economism', but also created the theoretical foundations for a truly revolutionary movement of the Russian working class."⁵⁹

MIMP's economism further reveals itself in their practicing the sort of political "amateurishness" identified by Lenin that ends in becoming "lost in narrow study circle life..."⁶⁰ As we've noted MIMP admits being a small group that **confines its work** primarily to prisoner study groups.⁶¹

[MIM(Prisons): Our work is not confined to study groups, although that is a large part of what we do. In a prior polemic with Rashid, we stated "As our readers should know, we struggle to do the things we do to support prisoner education programs and organizing work. We do not have the resources right now to do any serious organizing outside of prisons. And we made the conscious decision of how we can best use our resources in no small part due to historical experience of our movement. In other words we go where there is interest in revolutionary politics. The margins, the weakest links in the system, that is where you focus your energy. Within the lumpen class, the imprisoned lumpen have a unique relationship to the system that results in a strong contradiction with that system. The imprisoned population could also be considered 100% lumpen, whereas less than 20% of the New Afrikan nation is lumpen, the rest being among various bourgeois classes, including the labor aristocracy." See "Rashid's Empty Rhetoric on the Labor Aristocracy" which was published in ULK 34.]

It is important to note that they arrive at the VLA line by applying an economist analysis which claims First World workers have overcome oppression as a sole consequence of economic benefits. So **MIMP's entire claim that US and other advanced capitalist country workers are a LA is based on an explicitly bourgeois (economist) analysis** and one which Lenin fiercely fought against. But they claim themselves to be inheritors of Leninist practice and line.

[MIM(Prisons): Rashid starts by giving us an economic definition of exploitation and the proletariat, and criticizes us for not using that definition. And then criticizes us for economism for using that economic definition of the proletariat to show how there is no proletariat amongst the documented United States workers. Rashid says using facts, statistics, and data is a "bourgeois" thing to do.]

An additional factor in the higher wages of imperialist country workers includes that historically the proletariat's struggles in these countries where the workers have been **more organized and developed and engaged longer in struggle(1)** (and met with **particularly violent repression at that(2)**) against their bourgeois, has won them greater concessions than the less-developed, organized and legally protected Third World proletarians. Yet **MIMP considers the mere fact of higher wages as basis for charging US workers to be enemies of their own class.(3)** As Marx said:

[MIM(Prisons): 1. Chauvinist lies. 2. Third World workers are shot by the dozens today when protesting their abhorrent work conditions (which First World workers are NOT subject to). Please show us where/how FW workers face particular violent repression compared to TW workers. 3. Lie. We, and others in the International Communist Movement, have proven the labor aristocracy line from many angles, not just wages. Too many to list here.]

"By looking only upon the change in wages and overlooking all the other changes from which they emanate, you proceed from a false premise in order to arrive at false conclusions."⁶²

MIMP's Misrepresentations

In addition to their "strawpersyn" argument which we've addressed above, MIMP made several outright misrepresentations of what we said in our prior article employing dirty tactics of the sort that Lenin critiqued Karl Kautsky for, namely **falsely claiming an opponent in a polemic to have made a patently foolish argument and then refuting it as if responding to a position we took rather than one they wholly manufactured.**

[MIM(Prisons): LOL, so ironic. Isn't that what this entire document is doing?]

In one case MIMP claimed we classified as US proletarians those who own \$20,000 cars, \$200,000 homes and multiple hand-held computers. Which refers obviously to the middle class (PB) sector that members of MIMP come from and not any proletarians we know, especially not those multitudes who live in the urban centers that we come from and is our targeted social base.

[MIM(Prisons): Okay, so at least Rashid agrees that the majority of workers in the United States are not proletariat?]

In fact at least 40% of American workers own nothing and most of the rest live one or two paychecks away from homelessness. But, in that MIMP describes “people sitting behind computers typing keys” as non-exploited, they’re again obviously describing their own PB class and furthermore their own peculiar form of political ‘activism.’ And consider too, even if American workers could be said to enjoy a petty-bourgeois lifestyle, this does not make them enemies to be denounced by revolutionaries. In “Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism”, Lenin held the exact opposite. He stated it “is the bounded duty of the party of the proletariat [to] win away from the bourgeoisie the small proprietors who are duped by them, and the millions of working people who enjoy more or less petty-bourgeois conditions of life.”

[MIM(Prisons): Whoa whoa whoa. This is a fact? While not separating out the Americans from the U.S. citizens in these statistics... Over 84% of all U.S. households own a computer, according to the Census. 95% of “American” households own a car. The “national” (i.e. country-wide) average is 2.28 vehicles per household. 64% of people in the United States own their own home as of 2013. <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2014/09/19/census-computer-ownership-internet-connection-varies-widely-across-u-s/>, http://photos.state.gov/libraries/cambodia/30486/Publications/everyone_in_america_own_a_car.pdf, <http://www.autospies.com/news/Study-Finds-Americans-Own-2-28-Vehicles-Per-Household-26437/>, <http://www.statisticbrain.com/percent-of-americans-who-own-their-home/>]

Then they claimed we said US and Third World workers earn different wages because US labor is “worth” more than that of Third World workers. We said no such thing. What we said and repeat is US workers receive higher wages in part because the costs of living and the **standard of living are higher in the US than in the Third World**. And we cited Marx’s own “scientific” political economic analyses in validation of this point. And contrary to MIMP’s further false statement, where we cited Marx in Wages, Price and Profit he wasn’t comparing weak versus strong nor skilled versus unskilled workers – MIMP demonstrably doesn’t even comprehend what Marx wrote. He was talking about different levels of economic development in different countries as determining higher versus lower wages which again brings us to the point that higher wages does not make First World workers non-proletarian and the enemy of Third World workers.

[MIM(Prisons): This is chauvinist crap. We addressed it earlier.]

Let’s look at Marx’s own study in Wages, Price and Profit. Recall that he revealed that the commodity lies at the very core of the capitalist system and its productive relations. What’s more is labor power is not only itself a commodity but the core commodity of the capitalist system. It’s important to point out here that the MIM line has always avoided the fact labor is a commodity in advancing its line that First World workers don’t produce surplus value because they claim these workers do not produce commodities at all. But Marx explained, “labor is only a commodity like others,” and its costs “correspond to its value. It would be absurd,” he said “to treat it on one hand as a commodity, and to want on the other hand to exempt it from the laws which regulate the price of commodities.”

[MIM(Prisons): Workers produce labor? No they produce commodities. Disconnect of logic.]

He went on to explain that the value of labor itself is what determines the value and cost of all other commodities. “But”, he explained “there are some peculiar features which distinguish the value of the laboring power, or the value of labor from the value of all other commodities. The value of the laboring power is formed by two elements – the one merely physical; the other historical or social.” The physical element he observed, simply relates to providing for the basic physical needs of the worker and her/his family to reproduce themselves so they can continue to provide their labor power. This is the COST of living while the second or social element, which is what we referred to as the STANDARD of living, Marx explained thusly:

“Besides [the] mere physical element, the value of labor is in every country determined by the **traditional standard of life(1)**. It is not mere physical life, but it is the **satisfaction of certain wants springing from the social conditions in which people are placed and reared up(2)**. The English standard of life may be reduced to the Irish standard: the standard of life of a German peasant to that of a Livonian peasant....

[MIM(Prisons): 1. Read Settlers by Sakai for more information on this “traditional” standard of life. 2. Social conditions which stem from their status as a bourgeois sub-class in a majority exploiter country.]

“By comparing the standard wages or value of labor in different countries and by comparing them in different historical epochs of the same country, you will find that the value of labor itself is not a fixed but a variable magnitude, even supposing the values of all other commodities to remain constant.”

[MIM(Prisons): This is the chauvinists' favorite Marx quote.]

So in complete contradiction of the MIM VLA line, Marx made clear that different wage levels between different countries inhere in the capitalist system and their different levels of development and standard of living in them. A condition that has of course been enhanced with the internationalization of capitalism under imperialist monopoly which developed after Marx’s time. So, **different wage levels**

certainly does not make one more or less a proletarian(1). Lenin also observed that to presume there could possibly be an equal distribution of wages under capitalism as MIMP implies(2), “is sheer Proudhonism, stupid philistinism.”63

[MIM(Prisons): 1. We disagree. 2. Lie, this is not our line. This is a theoretical model.]

No Proletariat No State

Yet another Marxist principle proves the VLA line to be absolutely absurd. Namely, that if there is no proletariat in Amerika there by consequence could be no bourgeois nation state(1). Which sounds like vulgar Intercommunalism(2).

[MIM(Prisons): 1. So the definition of imperialism does not include international connections? This logic makes no sense. 2. What is the NABPP-PC's stance on the BPP's intercommunalism? We actually oppose intercommunalism (ask for our study pack on it).]

As we know the state is simply the organized coercive power by which one class exercises its dictatorship over its opposite and irreconcilable internal class. In the case of the capitalist state it is a bourgeois dictatorship over the proletariat principally and other groups, in the case of the socialist state it is a dictatorship of the proletariat in alliance with other non-proletarian workers over the bourgeoisie. Lenin elaborated these principles refuting the revisionist PB in The State and Revolution, August 1917. Here is a key passage:

[MIM(Prisons): Why? Imperialism is international. Totally dogmatic and metaphysical principle. Rashid is pulling at straws trying to justify h own errors and make them all line up as a coherent thesis.]

“The state is a product and manifestation of the irreconcilability of class antagonisms. The state arises where, when and insofar as class antagonisms objectively cannot be reconciled. And, conversely the existence of the state proves that class antagonisms are irreconcilable.”

MIMP admits that Amerika is a nation state(1). Indeed like Lenin, Stalin and Mao they account it an “oppressor nation.” Yet MIMP turns around and claims that the US bourgeoisie has reconciled its contradictions with US workers by means of converting them into a homogenous LA(2). MIMP also claims New Afrikans and other internally oppressed nationalities are a LA too. If MIMP’s line were correct then the US would not and could not exist as a state.(3)

[MIM(Prisons): 1. Amerika is a nation. The United States is a state which is mostly representative of the Amerikan nation, but has allowed some integration only as necessary to maintain its existence. The U\$. state has been historically necessary to spread and maintain Amerikan hegemony. The USA is a military force on all continents. This passage is dogmatically being applied in an obsolete way. 2. Nope, we also say there exists a semi-proletariat, a petty-bourgeoisie, and even (gasp!) a proletariat. 3. ...unless somehow they could transfer wealth from other countries.... maybe using military force... hmm...]

State power, as Lenin observed, “consists of special bodies of armed men [and now wimyn - Rashid] having prisons, etc. at their command.” He further specified that a “standing army and police are the chief instruments of state power.” It is certainly no doubt that Amerika boasts the world’s largest prison system and one of its largest and most formidable military/ police apparatuses.

[MIM(Prisons): We are very clear on why Amerika needs prisons as a tool of national oppression. Statistics show they target the oppressed internal semi-colonies. Presence of a state does not prove the presence of an internal proletariat.]

So if we are to believe MIMP that the US has no opposing internal class that is irreconcilably oppressed by the bourgeoisie (i.e. a proletariat), who are we to imagine are the subjects – and compel such an extensive need – of its massive internal surveillance, police, prison system and standing army? If everyone in Amerika is so securely and happily bribed by and reconciled by the bourgeois ruling class there would and could be no such repressive institutions of bourgeois state power in the US.

[MIM(Prisons): Lie, not our line. The subjects of the massive internal surveillance, police, prison system and standing army are the lumpen of all nations, especially of the internal semi-colonies; the semi-proletariat and proletariat of the Chican@ nation and Raza national minorities; and the labor aristocracy and lumpen of the internal semi-colonies.]

But here again Lenin reveals the class of people who are inclined to argue such revisionist positions as MIMP does on this point. What is most revealing is that all of what MIMP promotes Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao confronted in their own times and opposed. But here is Lenin:

“On the one hand, the bourgeois and particularly the petty bourgeois ideologists, compelled under the weight of indisputable historical facts to admit that the state only exists where there are class antagonisms and class struggle, ‘correct’ Marx in such a way as to make it appear that the state is an organ for the reconciliation of classes. According to Marx, the state could neither have arisen nor maintained itself had it been possible to reconcile classes. From what the petty bourgeois and philistine professors and publicists say, with quite frequent and benevolent references to Marx, it appears that the state does reconcile classes.”

[MIM(Prisons): How does this quote criticize our line? We agree with Marx and Lenin here. On the contrary, we are

clear that the state in the First World exists because of class antagonisms, just not with the petty-bourgeoisie.]

And here we come to yet another of MIMP's revisionist "cardinal principles" that it claims to be Maoist and forbids anyone to disagree with lest they be deemed an enemy. That being what MIMP calls a Joint Dictatorship of the Proletariat of the Oppressed Nations (JDPON). Under this notion MIMP says:

[MIM(Prisons): Not our line, addressed elsewhere in these notations. Rashid takes pot shots at the idea of cardinal principles. But is it not the very definition of a communist that we see the bourgeoisie as the enemy class? And that we sharpen our political line by arguing against enemy political lines? Rashid upholds political struggle but then condemns us for criticizing enemy political lines.]

"In a dictatorship of the proletariat the formerly exploited majority dictates to the minority (who promoted exploitation) how society is to be run. In the case of imperialist nations, a Joint Dictatorship of the Proletariat of the Oppressed Nations must play this role where there is no internal proletariat or significant mass base favoring communism."64

This notion of overthrowing the US ruling class (and there's not even a hint how that might be done under MIMP's claimed Maoist leadership) and creating a socialist state run by an external Third World proletariat is nonsensical since state power reflects internal class contradictions(1). This absurd JDPON theory is predicated on MIMP's line that there is no First World proletariat because the imperialist countries have reconciled their internal class contradictions by means of paying their workers higher wages than Third World workers receive, and there is thus no internal proletariat to seize and exercise state power. A position that as we've pointed out is refuted by Lenin in The State and Revolution.

Any sort of class dictatorship signifies the exercise of state power. How does MIMP suppose state power might be exercised by a Third World proletariat who live outside of US borders over Amerika's economic, political, educational, military, ideological and cultural institutions? **Apparently they suppose that with the overthrow of the bourgeois state borders will instantly vanish(2).** That would be communism, where national states and national borders no longer exist. The instant disappearance of state power is exactly what anarchists call for, and is the very notion Lenin dispelled in his essay on the state. The JDPOM reflects exactly what Lenin described as "petty bourgeois revolutionism, which smacks of anarchism, or borrows something from the latter and, in all essential matters does not measure up to the conditions and requirements of a consistently proletarian class struggle."65

[MIM(Prisons): 1. The necessity of a JDPON is one of our six main points. We're not going to debate Rashid on this point. We will refer readers to further reading however. See further reading for more info. 2. It's possible for the U\$. military to impose its will on people outside of its state borders. Is this concept so absurd to imagine? Borders don't exist without a state to enforce them. Also, we don't follow this logic. We know the JDPON does not equate to communism, which would include an eradication of all borders. The JDPON is a means of imposing socialism on the formerly-imperialist countries.]

Path of Least Resistance

MIMP concedes that prisoners will not make revolution(1) but focuses on this strata because subjectively they're "on the margins, the weakest links in the system, that is where you focus your energy." Yet MIMP went on to **admit to refusing to do any level of work that genuinely threatens the US ruling class because of fear of repression(2)**, which means they are really at best a reformist group. Indeed, they are **so frightened(3)** that they make a point of hiding from the very people they're supposed to lead, just as MIM before them hid its members' identities from their followers under claimed concern to hide from pig repression. Such a concern would have some merit perhaps if MIMP and MIM were actually revolutionary groups.

[MIM(Prisons): Major pig work here, baiting us for information. What information could we provide to Rashid to prove to him that we do revolutionary work? Maybe our tax returns, so he could determine if we fit his definition of proletariat, and thus permit us to lead the masses in the United States? 1. Lie, we don't say that. 2. Lie. What does Rashid know about whether our work threatens the ruling class? He gives no examples of what he suggests we should do, except to live amongst those we(he?) considers to be proletariat. If Rashid is advocating taking up arms now, which is something we say we are not yet prepared to do, then we would say that's focoism. 3. If a petty-bourgeois intellectual were "so frightened" then why wouldn't they just retreat into their petty-bourgeois leisure time, which would be incredibly easy to do. It's not like we do this work for fun or for recognition.]

However MIMP is admittedly **no threat(1)** and doesn't intend to be, so it has **no need to fear retribution and therefore no need to hide(2)**. But what really discredits their claims is in today's super-surveillance Amerika, it's rather absurd for MIMP to pretend to believe the pigs don't know who they are when they **have a publishing outlet, email and internet accounts, attend rallies, table literature, deliver and collect mail from a decades-old post office box, etc(3)**. Is MIMP serious?

[MIM(Prisons): 1. MIM is the only political prisoner support group that was listed in the report "The Problem of Gangs and Security Threat Groups in American Prisons and Jails Today" (2012) as "The Maoist International Movement (MIM) exists to spread communist ideology among inmates incarcerated in American jails and prisons. It seeks to radicalize prison inmates and give them a platform for organizing resistance against the American government. If your inmates are corresponding with MIM, you might have a problem brewing." So obviously we're not NO threat. 2. Here we recommend further reading on COINTELPRO, Ward Churchill, the CIA's secret war against the AIM and BPP... even anti-imperialist liberals like Edward

Snowden and Julian Assange need to engage in security practices to protect themselves from U.S. retribution. 3. So Rashid sees an extensive practice we have, yet claims we do nothing?]

What a lot of MIMP followers might find surprising since most of them are racial and national minorities who've bought into MIMP's anti-PB, anti-white working class, and anti-"USA" rhetoric, is MIMists have always been a small clique of PB white Amerikans, as many on the outside who've interacted with them well know. **Enaemaehkiw Tupac Keshena, a past member of the African Peoples Socialist Party who's long engaged the MIM line, observed that MIMP is among several splinter groups "that emerged from the collapse of the somewhat infamous American white radical group known as the Maoist Internationalist Movement."**⁶⁶ According to its old handbook *What is the Maoist Internationalist Movement?*⁶⁷ the old MIM said it was founded by a majority of national minorities and wimyn, but this composition quickly changed to a majority of white male Amerikans according to various sources that interacted with MIM over its years of existence.

[MIM(Prisons): Identity politics. Based on individual interactions. And if Rashid considers white male Amerikans to be proletarian, then why would that be a problem anyway? 1. What is the point of the citation given except to claim credibility by offering "insider info"? We encourage our readers to think scientifically and not bother with identity politics, which maybe is a way to brush off our alleged white petty-bourgeois standing, or maybe it's a way to find the most correct line and avoid being duped by the bourgeoisie by trusting people because of "who" they are. As a New Afrikan prisoner, identity politics does a lot to garner support for Rashid's political perspective. And this essay from Rashid does the work of cops by fishing for identifying information, and pushing the labor aristocracy debate further away from scientific thinking.]

One must question, in light of MIMP's racial, class and national make-up, whether the insistence on concealing its members' identities from even its most loyal followers isn't to avoid having to confront the blatant **hypocrisy(1)** and **contradiction(2)** between its years of blistering denunciations of white, PB, Amerikan **"settlers"(3)**, and the fact that this is the very character of its own membership. Especially given the long historical experience of people of color in Amerika having their struggles and movements coopted, subverted and taken over by "white Amerikan settlers", which is the theme of the J. Sakai book that the MIMists concocted the VLA line from.⁶⁸ This actually comports more with reality than their claimed concern to avoid pig repression, when they admit **unwillingness to engage in any political work that might actually provoke any such repression.(4)**

[MIM(Prisons): 1. Not sure what would be hypocritical about ANYONE (even petty-bourgeois Amerikans) adopting a material analysis. 2. Everything has contradiction, that is the basis of dialectics. Does Rashid fear contradiction or believe that to not be true? 3. Does Rashid not think Amerika is a settler nation? Why the quote marks? 3. Political work should provoke repression? What practice does Rashid want us to take up?]

MIMP is of course fond of advertising that its newsletters are **randomly(1)** censored by various prisons, as if censorship gives them revolutionary credibility and evidences that their work is the target of pig repression. Quite the contrary, as **prison officials frequently and with much greater unanimity and regularity censor cultural publications especially on Indigenous, New Afrikan/Black, Latino history etc., all varieties of pornography – from the mildest to hard core – rap magazines like Vibe, Source, XXL and so on.(2)** None of which has the slightest revolutionary orientation. MIMP's greatest "threat" to the status quo we feel is that by promoting Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao, they do get prisoners into reading the right material and some, with a bit of critical and persistent study do make the distinction between MIM and MLM, and come to embrace the genuinely revolutionary line. Quite a few of whom are now members of NABPP-PC, or are informed by our analyses and practice.

[MIM(Prisons): 1. It's not random censorship. Why does Rashid think it's random? Has he ever read our censor reports or looked at the censor data on our website? Well clearly Rashid has a hard time detecting patterns, so we shouldn't be surprised he thinks censorship of our material is random. 2. Rashid is not connecting the censorship of the materials he listed to national oppression of internal semi-colonies. Total Amerikan apologism.]

But on the points of choosing the easiest path and being paralyzed by fear of retribution, let us return to contrasting the line of MIMP with that of MLM.

The claim of pursuing the path of least resistance and greater safety as if politically commendable for communists(1), flies in the face of MLM. As one of Lenin's closest Party comrades and wife Nadezhda Krupskaya recalled, Lenin's revolutionary Party was tempered by struggling under the most difficult adversities and did not seek **comfort and ease:(2)**

[MIM(Prisons): 1. We don't make this claim or try to do this. 2. Total baiting and ridiculous. To say being semi-underground is comfortable or easy is bullshit. And there is a big difference between seeking comfort and ease, and analyzing the weakest link in existing contradictions and targeting it. Is Rashid saying that since we're not in prison, the work we do is comfortable and easy? Being semi-underground might even in some ways be considered a threat to our safety, because we could be killed on "accident" very easily and no one would know or care that it was probably politically motivated. At least if Rashid died, people would wonder if it was a politically motivated murder.]

"Prior to the Revolution of 1905 the Bolsheviks showed themselves capable of making good use of every legal possibility of forging ahead and rallying the masses behind them under the most adverse conditions. Step by step, beginning with the

campaign for tea service and ventilation they had led the masses up to the national armed insurrection. The ability to adjust oneself to the most adverse conditions and at the same time to stand out and maintain one's high-principled positions – such were the traditions of Leninism.”⁶⁹

In “‘Left-wing’ Communism: An Infantile Disorder”, Lenin himself argued at length that revolutionaries must go wherever the workers are, even in the most difficult places, including reactionary trade unions and even the bourgeois parliaments. He specifically opposed the PB line of going where work was easiest.

We of course recognize prisoners in Amerika to be an important strata of the oppressed and, **contrary to MIMP's line(1)**, see them as originating from among the proletariat and **lumpen (“broken”) proletariat,(2)** and as such have the class basis to become genuine revolutionary communists, especially if exposed to a correct revolutionary proletarian line. **MIMP does not see prisoners in this light so doesn't work to politicize them to this end.(3)**

[MIM(Prisons): 1. We see most prisoners as coming from the lumpen. 2. Rashid criticizes our line as being too simple, and here Rashid does the same thing he is criticizing us about. 3. Lie. And earlier Rashid said all we do is send out literature and run study groups. But we're not educating them to become genuine revolutionary communists, interesting...]

We do recognize that while on the inside prisoners cannot realistically impact the imperialist system at the point of production, but their struggles and developed revolutionary insight can catalyze work and struggles on the outside. Also, 90% or more of them will be returned to society at some point so they represent a vast body of potential revolutionary cadre. And as said, the Prison Chapter of the NABPP aims to educate, organize, unite and enlist them **while living and struggling right alongside them, sharing their hardships and learning from their same experiences, not preaching at them from a separate and isolated position of leisure and privilege(1)**, sitting safely behind a keyboard talking shit without a shred of experience nor success in solving any of their problems. Doing as Mao denounced, “trailing behind mass spontaneity waving one's hands and criticizing.” **We also have a strategy and program that extends to building outside broadly based revolutionary Parties with roots in all oppressed sectors.(2)**

[MIM(Prisons): 1. Rashid is saying only prisoners should provide revolutionary leadership...? And that people outside of prison should not work with prisoners to advance revolutionary leadership...? 2. Stupid to say MIM and MIM(Prisons) don't also offer this service.]

MIMP's exclusive focus on prisoners while calling itself a revolutionary Marxist leadership is contradicted by Lenin, who explained that any such leadership must focus on every strata and build hundreds of groups to educate and organize them. Or collapse or end in becoming tiny bureaucratic groups, which is the exact experience of MIM and MIMP. Yet MIMP portrays their tiny clique, commandist posture and self-isolation from the masses as commendable practices. Here's Lenin in his own words; A revolutionary leadership, he said: **[MIM(Prisons): Seems like baiting. Obviously we would want to be hundreds of groups and focus on every strata, but unfortunately we aren't large or popular enough to do that, so we focus where we think we can have the biggest impact. None of our literature says otherwise.]**

“must be sure to organize, organize, organize hundreds of circles, completely pushing into the background the customary, well meant committee (hierarchic) stupidities ... Either you create new fresh energetic battle organizations everywhere for revolutionary Social Democratic work of all varieties among all strata, or you will go under wearing the aureole of ‘committee’ bureaucrats.”⁷⁰

[MIM(Prisons): See the United Front for Peace in Prisons, prisoner-led study groups, oppressed nation parties and lumpen organizations that we partner with on campaigns..... Rashid has no idea of our practice.]

Also contrary to MIMP's resorting to a small exclusivist organizational response in fear of and response to the history of repression, Lenin in fact “opened wide the doors of the Party” in response to intense repression not only to counter efforts to reduce it to a small localized clique, but because under such repression only the most sincere elements would be drawn to join the Party and face pig attack, thus expanding its ranks with a formidable body of recruits.⁷¹

As for Mao, he of course never shunned difficulty. His position is exactly the opposite of what MIMP has said. Here's what he stated in October 1945:

“What is work? Work is struggle. There are difficulties and problems in these places for us to overcome and solve. We go there to work and struggle to overcome these difficulties. **A good comrade is one who is eager to go where the difficulties are greatest.**”

[MIM(Prisons): We still don't know what Rashid wants....]

And again in December 1945:

“We must thoroughly clear away all ideas among our cadre of winning easy victories, through good luck, without hard work

and bitter struggle, without sweat and blood.”

Matter of fact Mao not only didn't shun work that might provoke enemy repression, but instead he measured the effectiveness of revolutionary work by how extreme the level of enemy repression it generated. And **people like MIMP who aim to reduce and avoid repression** he deemed little better than the enemy. In fact the title of his article from which the relevant passage is taken says it all. The title being, “To be Attacked by the Enemy is Not a Bad Thing But a Good Thing” (May 26, 1939). Here's what he said in relevant part: **[MIM(Prisons): Only an idealist with no practice could take such a view that the work we do is to reduce and avoid repression. And are you opposing efforts to reduce repression? So you would oppose prisoners being calculated in how they communicate with other prisoners about the study group that they are running, or about the strike that they are planning, because that would be an effort to reduce repression? If we feared attack by the enemy, we would change our line and tactics, or simply stop doing this work. We are security conscious because we want to remain as useful as possible to the international communist movement, for as long as possible.]**

“I hold that it is bad as far as we are concerned if a person, a political party, an army or a school is not attacked by the enemy for in that case it would definitely mean that we have sunk to the level of the enemy. It is good if we are attacked by the enemy since it proves that we have drawn a clear line of demarcation between the enemy and ourselves. It is still better if the **enemy attacks us wildly and paints us as utterly black and without a single virtue**; it demonstrates that we have not only drawn a clear line of demarcation between the enemy and ourselves but achieved a great deal in our work.”
[MIM(Prisons): Hmm this sounds like it's describing this exact polemic.]

MIM's line and practice reflect what is typical of the unremolded PB. As Marx said, they **want to make capitalist society as comfortable and tolerable for themselves as possible(1)**. MIMP out of admitted dread and a desire to at all costs **avoid official attack(2)**, refuses to base itself among and unite with the broad masses and on top of this they embrace completely contrived analyses of classes in Amerika so to justify refusing to unite with the actual proletariat in Amerika.

[MIM(Prisons): 1. LOL. Tell me more about this! This is exactly what organizing the labor aristocracy around their economic interests does! (in Rashid's words, organizing the “proletariat” against their “exploitation”) 2. There's a difference between avoiding official attack and protecting our ability to do this work. Rashid could not be famous without people on the outside typing, formatting, etc. his work. Would he tell all those people that they'd be better off surrendering all security precautions and basically volunteering themselves for repression and harassment by the pigs?]

And MIMP demonstrably fears the masses, electing to focus exclusively on prisoners because MIMP fears being challenged, which as Mao observed they could not so easily prevent the outside masses from doing. Whereas they can silence prisoners by threat of withdrawing support, **newsletter subscriptions(1)**, or their participation in MIMP study groups and correspondence (**which reaches a need for social interaction that many US prisoners are torturously denied and thus in desperate need of(2)**). And what's ironic is MIMP recognizes all of the foregoing to be PB tendencies and have identified and critiqued them in the practice of others, they just don't want to recognize that they practice them and are themselves PB. Maoists practice equally criticism and self-criticism.

[MIM(Prisons): 1. We never withdraw newsletter subscriptions. 2. The PIGS are the ones who deny social interaction that U.S. prisoners are in need of. The STATE is who locks people up in prisons for bullshit reasons (which Rashid says has nothing to do with national oppression?). Don't fucking blame MIM(Prisons) for the conditions of confinement that the state imposes on the oppressed nations in the United States.]

Racial/National Chauvinism – Tactics of Divide and Conquer

As we've mentioned the work central to the creation of the MIMist VLA line was J. Sakai's Settlers72 and anti-Marxist analysis of race (which replaces race for class as the principal form of oppression in Amerika). Settlers cites episodes from the extensive history of “white” racial oppression of people of color in Amerika and the relative privileged status that “whites” at all social-economic levels have enjoyed at the expense of peoples of color, and which has allowed even working class and poor whites to betray the interests of their counterparts of color. The main theme of Settlers is “white” racial treachery, betrayal, brutality and privilege that claims to know no class distinction. The conclusion being that these factors combine to create a uniform **class of “whiteness”** that has no proletarian sector.

[MIM(Prisons): Rashid talks about race instead of national oppression. Race is metaphysical. Stalin taught about nations. MIM(Prisons) never talks about race. Rashid is denying nation. Racism is an idea used to support national oppression. Rashid's “class of ‘whiteness’” is what materialists call the nation of Amerika.]

We contrast Sakai's narrow work with the broader and exhaustive works of Marxist proletarian intellectual Theodore Allen, particularly his two volume study The Invention of the White Race. Applying a political economic analysis he demonstrates that race and racism were/are created and manipulated by the ruling class as a tool to divide the working class against itself and only to the benefit of the ruling class.

Sakai's work is geared more to the incitement of visceral reactions to the horrors of the practice of white supremacy and driving home the

subjective theme of inherent treacherousness of “whites”. This to the end of **inciting people of color to look upon all “whites” as a collective oppressor class(1)** and to erase the class lines that exist between and separate ruling class and working class “whites”. Sakai’s **non-materialist study(2)** readily appeals to the affective mind. Allen’s work by contrast materially examines the methods and history behind the ruling class’s schemes that created race and racism, and incited workers and other strata against each other in the name of racial supremacy and counter-racial narratives which have perpetuated ongoing racial alienation, competition, subordination and so on. This has served to suppress and divert the collective outrage of the overall oppressed masses into channels that have protected and advanced the wealth, power and interests of the ruling class. Allen also examines how the concept of “whiteness” has been used and serves to blind “whites” to the sufferings imposed by “whiteness” on racialized “others” and **he further demonstrates that ultimately “whites” do not benefit from racism or the sense of racial privilege and entitlement.(3)** Allen’s work is geared more to the cognitive materialist mind that is interested in understanding the origins, roots and purpose of race and racism and how to counter its divisive and often catastrophic impact on oppressed peoples of all colors and especially the proletariat.

[MIM(Prisons): No, it is inciting everyone to look at the history of Amerika as a separate nation, not a class. 2. What is non-materialist about it? It's history. Did Sakai just make it all up? Sakai demonstrated how whites benefited from national oppression. Rather than address Sakai's arguments, Rashid just generalizes that it's wrong and “non-materialist.” 3. Rashid, have you read the book *The New Jim Crow*? What did you think about it? This is really an amazing statement that should throw Rashid's credibility completely out the window.]

Allen’s treatment of the question race and white supremacy comports with what Mao himself saw and in fact struggled against with great effect in China. In fact the revolution that he led confronted a condition in China not much different than the racial divisions in Amerika, as between the historically and socially privileged Han majority and many dozens of minority nationalities. As Mao noted:

[MIM(Prisons): Rashid is unable to analyze Amerikan society, instead just resorting to saying China's conditions in 1949 were “not much different than the racial divisions in Amerika”!]

“Over nine-tenths of [China's] inhabitants belong to the Han nationality. There are also scores of minority nationalities, including the Mongol, Hui, Tibetan, Uighur, Miao, Yi, Chuang, Chungchia and Korean nationalities, all with long histories though at different levels of cultural development. Thus China is a country with a very large population composed of many nationalities”.⁷³

Unlike MIMP and the revisionist VLA line, he didn’t account the Han of which he was himself a member, a non-proletarian LA because of its history, up till the period of China’s revolution, of relative privilege and domination over the other Chinese groups. Rather, he approached the struggle as one of all nationalities being oppressed by imperialism and the Chinese ruling classes. He also led the struggle of the Han against their conditioned sense of “entitled” social privilege, domination and superiority over others. And not only this but also the need for struggle of the minority groups who also entertain and practice their own forms of chauvinism against the Han and other nationalities. Which is exactly what **the VLA line is – a position that postulates the basis for minority national and racial chauvinism against “white” Amerikans.** Here again is Mao:

[MIM(Prisons): We agree with Mao that the Han majority were not labor aristocracy. Rashid is now equating the labor aristocracy line to racism. If rich workers are so advanced as postulated earlier, then how come Amerikans can't figure out what the Han did to lead a multi-national revolution against imperialism?]

“[Minority nationalities] inhabit extensive regions which comprise 50 to 60 percent of China’s total area. It is thus imperative to foster good relations between the Han people and the minority nationalities. Both Han chauvinism and local-nationality chauvinism are harmful to the unity of the nationalities; they represent one kind of contradiction among the people which should be resolved.”⁷⁴

Even after the communist overthrow of the old oppressive Chinese system Han chauvinism persisted in many areas. And Mao correctly identified this as a continuation of feudal and bourgeois ideas which could only be cured by the masses’ mastery of Marxism and a correct communist national policy. In his March 1953 article “Criticize Han Chauvinism”⁷⁵, Mao identifies the problem and leads its resolution. Although we previously quoted in part from this article in a different context it warrants quoting here at length:

“In some places the relations between nationalities are far from normal. For Communists this is an intolerable situation. We must go to the root and criticize the Han chauvinist ideas which exist to a serious degree among many Party members and cadres, namely, the reactionary ideas of the landlord class and bourgeoisie or the ideas characteristic of the Kuomintang, which are manifested in the relations between nationalities. Mistakes in this respect must be corrected at once. Delegations led by comrades who are familiar with our nationality policy and full of sympathy for our minority nationality compatriots still suffering from discrimination should be sent to visit the areas where there are minority nationalities, make a serious effort at investigation and study and help Party and government organizations in the localities discover and solve problems. The visits should not be those of ‘looking at flowers on horseback.’

“Judging from the mass of information on hand, the Central Committee holds that wherever there are minority nationalities

the general rule is that there are problems calling for solution and in some cases very serious ones. On the surface all is quiet, but actually there are some very serious problems. What has come to light in various places in the last two or three years shows that Han chauvinism exists almost everywhere. It will be very dangerous if we fail now to give timely education and resolutely overcome Han chauvinism in the Party and among the people. The problem in the relations between nationalities which reveals itself in the Party and among the people in many places is the existence of Han chauvinism to a serious degree and not just a matter of its vestiges. In other words, bourgeois ideas dominate the minds of those comrades and people who have had no Marxist education and have not grasped the nationality policy of the Central Committee. Therefore, education must be assiduously carried out so that this problem can be solved step by step. Moreover, the newspapers should publish more articles based on specific facts to criticize Han chauvinism openly and educate the Party members and the people.”

Many think that China is and has always been a territory composed of a single race, ethnicity or nationality of people. Not so. Huey P Newton, the BPP’s co-founder discovered this upon his 1971 visit to and tour of revolutionary China. But what he also found and was amazed by, was how the revolution had resolved much of the chauvinism and discrimination between groups that Mao identified and led the struggle against. Not only that, but Huey was so impressed by what he witnessed, that it profoundly influenced and informed his own strategy of building self-sufficiency in New Afrikan/Black communities in Amerika, and developing ties to those of other national and racial minorities in Amerika, and also the “white” Amerikan majority. Here’s what he bore witness to and its impact on his thinking:

“I saw crystal clear how we can start to reduce the kinds of conflicts that we’re having in this country. I saw an example of that in China ... What I saw was this: when I went there I was very unenlightened and I thought, as it has been said so often, that China would be a homogenous kind of racial/ethnic territory. Then I found that 50 percent of the Chinese territory is occupied by a 54 percent population of national minorities, large ethnic minorities. They speak different languages, they look very different, they eat different foods. Yet, there is no conflict. I observed one day that each region – we call them cities – is actually controlled by these ethnic minorities, yet they’re still Chinese.... I’m talking about a general condition in China where ethnic minorities I’ve observed control their whole regions. They have a right to have representation in the Chinese Communist Party. At the same time they have their own principles.... The cities in this country could be organized like that, with community control. At the same time, not black control so that no whites can come in, no Chinese can come in. I’m saying there would be democracy in the inner city. The administration should reflect the population of the people there.”⁷⁶

Actually the Russian revolution also confronted and overcame a similar condition of contending national and racial groups, of which the Russians were the majority. In fact in his struggle against Stalin for Party leadership following Lenin’s death, Leon Trotsky attempted to incite animosity against Stalin because he was a member of the Georgian national minority, which Trotsky cited as the basis for what he attacked as a source of genetic inferiority, namely a basic racist attack on Stalin. In his huge biography Stalin, Trotsky went to great lengths to undermine Stalin’s revolutionary work, life and even “moral stature” as the result of his racial inferiority, first raising the question of whether Stalin had “an admixture of Mongolian blood”, then attributed the flaws Trotsky imputed to him as characteristic of Stalin’s Georgian ethnicity, where “in addition to the so-called Southern type, which is characterized by a combination of lazy shiftlessness and explosive irascibility, one meets cold natures in whom phlegm is combined with stubbornness and slyness.”

Lenin also combatted the national chauvinism which the imperialists incited in the proletarians of their respective countries, to win their allegiance so they’d fight world wars against other proletarians, and carry out atrocities against each other as grim and heinous as those inflicted by “white” Amerikan racists against other so-called races (who were/are actually minority nationalities, i.e. New Afrikans, Mexicans, Asians, Puerto Ricans, etc.).

[MIM(Prisons): Here Rashid uses the term “minority nationalities” instead of races. Why? What is different from above?]

But Lenin didn’t denounce these First World proletarians who were massacring each other by the millions as hopelessly counter-revolutionary, because they’d been manipulated by their “own” national bourgeoisie to commit atrocities against each other, which the so-called revolutionary leadership of the second Communist International supported. Instead **he – recognizing that it was a leadership problem – founded the Third Communist International (Comintern)(1)** to create, coordinate and organize revolutionary ML Parties in the imperialist countries to root their masses in Marxism and “turn the World War into Civil Wars”, where the proletarians would instead of killing each other for the bourgeoisie turn their guns on their “own” national bourgeoisie and engage in civil wars to overthrow them. This, as Mao recognized in uniting the various Chinese nationalities against the imperialists and their Chinese bourgeois puppets, is the same ideological political approach we must take to counter national and racial chauvinism in Amerika as opposed to the **national/racial chauvinist VLA(2)** line that MIMP and other PB “theorists” promote.

[MIM(Prisons): 1. Why did Stalin dissolve the Comintern? This is just as important to understand as why he initially founded the Comintern. 2. Chauvinism of whom? The oppressed nations? Again equating the labor aristocracy line to racism. And what about criticizing Han chauvinism? Why was that not a problem to Rashid (aside from being completely different historical conditions, which we would understand, but Rashid earlier said race relations in Amerika today are basically the same as national contradictions in China in 1949 so we’ll assume “different historical periods” is not going to be his answer).]

Conclusion

The LA is very real and has been in control of the so-called labor movement and mainstream labor groups and Parties in First World countries (and in the Third World) since the major imperialist counter-revolutionary drive against Communism post-World War I and especially since World War II. But the unremolded PB has proven to be the most treacherous counter-revolutionary element during this period in undermining and overthrowing socialist struggles and states.

What does history teach us? Who drowned the Paris Commune in blood? – the liberal bourgeoisie. Who was the Russian Revolution made against? – the liberals, Mensheviks and Social Democrats. The Chinese Revolution was made against the formerly revolutionary Kuomintang (KMT) 20 years after the Chinese Communist Party was nearly wiped out by Chiang Kai Chek's betrayal and the Shanghai Massacre. The formerly revolutionary KDP put down the German Revolution (Spartacist) and paved the way to the Nazi's rise to power. The Communist Party of India bloodily repressed the Naxalite Rebellion in India. Capitalist restoration in Russia, China, Albania, etc. was carried out by the right wing of the revolutionary movement and leadership. Time and again it has been the PB within the revolutionary movement with its revisionist politics and ideology, the would-be and formerly revolutionary comrades who have proven to be the die-hard enemies of the proletariat. Mao above all understood this well, and this is why he enjoined us to not be liberal and not allow the PB and its contentions to be given sway. The class basis of the ideological and political line is what makes the fundamental difference between the teachings and practice of MLM versus the MIM line. The former is proletarian and revolutionary, the latter is PB and revisionist/ reactionary.

[MIM(Prisons): So it's okay for Rashid to call us reactionary/revisionist but when we identify a line as enemy line, it is somehow bad?]

We quite literally could go on and on, but our point is not to harp on MIMP's many errors. Our aim is to point out fundamental harmful deviations from a revolutionary communist perspective and encourage MIMP and their followers and others with similar views to honestly reflect upon, self-criticize and struggle to correct their mistakes. Because as it stands, their line and objective practice (or lack thereof) puts them at odds with the proletariat while they promote in empty words to be its champion. And while **we do not account MIMP to be a revolutionary Party of the proletariat**, it postures as a revolutionary leadership, so we close with the following quote from Lenin:

[MIM(Prisons): Right, MIM(Prisons) is not a party. We agree with that. We are a cell of revolutionaries. Read about our organization or shut the fuck up.]

“A political Party's attitude towards its own mistakes is one of the most important and surest ways of judging how earnest the party is and how it fulfills in practice its obligations towards its class and the working people. Frankly acknowledging a mistake, ascertaining the reasons for it, analyzing the conditions that have led up to it, and thrashing out the means of its rectification – that is the hallmark of a serious Party; that is how it should perform its duties, and how it should educate and train its class, and then the masses. By failing to fulfill this duty and give the utmost attention and consideration to the study of their patent error the ‘Lefts’ ... [prove] that they are not a party of a class but a circle, not a party of the masses but a group of intellectualists and of a few workers who are the worst features of intellectualism.”⁷⁷

Dare to Struggle Dare to Win! All Power to the People!

1. Kevin “Rashid” Johnson, “Answering A Revisionist Line on the Labor Aristocracy,” August 25, 2013, can be read at rashidmod.com/?p=879 [↔]
2. Wiawimawo of MIM (Prisons), “Rashid's Empty Rhetoric on the Labor Aristocracy,” Under Lock and Key, No. 34 (Sept./Oct. 2013), pp. 8-9. [↔]
3. Mao Tse-tung, “Rectify the Party's Style of Work,” Feb. 1, 1942. [↔]
4. Mao Tse-tung, “Reading Notes on the Soviet Text Political Economy,” Critique of Soviet Economics, trans. Moss Roberts (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1977), p. 110. [↔]
5. Karl Marx, “The Class Struggle in France 1848 to 1850,” Marx and Engels Selected Works (Moscow: Progress Publishers 1973), Vol. 1, p. 282. [↔]
6. Karl Marx, The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte (Moscow: Progress Publishers, emphasis in original), pp. 43-44. [↔]
7. Mao asked “Who are our friends? Who are our enemies? ... To distinguish real friends from real enemies, we must make a general analysis of the economic status of the various classes in ... society and of their respective attitudes toward the revolution.” “Analysis of the classes in Chinese society,” March 1926. [↔]
8. Mao Tse-tung, “On Practice: On the Relationship Between Knowledge and Practice, Between Knowing and Doing,” July 1937. [↔]
9. Karl Marx, “Preface and Introduction to A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy,” (Peking: Foreign Language Press), p. 3. [↔]
10. V.I. Lenin, “The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism,” March 1913. [↔]
11. Mao Tse-tung, “Talk at the Yen-an Forum on Literature and Art,” May 1942. [↔]
12. V.I. Lenin, “‘Left-wing’ childishness and the Petty Bourgeois Mentality,” May 5, 1918. [↔]
13. V.I. Lenin, “‘Left-wing’ Communism – An Infantile Disorder,” April/May 1920. [↔]
14. V.I. Lenin, “‘Left-wing’ Communism – An Infantile Disorder,” April/May 1920. [↔]
15. MIMP maintains the position as one of its six “Cardinal Principles,” that the LA is a new PB, stating in the front of each issue of its Under Lock and Key newsletter: the “so-called workers” of the First World countries are “bought off by imperialism [and] form a new petty bourgeoisie called the labor aristocracy.” [↔]
16. Ibid. In each issue of Under Lock and Key MIMP states as to its six Cardinal “Principles,” “We consider other organizations actively upholding these

- points to be fraternal”. And as to its prisoner-based groups, “members don’t have to agree with MIM (Prisons)’s cardinal points ... but they can’t consciously disagree with any of them either.” [↔]
17. V.I. Lenin, “‘Left-wing’ Communism – An Infantile Disorder,” April/May 1920. [↔]
 18. Mao Tse-tung, “Revolutionary Forces of the World Unite, Fight Against Imperialist Aggression!” November 1948. [↔]
 19. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Volume 19 (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1960-1970), p. 398. [↔]
 20. V.I. Lenin, “Marxism and Revisionism,” April 1908. Lenin also recognized revisionism to be the continuation of pre-Marxist socialism or utopian socialism. [↔]
 21. Wiawimawo of MIM (Prisons), “Rashid’s Empty Rhetoric on the Labor Aristocracy,” *Under Lock and Key*, No. 34 (Sept./Oct. 2013), pp. 8-9. [↔]
 22. Mao Tse-tung, “Talks to an Enlarged Central Work Conference,” January 30, 1962. [↔]
 23. V.I. Lenin, “‘Left-wing’ Communism – An Infantile Disorder,” April/May 1920. [↔]
 24. Kevin “Rashid” Johnson, “Answering A Revisionist Line on the Labor Aristocracy,” August 25, 2013, can be read at rashidmod.com/?p=879 [↔]
 25. Mao Tse-tung, “Speech at the Assembly of Representatives of the Shenshi-Kansu-Ningsia Border Region,” 1942. [↔]
 26. Mao Tse-tung, “Talk at the Yen’an Forum on Literature and Art,” May 1942. [↔]
 27. V.I. Lenin, “‘Left-wing’ Communism – An Infantile Disorder,” April/May 1920. [↔]
 28. *Under Lock and Key*, Vol. 39, p. 8. [↔]
 29. This was stated by MIMP in a letter to us of December 2013. [↔]
 30. Mao Tse-tung, “Combat Liberalism,” September 7, 1937. [↔]
 31. Mao Tse-tung, “Talks to an Enlarged Central Work Conference,” January 30, 1962. [↔]
 32. Mao Tse-tung, “On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People,” February 27, 1957. [↔]
 33. Mao Tse-tung, “On Practice: On the Relationship Between Knowledge and Practice, Between Knowing and Doing,” July 1937. [↔]
 34. Mao Tse-tung, “Talks to an Enlarged Central Work Conference,” January 30, 1962. [↔]
 35. Mao Tse-tung, “Talks to an Enlarged Central Work Conference,” January 30, 1962. [↔]
 36. Mao Tse-tung, “Speech at the Assembly of Representatives of the Shenshi-Kansu-Ningsia Border Region,” 1942. [↔]
 37. Joseph Stalin, *Marxism and the Problem of Linguistics* (Peking: Foreign Language Press, 1972) p. 29. [↔]
 38. Mao Tse-tung, “The Role of the Chinese Communist Party in the National War,” October 1938. [↔]
 39. Mao Tse-tung, “Oppose Stereotyped Party Writing,” February 8, 1942. [↔]
 40. Mao Tse-tung, “Talks to an Enlarged Central Work Conference,” January 30, 1962. [↔]
 41. Mao Tse-tung, “Talks to an Enlarged Central Work Conference,” January 30, 1962. [↔]
 42. V.I. Lenin, “‘Left-wing’ Communism – An Infantile Disorder,” April/May 1920. [↔]
 43. Quoted in Ralph Carter Elwood, “Lenin and Pravda, 1912-1914,” *Slavic Review*, Volume 31, No.2, June 1972. [↔]
 44. V.I. Lenin, “The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism,” March 1913. [↔]
 45. V.I. Lenin, “Our Programme.” First published 1925. [↔]
 46. Mao Tse-tung, “Talks on Questions of Philosophy,” August 18, 1964. [↔]
 47. Mao Tse-tung, “Statement Calling on the People of the World to Unite to Oppose Racial Discrimination in the US and Support the American Negroes in Their Struggle Against Racial Discrimination,” August 8, 1963. [↔]
 48. Joseph Stalin, “The Foundations of Leninism,” April 1924. [↔]
 49. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Volume 20, pp. 411-412. [↔]
 50. Joseph Stalin, “The Foundations of Leninism,” April 1924, note 48 [↔]
 51. Joseph Stalin, “Concerning the Question of the Proletariat and the Peasantry,” January 27, 1975. [↔]
 52. Mao Tse-Tung, “Criticize Han Chauvinism,” March 16, 1953. [↔]
 53. V.I. Lenin, “*Collected Works*,” Volume 4, p. 280. [↔]
 54. V.I. Lenin, “*Collected Works*,” Volume 4, p. 282. [↔]
 55. V.I. Lenin, Preface to French and German Edition to “*Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*.” [↔]
 56. V.I. Lenin, Preface to French and German Edition to “*Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*.” [↔]
 57. Frederick Engels, quoted in V.I. Lenin, Preface to French and German Edition to “*Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*.” [↔]
 58. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, pp. 366-367, 368. [↔]
 59. Joseph Stalin, “The Foundations of Leninism,” April 1924. [↔]
 60. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, p. 217. [↔]
 61. *Under Lock and Key*, Vol. 39, p. 8. [↔]
 62. Karl Marx, *Wages, Price and Profit* (Peking: Foreign Language Press), 1975. [↔]
 63. V.I. Lenin, “‘Left-wing’ Communism – An Infantile Disorder,” April/May 1920. [↔]
 64. MIMP publishes this statement as one of its Cardinal Principles in each issue of *Under Lock and Key*. [↔]
 65. V.I. Lenin, “On the Slogan for a United States of Europe,” August 23, 1915. [↔]
 66. Enaemaehkiw Tupac Keshena, “A Critical Look at the Politics of the Leading Light Communist Organization”. [↔]
 67. What is the Maoist Internationalist Movement? (First ed. July 1991/Second ed. September 1995). [↔]
 68. J. Sakai, *Settlers: Mythology of the White Proletariat From Mayflower to Modern* (republished Montreal: Kersplebedeb, 2014). [↔]
 69. Nadezhda Krupskaya, *Reminiscence of Lenin* (New York: International Publishers, 1970), p. 167. [↔]
 70. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Volume 8, pp. 145-146. [↔]
 71. V.I. Lenin, “‘Left-wing’ Communism – An Infantile Disorder,” April/May 1920. [↔]
 72. J. Sakai, *Settlers: Mythology of the White Proletariat From Mayflower to Modern* (republished Montreal: Kersplebedeb, 2014). [↔]
 73. Mao Tse-tung, “The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party,” December 1939. [↔]
 74. Mao Tse-tung, “On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People,” February 27, 1957 [↔]
 75. Mao Tse-tung, “Criticize Han Chauvinism” March 16, 1953. [↔]
 76. David Hilliard and Donald Weiss, eds., *The Huey P. Newton Reader* (New York: Seven Stories Press, 2002) pp. 279- 280. [↔]
 77. V.I. Lenin, “‘Left-wing’ Communism – An Infantile Disorder,” April/May 1920 [↔]

1 Response to "MIM or MLM? Confronting the Divergent Politics of the Petty Bourgeois "Left" On the Labor Aristocracy and Other Burning Issues in Today's Revolutionary Struggle"

1. **Free Criticism** says: February 1, 2015 at 11:53 pm ,Is the Black Nation an Oppressor Nation? A response to Kevin "Rashid" Johnson.

In 1913, Lenin wrote a short work titled "Russians and Negroes." The work is definitely worth reading in its entirety, as its shortness conceals a huge depth of theoretical insight. Basically, Lenin is making a comparison between the lives of American Negroes circa 1913 and Russians. To quote Lenin:

It is a permissible comparison. The Negroes were the last to be freed from slavery, and they still bear, more than anyone else, the cruel marks of slavery—even in advanced countries—for capitalism has no "room" for other than legal emancipation, and even the latter it curtails in every possible way.

..half a century later, the Russians still show many more traces of slavery than the Negroes. Indeed, it would be more accurate to speak of institutions and not merely of traces. But in this short article we shall limit ourselves to a little illustration of what we have said, namely, the question of literacy. It is known that illiteracy is one of the marks of slavery. In a country oppressed by pashas, Purishkeviches and their like, the majority of the population cannot be literate.

In Russia there are 73 per cent of illiterates, exclusive of children under nine years of age.

Among the U.S. Negroes, there were (in 1900) 44.5 per cent of illiterates.

So Lenin, going by a single dimension of measure (literacy), concludes that the average Russian had it worse off than the average black person in Amerika in the 1910s. I am immediately reminded of a Social-Justice Warrior type article called Straight White Male: The Lowest Difficulty Setting There Is. Like all people who subscribe to such notions, it is rife with the narrow nationalism of White Nation "Leftism." This is why the author thinks "Straight White Male" is the easy setting, while "Gay Minority Female" is the "hardcore" setting. The narrow nationalism is self-evident to anyone with a global outlook on the world, as the article is reeking of First-World chauvinism. The author of the piece even explicitly seeks to limit the thought experiment to the "the Western world," because to extend the scope of the thought experiment to the entire planet immediately breaks the point the author is trying to get across. How cold "Gay Minority Female living in AmeriKKKa" possibly be the hardcore setting, compared to say, "Poor ugly guy living in Bangladesh" or even "Working class Indian woman"?

Comparing the lives of your average black person today with your typical Russian probably doesn't change the results much. The life options and prospects available to your average black man or woman living in AmeriKKKa exceeds anything available to your typical Russian man or woman. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the average black man makes around \$37,000 a year. The average Russian income is around \$17,000 a year. The difference between the income available to your average Amerikan white dude and a black guy is just as large as between a black guy and a Russian. Within a global context, perhaps playing the game on "Black guy living in AmeriKKKa" isn't that hard of a difficulty setting.

Things undoubtedly begin to change as you climb up the social-ladder in Amerika. The Obama-supporter and black comedian Chris Rock once had a bit where he proclaimed a poor one-legged "white" bus boy wouldn't trade places with him, even though Chris Rock is a millionaire; they would prefer to see where being "white" takes them. The actual social-reality Chris Rock is complaining about to his audience is one only successful blacks have to deal with: never really being accepted into the rich-guy club. It's probably true that a rich Russian would never want to trade places with a rich black Amerikan, even one that was significantly richer, because of some negative social aspects of being black that apply to all blacks in Amerika regardless of wealth. But the typical Russian, let alone those even more "hardcore" on the difficulty-setting of life, would trade places with your average Amerikan black man in an instant.

This begs the question: is the Black Nation an Oppressor Nation?

Some have answered the question in the affirmative. The so-called Leading Light has all but explicitly stated as much, when they seek to liquidate the National Question in the North Amerikan context. What they are gently trying to tell their international readers is that you are insane if you think the Black Nation is gonna rise up anytime soon. They are saying the workers of the Black Nation have more in common with imperialism than they do the Oppressed Nations of the world, even if many of them are socially-slighted by chauvinist White Nation workers. George Jackson once said "The entire colonial world is watching the blacks inside the U.S., wondering and waiting for us to come to our senses." The so-called Leading Light is telling the world that any "Hope" placed on the Black Nation for some "Change" to the imperialist world system is completely misplaced. Absolutely and utterly misplaced.

MIM disagrees with this assessment of the so-called Leading Light, still holding out hope for the Black Nation, Aztlan, white women, etc, to be able to play some sort of revolutionary role within the Belly of the Beast. Which is why Kevin "Rashid" Johnson's polemic against

MIM Prisons appears interesting. Is Kevin “Rashid” Johnson unaware of this theoretical difference separating MIM Thought from the so-called Leading Light?

Much of Rashid’s critique is basically aimed at tagging the old “Petty Bourgeois” label on to MIM and MIM Prisons. Rashid quotes Mao as saying all classes have their own ideologies, and will assert themselves on ideological questions at all possible opportunities. Rashid points to the alleged white dominance of the defunct MIM organization as proof of the “PB” nature of MIM Thought.

But as anyone who knows the MIM line in and out, it isn’t all “workers” in Amerika they considered parasites. **They specifically excluded black workers, immigrants laborers, etc.(1) MIM said White Nation workers were hopelessly parasitic.(2)** MIM never once claimed it was the case for the workers of the Black Nation. MIM seemed to have unlimited faith in the workers of the Black Nation. MIM believed in the potential of workers of the Black Nation. MIM Prisons still seems to believe in it today. The so-called Leading Light is telling MIM Prisons that this belief is misguided, that black “workers” are just as parasitic as their White Nation counterparts. The so-called Leading Light thinks all of this is misguided pious faith in a nation basking in parasitism.

[MIM(Prisons): 1. Only about 20% of New Afrikans are lumpen, and almost none are proletarian. So the nation as a whole is economically similar to the white Amerikan nation. But New Afrikans are subject to national oppression, for example imprisonment, that makes it more likely to take up anti-imperialist politics. This is the contradiction between integration and liberation. 2. Hopelessly parasitic as a group, but that doesn't mean individuals won't commit nation and class suicide and take up proletarian politics.]

One could even go further, and note that while MIM would have never dreamed of disparaging workers of the Black Nation in this fashion, they were more than willing to do so in the case of various European nations. The most glaring case is when MIM claimed that the struggle in Ireland could be viewed as simply the Irish Nation attempting to renegotiate their relationship with Western imperialism. In other words, MIM was saying the Irish demand for the self-determination of their nation was not sincere, but a cynical expression of opportunism by an entire nation. MIM’s hope for the Black Nation would never allow them to contemplate this possibility, though they didn’t even hesitate suggesting this possibility when discussing the Irish Question.

Should a serious anti-imperialist refuse to contemplate whether or not the entire Black Nation is bought off, and parasitic?

[MIM(Prisons): We do not refuse to contemplate whether the New Afrikan nation is bought off by imperialism, and we certainly think a large proportion of them are. Even many lumpen New Afrikans are able to reap material gains from their close proximity to the Amerikan nation. Free Criticism appears to have an understanding of the original MIM's line on the topic, and we would encourage you to study more contemporary materials on our website prisoncensorship.info/news. Select “economics” from the “more search options” button, under “other topics.”]

Luckily, reality is giving us an opportunity to test this question. The victory of the PASOK 2.0 organization in Greece known as SYRIZA has much larger implications than whether or not the Labor Aristocracy thesis is valid. SYRIZA is clearly an opportunist organization, and only the criminally stupid or the conscious agents of White Power and Zionism are pretending otherwise. The coming struggle of the KKE against the Euro-Union imperialist agents known as SYRIZA will tell the entire world something about the Greek Nation itself. As George Jackson said, the entire Third World should be watching the Greek Nation now, to determine whether or not those nations on the periphery of US imperialism are capable of truly revolutionary feats, or whether they prefer the imperialist comforts collaborating with Zionism and White Power gives them. What the Greek Nation and the KKE is capable of doing in the coming months and years will give an indication of what the Black Nation is capable of in the Belly of the Beast. And it will tell the world the significance of the National Question to the struggle against Western imperialism and Zionism.

sources:

<http://blackdemographics.com/households/african-american-income/>

<http://www.oecdbetterlifeindex.org/countries/russian-federation/>

MIM(Prisons) recommends the following further reading:

Nationalism and internationalism

False Nationalism, False Internationalism by Tani and Sera

study pack here <http://www.prisoncensorship.info/archive/study/sp18.zip>

pdf of book here http://www.mediafire.com/view/1419r44u01vlp21/Sera_and_Tani__False_Nationalism,_False_Internationalism--Class_Contradictions_In_The_Armed_Struggle.pdf

MIM Theory 7: Proletarian Feminist Nationalism

<http://www.prisoncensorship.info/archive/books/mt/mt7.pdf>

Stalin's Marxism and the National-Colonial Question, a collection of essays

Stalin's Marxism and the National Question, an essay which defines nations

<https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/stalin/works/1913/03a.htm#s1>

Intercommunalism study pack

Economics

MIM Theory 1: A White Proletariat?

<http://www.prisoncensorship.info/archive/books/mt/mt1.pdf>

MIM Theory 10: Labor Aristocracy

<http://www.prisoncensorship.info/archive/books/mt/mt10.pdf>

Imperialism and Its Class Structure in 1997

<http://www.prisoncensorship.info/archive/etext/mt/imp97/index.html>

Raise the Minimum Wage to \$2.50

<http://prisoncensorship.info/news/all/US/1893/> and ULK 36

Amerikans Richer Than Ever

<http://prisoncensorship.info/news/all/US/2245/> and ULK 42

Bromma's Worker Elite and the Global Class Analysis

<http://prisoncensorship.info/news/all/US/2025> and ULK 40

Divided World, Divided Class by Zak Cope

New Must-Read on the Labor Aristocracy (review of Divided World, Divided Class)

<http://prisoncensorship.info/news/all/US/1519/> and ULK 30

Amerikan history

Settlers: Mythology of the White Proletariat by J. Sakai

<http://www.prisoncensorship.info/archive/books/settlers.pdf>

Reference

Rashid's Empty Rhetoric on the Labor Aristocracy, by Wiawimawo of MIM(Prisons)

<http://prisoncensorship.info/news/all/US/1771/>

Fundamental Political Line of the Maoist Internationalist Ministry of Prisons

www.prisoncensorship.info/archive/books/FPLmimp.pdf

Joint dictatorship of the proletariat of the oppressed nations (JDPON)

“What is the dictatorship of the proletariat?” MIM FAQ

<http://prisoncensorship.info/archive/etext/faq/dictp.html>

Study the successes of Maoism and Protracted People's War On Focoism and the Lumpen Proletariat by Lord Grim

<http://www.prisoncensorship.info/archive/etext/mn/mn195/focoism.txt>

Stages of scientific development: Contemplative materialism and your own relationship to Marx's writings by MIM

<http://www.prisoncensorship.info/archive/etext/wim/wyl/contemplativematerialism.html>

MIM(Prisons) self-criticisms

Self-Criticism on Relations with New Afrikan Ujamaa Dynasty

<http://prisoncensorship.info/news/all/US/793/> and ULK 16

Criticism and Good Communication Helps Us Grow and Develop

<http://prisoncensorship.info/news/all/US/1262/> and ULK 24

Security, Lumpen Organizations and names in ULK

<http://prisoncensorship.info/news/all/US/1299/> and ULK 25

Security, why we need it

MIM's security page

<http://prisoncensorship.info/archive/etext/faq/security.html>

Agents of Repression: The FBI's Secret Wars Against the Black Panther Party and the American Indian Movement

The COINTELPRO Papers: Documents from the FBI's Secret Wars Against Dissent in the United States

The CIA's Greatest Hits

Science

Combating subjectivism in all arenas, from cigarettes & drugs to sectarianism and white chauvinism

<http://www.prisoncensorship.info/archive/etext/faq/subjectivismI.html>

<http://www.prisoncensorship.info/archive/etext/wim/wyl/crypto/subjectivismII.html>

Examples of pragmatist empiricism

<http://www.prisoncensorship.info/archive/etext/faq/pragmatistempiricism.html>

Any U.S. prisoners should write to MIM(Prisons) for the study material listed above.

Contact us:

MIM(Prisons) PO Box 40799 San Francisco CA 94140

mim@prisoncensorship.info