


WINTER 1993 • NUMBER 4 • \$4.95

# MIM THEORY

The Official Theoretical Journal of the Maoist Internationalist Movement



**INSIDE: Letters from our readers, Ex-USSR, Yugoslavia, China, Cuba**

**MIM  
THEORY**  
Winter 1993  
Number 4  
Vol. I

**MAOIST INTERNATIONALIST MOVEMENT**

Editor: MC 5  
Assistant Editor: MC 17  
Proofreading: MA343  
Production: MC99, MC45

Maoism is very deep thought. It requires study, struggles and arguments, arguments, arguments. The imperialists print millions of pages a day telling their side of the story. MIM has as many thoughts as the imperialists, but not as much paper, especially the green kind.

Struggle with MIM—in person, by computer, by mail: just do it somehow because the imperialists are already struggling with you by television, newspapers and radio. No one can advance their own thinking and the cause of revolution by themselves. The most progress is brought about in the challenge of a revolutionary collective—a vanguard party.

MIM theory is the official theoretical journal of the Maoist Internationalist Movement (MIM). Subscriptions are \$10 per year/four issues. Overseas airmail is \$20 per year.

MIM also publishes MIM Notes, the party's official voice on current news. Subscriptions are \$12 per year or \$1 an issue.

MIM is an underground party that does not publish the names of its comrades in order to avoid state surveillance and repression that has been historically directed at communist parties and anti-imperialist movements.

"MC" in a byline means "MIM comrade" or a party member; "MA" means "MIM associate."

To send money to MIM for any purpose, send cash or a check payable to "ABS."

MIM  
P.O. Box 3576  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-3576

## Note from the editor:

.....

MIM Theory 4 marks an advance over previous issues in its participation from people outside the party. Throughout this issue, we will be printing letters from people with varying reactions to MIM's work building public opinion for a revolution of the oppressed.

A lot of the letters we receive border on hate mail. Some might question why we publish our critics' opinions at all. Yet, at this time in history, these hate letters are representative of common opinion within the U.S. empire. Although the hate mail rarely says anything of substance, refuting the falsehoods and putting forward proletarian values are very important.

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

MIM seeks to engage in a tit-for-tat struggle in every part of the superstructure. Only in that way can we build the independent power of the oppressed and prepare for the all-round dictatorship of the proletariat.

MIM's tit-for-tat struggle depends both on strategic confidence and tactical respect. Strategically, MIM fears no argument that can be put to it. Tactically, MIM goes to painstaking effort to criticize each individual expression of bourgeois consciousness, because the bourgeoisie is capable of winning individual battles in the superstructure and elsewhere.

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

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

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

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

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

## A Spiral Trajectory: The failure and success of communist development

### Table of Contents

NOTE FROM THE EDITOR .....	INSIDE COVER
INTRODUCTION TO THIS ISSUE .....	3
CHAPTER 1 LETTERS .....	5
Southern Reader Mostly Agrees with MIM .....	6
MA71 Tells MIM what it Needs .....	8
Sickened by Cold War Liberals.....	8
Reader Tells MIM about Species Oppression....	9
CHAPTER 2 WHITE WORKING CLASS DEBATE CONTINUES.....	11
MA71 Lets it Rip.....	12
The Settlers and Surplus-Value .....	14
Clarification .....	17
CHAPTER 3 GENDER AND REVOLUTIONARY FEMINISM DEBATE CONTINUES.....	19
Former Rape Crisis Center Volunteer Spills Beans.....	20
Surprised by "Communist" Homophobia .....	22
Hate MacKinnon Mail.....	22
MA71 on Gender .....	23
Identity Politics: How Subversive Is Cultural Subversion .....	25
Two New England Women's Papers Reviewed .....	26
Selective Prosecution Is Justified in Rape .....	28
Corrections from MIM Theory 2/3 .....	29
What Didn't Work in China.....	29
CHAPTER 4 EAST BLOCK .....	33
Ex-Soviet Union: Notes from Siberia.....	34
Yugoslavia: Class War in Yugoslavia.....	38
CHAPTER 5 THE CUBA QUESTION .....	41
A Brief Summary of MIM's Line on Cuba .....	42
Interview with a Member of the July 26 Coalition.....	42
Review of "History Will Absolve Me" .....	44
Review of "The Political Economy of Cuban Dependence" .....	45
CHAPTER 6 CHINA .....	49
MIM Gets Anti-Mao Mail .....	50
Long Live Maoism I! .....	50
Chinese Engineer in Canada Criticizes MIM....	52
Chinese Can't Even Express All the Horror of Maoism .....	53
Long Live Maoism II! The Need for a Comparative Approach.....	54
MIM Critics Disagree with Long Live Maoism II!: Maoists are Inhuman.....	56
Another Critic Talks about Kent State .....	57
Long Live Maoism III! Consistent Use of Statistics.....	59
New Critic Responds to Long Live Maoism III!	59
Amerikan Writer Prefers "Freedom" to Life....	61
Request for Definition of Maoism .....	61
Long Live Maoism IV! A Response to the Question of Definitions .....	62
Long Live Maoism V! The Reality of Imperialist Exploitation: No Democracy for the Exploited.....	63
Long Live Maoism VI! USA is Number One ....	64
Long Live Maoism VII! The Right to Talk about China.....	66
Long Live Maoism VIII! The Cultural Revolution and Mao: The Real Fighter for Democracy...68	68
Long Live Maoism IX! .....	70
Long Live Maoism X! State Ownership and Development .....	71
Long Live Maoism XI! Mao or George Bush: Trade in China.....	72

## Table of Contents continued

<b>CHAPTER 7 FOUR TIGERS.....</b>	<b>75</b>
Korean Student Studying in USA Writes MIM..	76
Maoist View of Success in South Korea, Japan and Taiwan: the United States on the Bandwagon of Class Struggle .....	76
Taiwanese Criticizes MIM View of Export-led Development .....	80
Maoism on International Trade Relations.....	81
Excerpts from the <i>Fundamentals of Political Economy</i> on Mutual Aid and Exchange .....	82
Student Challenges MIM Political Economy on "Four Tigers" and International Trade .....	82
Taiwanese Points out Taiwanese Difference ...	84
<b>CHAPTER 8 SECTARIAN REVIEWS .....</b>	<b>85</b>
<i>Workers World</i> : Inconsistent Socialist or Consistent Opportunists? .....	86
<i>Slingshot</i> .....	87
Socialist Workers Party Sells Its Secrets to Imperialism.....	89
MIM polemicizes with <i>The Truth Hurts</i> .....	90
Comment on the "Call to Form Organizing Committees" .....	92
<i>Guardian</i> Bites the Dust .....	93
<i>America in Decline</i> Review.....	94

# Introduction to this issue

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MIM disputes the idea that Eastern Europe was ever socialist—with the exception of Albania until 1978. Furthermore, MIM has also always denied that the Soviet Union was socialist once Khruschev definitively steered the Soviet Union down the capitalist-road in 1956.

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

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

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

MIM also disputes the method used in comparison of capitalist and socialist countries. Most grievously, the Liberal analyst rarely applies critical conceptions across the board. The Liberal knows that population estimates show that 20 million people might have starved in the aftermath of Mao's Great Leap in China, but did the Liberal attempt to use the same methods of calculation for the deaths caused in capitalist starvation? No, the Liberal seeks to avoid the broad patterns of facts concerning

international starvation. In fact, MIM will demonstrate that the overall health of peoples has always been served better by socialism than capitalism.

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

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


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

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

Outside the Third World, those countries in the "collapsed" "socialist" bloc, those that face severe hardship, are again ripe for socialism. In the imperialist countries, MIM has already explained why it does not believe a revolution of starving and homeless workers will succeed, but we Maoists rest assured that imperialist maneuvering in the Third World and inter-imperialist rivalry provides, as always, plenty of opportunities for ultimately successful revolutionary work.

# Chapter 1

## Letters



## A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT

# Southern Reader Mostly Agrees with MIM

.....

**DEAR MIM:**

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

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

I've long considered myself a Maoist, which doesn't mean that I think that Mao was perfect, merely that I agree with many of his ideological perspectives and feel that under Mao, at least there

was movement towards socialism and a classless society. I said a long time—well, I'm 38 now, and have been drawn towards Mao's thought since I was 14, an interest which in turn led me to a deeper interest in China and Asia and to obtaining my B.A. in Asian Studies. I have several Chinese friends, most of whom do not—admittedly—agree completely with me, though many see through the illusions of capitalism and I believe that at least some are committed to socialism.

Why did I become a Maoist? Growing up in a working-class Appalachian community, I was able to see the system at work, a system that turned people into virtual slaves who had nothing. I remember my father working two jobs, from 8 AM to 11 or 12 PM at night through the week, and working his second job on the weekend. What else is that but slavery? To spend almost every waking moment working, and still barely able to enjoy time for oneself. His reward is a pittance of a pension and a little social security, and he still doesn't have enough to

## What is MIM?

The Maoist Internationalist Movement (MIM) is a revolutionary communist party that upholds Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong thought. MIM is an internationalist organization that works from the vantage point of the Third World proletariat; thus, its members are not Amerikans, but world citizens.

MIM struggles to end the oppression of all groups over groups: classes, genders, nations. MIM knows this is only possible by building public opinion to seize power through armed struggle.

Revolution is a reality for the United States as the military becomes ever extended in the government's attempts to maintain world hegemony.

MIM differs from other communist parties on three main questions: (1) MIM holds that after the proletariat seizes power in socialist revolution, the potential exists for capitalist restoration under the leadership of a new bourgeoisie within the communist party itself. In the case of the USSR, the bourgeoisie seized power after the death of Stalin in 1953; in China, it was after Mao's death and the overthrow of the Gang of Four in 1976. (2) MIM upholds the Chinese Cultural Revolution as the farthest advance of communism in human history. (3) MIM believes the North Amerikan white-working class is primarily a non-revolutionary worker-elite at this time; thus, it is not the principal vehicle to advance Maoism in this country.

MIM accepts people as members who agree on these basic principles and accept democratic centralism, the system of majority rule, on other questions of party line.

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

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

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

face the costs of living today, as medical bills and doctors who work in poor rural area charge rates that soak the people there and with insurance bureaucrats who try to find every excuse for not paying their share.

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

Finally, I think that Mao's ideals are not dead. Aside from living in the hearts and beliefs of people here, it continues in much of the rest of the world—at least to an extent. In Peru, the Shining Path, which is denigrated in the media here, nonetheless has sufficient support to control many of the prisons in which they are held as well as much of the countryside, which is hardly a sign of a group that has no base in the population. Several people from other countries have expressed their sympathies for socialism and Mao's ideals to me. In China, itself, it's important to remember that preceding Tiananmen, many participants in the demonstrations carried portraits of Mao, and people are turning back to those ideals, at least to some extent.

Too, one cannot blame Tiananmen on socialism (its similarities to the Kwangju uprising in Korea are remarkable, although the media here gave far less attention to Kwangju), which China has moved away from over the past years—moving to an embrace of capitalism that has led to a resurgence of such activities as kidnapping and selling women (reminiscent of the chapter "Her Past" in *Chinese Lives* by Zhang Xinlin and Sang Ye) and other activities that had at least largely disappeared after 1949.

Remember, too, that the Tiananmen Massacre was not orchestrated by Mao's supporters, but rather by his opponents, those he labeled capitalist roaders decades ago. I also find it difficult to accept that rule in China under Mao was brutal—most countries, including the United States, would execute someone who collaborated with an enemy to the extent that Pu Yi did, and Mao clearly did not have his political opponents executed (Deng is proof of this). I'm not arguing that there wasn't factionalism, that nothing negative ever happened during

those years, that it was perfect, but is it really better now?

Too, does anyone really believe that a system based on exploitation can last forever, before the "slaves" of that system revolt? You might find yourself surprised at how many poor, working class people in this country are sympathetic to socialism or at least see through capitalism, since they experience its worst side everyday.

I suppose that my views are most similar to those of William Hinton, as expressed in a talk that he gave following Tiananmen (a videotape of that lecture was available from Monthly Review Press) and outlined in his recent book *The Great Reversal*, which is also available from Monthly Review, though I won't venture predictions as to which direction China will move in over the coming years.

.....  
**... does anyone really  
believe that a system based  
on exploitation can last  
forever, before the "slaves"  
of that system revolt?**  
.....

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

—A MIM sympathizer  
May, 1992

A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT

## MA71 Tells MIM What it Needs

.....

DEAR MIM:

I think what is needed is some kind of correspondence course. Do people like to read the classics? [Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao—MC5] Many of the letters do not show any interest in theory. I don't think quoting "theory without practice ain't worth shit" gets at the problem. First of all, define exactly what practice is.

How can you have certain kinds of practice when there is no mass movement and when you are hemmed in and under attack from all quarters? We had mobility in the '60s and '70s. Second, J. Stalin said that practice gropes in the dark unless its path is illuminated by theory, and that theory is meaningless unless connected to practice. First you have to nail down the theory. Then you have to have a program. Therefore practice in the first stage is nailing down the theory. This ain't easy. Breakfast programs were revisionist. (From personal experience the BPP was revisionist from beginning to end. People like Hampton represented the best but they were squashed.)

Finally—I think it's wrong not to distribute the red book. I use one a lot. You cannot have a personality cult around someone who is dead. It is a good reference book. Besides, why don't you put together all the quotes concerning the Cultural Revolution and distribute it? Which reminds me—in his [Mao's—MC5] statement on the murder of Martin Luther King and his statement on the war in Vietnam you will find some good stuff.

### MC17 REPLIES:

We would love to have a correspondance course and if anyone is interested in putting one together they should get in touch with us—it is only

lack of time that prohibits MIM from pursuing many projects.

MIM agrees that without theoretical direction practice is likely to be meaningless. This is why we do so much work trying to "nail down the theory." The first four issues of MIM Theory have helped push us along in this regards. MIM does not believe that people should wait to have a practice until they have developed a complete theoretical evaluation of every last detail. This would be counter to the Maoist principle that practice is principal and theory is developed from lessons learned through practice. Hence, MIM continues to develop its practice in conjunction with the development of theory, although MA71 is correct that theoretical practice is also a practice.

MA71 will have to offer MIM some evidence for the BPP being revisionist. This is not our reading of history. The BPP upheld Maoism in theory and practice, and MIM distributes a number of books and essays on the Black Panthers for anyone who is interested in further reading on the subject.

As for the little red book, MIM believes that people can and should learn by reading more than just quotations. We distribute many writings by Mao and encourage people to read these rather than the less comprehensive quotations.

## Sickened by Cold War Liberals

.....

The following is an excerpt from a letter about all the hate mail MIM gets about the Shining Path in Peru—some of which is from people citing human rights reports.

DEAR MIM:

I love these cold-war liberals. They were the same folks who refused to support the "terrorist" Viet Cong against U.S. imperialism, and claimed they weren't for the dictatorship, they weren't for the North Vietnamese Government, they were for the "pro-democracy forces" in South Vietnam <snort!> Their standard references are Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch, who last year were peddling the tale of Kuwaiti babies ripped

## A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT

from incubators by the monster Iraqi invaders. We all know where Human Rights Watch's Aryeh Neir stands. It's disgusting.

—An East Coast Reader  
August, 1992

## Reader Tells MIM about Species Oppression

---

DEAR MIM:

MIM Theory 2/3 correctly identifies class, nation, and gender oppression as connected but non-reducible sources of unequal power relations leading to the injustice and violence in our world. I submit that it is both correct and necessary to add species oppression to this short list.

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

Directly analogous to the capitalists, imperialists, and pornographers/pimps of class, nation, and gender oppressions are the ranchers/dairy farmers/Frank Perdues, furriers/tanners, circus/race-track owners, and pharmaceutical/medical experimenters.

Butchers, owners of non-vegetarian restaurants, leather goods stores, racehorse owners, and even the makers of A-1 steak sauce are analogous to the labor, national, and gender aristocracies because they have a material interest in maintaining species oppression.

Those of us who consume the flesh of dead animals, wear their skins, bet at the races, go to the circus, or use products that have been tested on animals, have no material interest in continuing species oppression, but are influenced by taste, fashion, and other forms of socialization. In fact, because of its inherent wastefulness (9 lbs. of vegetable protein are necessary to produce 1 lb. of animal protein), unhealthiness (rates of heart disease and cancer, the greatest killers in industrialized countries, correlate directly with animal protein consumption), and pollution (90% of Arkansas' rivers are unfit for human contact due to contamination with chicken waste), the

working people of industrialized areas have a material interest in ending species oppression.

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

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

Humans interested in ending species oppression fall generally into two camps. Reformists, such as the ASPCA, believe that eliminating the cruellest treatment of the cutest or largest-brained animals advances the interests of oppressed species.

Animal liberationists, while often unmindful of the related struggles against class, nation, and gender oppression, seek to end all species oppression simultaneously. To this end, they modify their lifestyles by not eating, wearing, or deriving entertainment from animals, and by using "cruelty-free" products. In addition, the guerrillas of the Animal Liberation Front have dealt the most spectacular and costly blows of any organized liberation struggle inside Amerika's borders in recent years, torching buildings and destroying equipment while liberating captive species.

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

The links between national and species oppression, and between gender and species oppression have begun to be explored. Marjorie Spiegel's *The Dreaded Comparison* and Carol J.

## A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT

Adams' *The Sexual Politics of Meat* deal with these connections respectively.

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

P.S. Since precise thought requires precise language, I urge all revolutionaries to discontinue using animal epithets to describe oppressors (i.e. "pig" or "dog" for cop/capitalist/chauvinist).

—MA343

November, 1992

### MC5 REPLIES:

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

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

Karl Marx did believe that communism would resolve the contradiction between the humyn species and Nature generally. In the "Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844" from Karl Marx, we learn that Marx believed people would not destroy their own environments if they really controlled their own destinies as they should under communism.

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

Despite the provocative links the author draws amongst the various contradictions in society, MIM holds that the principal contradiction is between the oppressed nations and the imperialists. That means if we seize that contradiction with all our might, we will do the most to advance the cause against oppression generally. That is of course our main concern in treating the subject of animal liberation generally.

## **Chapter 2**

# **White Working Class Debate Continues**



## A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT

## MA71 Lets it Rip

DEAR MIM:

I do not believe there is such a term as "left imperialism." The first time I ever saw it was in one of your publications many years ago. On the back of this page is the definition of "left imperialist economism." [An excerpt from Lenin's "The Nascent Trend of Imperialist Economism"—MC5]... I never

saw anything by Engels on this term. From the definition on the back of this page, you can see that technically you fall into "left imperialist economism."

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

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

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

Why is there no movement along the lines of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism in the former Soviet Union, China, Germany, etc. etc. The major reason



must be the tremendous influence of imperialist bribery that extends everywhere.

Therefore, what is to be done? In the u.s., the only masses capable of following and adhering to Marxism-Leninism-Maoism (M-L-M) are those who do not speak English. And if you could get to them what would you have them do? In Third World countries like Mexico, the social-democrats, Trots and revisionists dominate. You cannot talk about M-L-M. The plain fact is you cannot do anything except write articles.

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

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

All those in "league" with imperialism are the enemy. Who does that leave you with? About 10% of the people in the u.s. We should say the masses are those who hate imperialism. Everybody else is reactionary. Take the labor aristocracy. Let's assume there is a nuclear war or an economic depression. What are they going to do? Go with fascism. Maybe some won't....

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

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

Some contradictions I would like input on. "Runaway shops" are going to increase. This means there will be an increase in unemployment of the labor aristocracy. You say that the labor aristocracy can get services jobs with about the same pay. It seems to me that the standard of living of the labor aristocracy must go down ending up about 50% of what it is. Plus, factory jobs in the u.s. will be taken

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

over more and more by immigrants, women, and oppressed nationalities. This puts the labor aristocracy in a position of being exploited, don't you think. Perhaps I didn't read your stuff carefully enough. Are you defining exploitation by the amount of money the labor aristocracy is being paid? If so, at what wage level is the labor aristocracy being exploited? Also, what about the contradiction between the imperialists? Japan seems to be going down the tubes. Germany seems to be stable.

Another point about the u.s. left. I know from personal experience—being almost 50 years old—that the positions of the u.s. left today are weak imitations of what they were 20-25 years ago. It makes me sick. For example, it was common for every group to regard the democrats and republicans as "tweedle dee and twiddle dum" and the whole u.s. left opted for either a third party such as the Peace and Freedom Party or a boycott. Now they are all talking about working in the Democratic Party. The overwhelming support for Jesse Jackson four years ago among u.s. lefts was sickening.

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

—MA71  
April, 1992

**MC5 REPLIES:**

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

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

it be that this provocation is another way of trying to sidestep the existence of oppressed nations within the u.s. borders? MIM goes beyond supporting the right to self-determination. It sees oppressed Black, Latino, indigenous and Asian nations within u.s. borders in need of liberation.

MA71 has pointed out in the past that MIM diverges from Mao Zedong on these points. We believe that we are better qualified to assess the situation in the u.s.a., just as Mao was better qualified than Stalin to assess the situation in China. Mao said in 1968, "The black masses and the masses of white working people in the United States share common interests and have common objectives to struggle for. Therefore, the Afro-American struggle is winning increasing sympathy and support from increasing numbers of white working people and progressives in the United States."(1) In contrast, MIM believes that the white working class has proved itself an enemy of the oppressed nationalities for several decades now.

.....  
**Of course, it is dialectically  
absolutely true that the  
labor aristocracy must fall.**

**However, it is also  
dialectically true that the  
human species must come  
to an end. On this point,  
Hegel and Marx had no  
disagreement: everything  
passes.**

.....  
As for Doug Henwood, we agree that he is not revolutionary. MIM learns through practice how various possibly progressive forces line up.

With regard to the labor aristocracy, we have already said that the white working class could have its wages cut in half and still not be exploited. (See MIM Theory 1.)

In addition, I would like to point out the chauvinist use dialectics is put to these days. The RCP and most of our First World comrades think our analysis of the white working class is "static," because we don't think the white nation working class is a vehicle for change right now and organizing it for its

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

class demands can only mean cross-class national unity of the oppressor.

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

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

That is why we must be dialectical materialists. When we examine the conditions of the white working class there is no way to conclude that it is exploited. Hence at this time we must base our actions on the interests of the international proletariat, not the white working class. Whereas the Azanian workers' movement is quite right to focus principally on its own demands as a contribution to world revolution, we in the belly of the beast can not pretend that there is a basis for revolutionary change within the white nation or we will perform invaluable services for the international apartheid system known as imperialism. Our working class in the First World must first be made to understand why it owes a debt to the Third World working class or we will not be able to make the first step into socialism.

**Notes:** "Statement by Comrade Mao Tse-Tung, Chairman of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, in Support of the Afro-American Struggle against Violent Repression," 4/16/68, Peking: Foreign Languages Press.

## The Settlers and Surplus-value

**DEAR MIM:**

Regarding MIM's use of \$177 billion in corporate profits to prove that only Third World workers are exploited—the assumption underlying this is that the \$177 billion is the ONLY result of exploitation by U.S. capital-



ists. That is errant nonsense—surplus value includes ALL revenue over and above NECESSARY costs of production.

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

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

—Critic of MT1  
June, 1992

### MC5 REPLIES:

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

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

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

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

quarter of employee compensation (wages and salaries) before taxes."(1)

Actually, what our critic says is not bad at all, just irrelevant to the issue we raised (for the most part.) The size of the surplus-value is only relevant to our question if it is not appropriated by the labor aristocracy. Our calculations in MIM Theory 1 (MT1) are based on a number of ways of approaching the economy statistically speaking. The whole problem of calculation lies in using government statistical categories in application to Marx's theoretical categories. For example, our figure on corporate profits actually includes bank profits and we examined it before and after taxes in the MT1. Yet, for Marx's purposes, it is dubious that taxes on profits should be counted as surplus-value if taxes really end up providing government services that are "socially necessary" to workers. Such taxes collected could really be a redistribution amongst the white nation people of surplus-value taken from the oppressed nations. Later we shall go through the exercise of applying government figures to Marx's theories along the lines that our critic and Gurley suggest. First we will explain some more mistakes in our critic's comment.

The point our critic makes about unproductive workers is actually great proof of our view. Our critic thinks that s/he can point to a larger surplus-value than we mentioned by counting unproductive work as part of surplus-value. The United States is so decadent, imperialist and parasitic that it can afford a huge military to oppress the international proletariat. It also can afford ridiculous advertising industries.

Now the critic was really thinking about why socialism is good when s/he specified that we use his/her definition of surplus-value instead of our overly narrow one, but his/her definition has nothing to do with the issue we raised about the white nation working class. Socialism will eliminate these waste and misallocation problems it is true. They are waste in the eyes of the Third World masses. However, who does our critic think is getting paid for ads, military contracting, etc.? Third World workers? White nation capitalists? No, it's predominantly Amerikan workers once again. They are doing all this parasitic living at the expense of the rest of the world. In fact, there are so many parasites, over half of the white working class in the United States is white collar according to the U.S. Census. The Amerikan nation is a nation of paper-shufflers helping the imperialists realize surplus-value. What our

critic would call productive workers are such a small minority of white nation workers and (with some pockets as exceptions like coal-miners) so overpaid, we cannot speak of a white proletariat.

.....

**The United States is so decadent, imperialist and parasitic that it can afford a huge military to oppress the international proletariat. It also can afford ridiculous advertising industries.**

.....

Our answer to Gurley would be the same, if we pretended that he opposed our analysis. MT1 goes so far as to count all before-tax income and shows that it would not make a difference to the calculations. In any case, taxes go to transfer payments and government services. Once again in these cases taxes end up in the white-collar class's pockets. The government sector of workers is largely another buffer between the white nation working class and the international proletariat. That is to leave aside the issue of the exact calculation of the extent of the labor aristocracies within oppressed nations which also appropriate surplus-value, an issue we will return to in the future.

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

The figures Gurley is concerned with are not all relevant to whether there is a white proletariat or not. Hence, let us attempt to break down the economy in a way which Gurley and our critic would recognize and see why it is that we can't answer our question by doing so. First of all, let us recognize that government workers are workers for this purpose. Let us also count the contributions of employers to social insurance as part of labor costs as well. Now let's just count those people who are "employees" by the government definition, which means

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

only those people who can be fired by an employer. It does not count "independent contractors," some consultants, family farms—basically the petty-bourgeoisie. Hence, the income of workers calculated in just this straight forward way was \$2.456 trillion in 1987 out of a figure of \$3.78 trillion personal income for the year.(2) Divide the first figure by the second and we get 65% of the income explained so far by straight-forward payments to u.s. labor.

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

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

When that is done, we are left with only three categories in this government survey that can manifest the appropriation of surplus-value—rental income, dividends and interest income. Add those three categories up and we come to a figure of \$634 billion, the vast bulk of which is interest payments, apart from bank profits, which are included in corporate profits. Indeed, we can add to the \$634 billion another \$47.8 billion if we believe that people receiving rent are 100% lying about any depreciation that occurred on their property. (In principle, for the calculations we are doing, any income from owning property will be counted as surplus-value.)

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

For the benefit of our opponent, let's make that dubious assumption and assume that some of the proprietors' income is surplus-value as well and round up to \$700 billion as a potential indication of surplus-value. That's still less than 19% of the total

income, but close to what Gurley says is the surplus-value—20%.

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

Also, if investment in capital accumulation were beneficial to the entire white nation in order to put it into better position to exploit the Third World, then that part of the surplus-value could not be counted for our purposes here either. However, say that it was actually a bourgeoisie that appropriated all \$700 billion entirely as the fantasy-prone "Left" is likely to assume. Let's assume that there really are no savings accounts or private pension funds for white workers out there, (like the ones for New York City unions which regularly bail the city out when it goes bankrupt), no Individual Retirement Accounts for the white working class that are even partly responsible for gathering that \$527 billion in interest income. Let's just assume that the capitalist class absorbs all the interest payments in our society. (The rent from 100% lying property-owners and the dividends combined come to less than the \$177 billion we explained already, so we will have to humor the "leftists" that this interest income is totally appropriated by the bourgeoisie if this exercise is to be worth anything at all.)

What we left out of the MT1 is the white poor and the Third World workers. With just discrimination against minority workers within the united states we explained the existence of \$300 billion in profits a year.

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

Of course, in MT1 MIM argued that there are pockets of exploited white workers, just not large enough to think of themselves as a class. Well, it turns out that if we make all the above outlandish

**R SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

assumptions to humor our critic, then if we took one-third of white workers and found them to be exploited at the level of the oppressed nation workers, we would come up with the \$700 billion in surplus value. That still leaves two-thirds of the white nation workers not exploited, a majority as H.W. Edwards said, and an overwhelming influence within the white nation as Sakai said. It would also mean that a majority of the people within u.s. borders are not exploited.

Perhaps in future issues, we can do a better job and track down where "net interest income" goes. We are also in need of more precise measures of u.s. exploitation and superexploitation of the Third World. As far as we know, Samir Amin, Alain De Janvry and Arghiri Emmanuel have written provoca-

**Clarification:**

In MIM Theory #1, MIM said that "if the labor aristocracy is not exploited, then organizing it will only result in white chauvinism and greater strength for imperialism, whatever the intentions of the organizer." (p. 8)

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

**TABLE:****CORPORATE PROFITS COUNT BANK PROFITS*****Corporate profits by industry in billions of dollars***

(No capital consumption allowance; inventory valuation adjustment allowed)

	<b>1987</b>
Financial	30.1
Manufacturing	96.8
Transport and public utilities	34.9
Wholesale and retail trade	42.8
Other non-financial	17.6
Foreign operations	36.4
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>258.7</b>

Source: Economic Report of the President, January 1989, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1989, p. 410.

tive books on the theory necessary to doing such a calculation of the transfer of surplus-value to the imperialist countries from the oppressed nations, but there is nothing that MIM could put forward as definitive work yet. Even without this information, however, we can see that white nation workers are thoroughly bought-off, which is why there is no white working class socialist or revolutionary movement to speak of compared with the majority nation revolutionary movements in South Africa, Puerto Rico, etc.

**Notes:**

1. John G. Gurley, Challengers to Capitalism: Marx, Lenin, Stalin and Mao, 3rd ed., NY: Addison-Wesley, 1988, p. 39.
2. Economic Report of the President: January 1989, p. 336-7.


# **Chapter 3**

## **Gender and**

## **Revolutionary**

## **Feminism Debate**

## **Continues**



## A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT

# Former Rape Crisis Center Volunteer Spills Beans

.....

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

**DEAR MIM:**

"So why do white women accuse Black men at a rate more than 22 times the rate they accuse white men?" [MIM Theory 2/3—MC5] Wrong question (and with horrible math). You left out quite a number of considerations.

MIM logo: A red square with a hammer and sickle symbol in the center, surrounded by the letters "MIM" in a bold, sans-serif font.

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

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

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

In short, MIM is blaming the victim instead of the actual perpetrators of the situation. MIM Theory 2/3 asks; "With statistics like these, MIM asks why so many anti-rape groups support the 'get-tough-on-crime' approach just like George Bush does." In fact, anti-rape groups who have to fight for the survivors' rights in this sexist and racist system have been quite adamant about removing both the racist and sexist filters in that system. MIM is misrepresenting these groups....

The rape crisis groups I've worked with were comprised mostly of women from the working and middle classes. While the membership of these

mostly-volunteer groups were distressingly short on black women, there was no shortage of what MIM would call "Third World Women." Our clients were of all races, and we worked hard for each and every one of them.

—Former rape crisis center volunteer  
June, 1992

**MIM REPLIES:**

We never presented any math, only statistics in our ad. The critic has not taken the time to figure out what s/he is talking about. Less than 1% of white women's sexual interactions are with Black men. Yet, 22% of the rape accusations by white women are against Black men. That means that every 1% of white women's total sexual interactions that are with white men generates less than 1% of the white women's rape accusations. The figures for Black women are also explained in MT2/3. (See MT2/3 for more on all of the above statistics and the sources).

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

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

Our critic also raises ignorant points about acquaintance versus stranger rape. If s/he had read the MIM Theory journal, s/he would know that white women accuse BOTH their Black male acquaintances and Black strangers at several times the rate they accuse white men. As for blaming the victim, the victim here is Black men. It's one of the

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

small contributing factors that enables our system to imprison Black people at a higher rate than the apartheid regime in South Africa does. Our critic is blaming the victim and MIM Theory proves that the pseudo-feminist strategy hasn't done a thing for women in its generation-long existence in the anti-rape and anti-battering centers.

.....

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

.....

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

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

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

The people denying the facts are just like the Rodney King jurors denying what is on videotape in

front of them. This is demonstrated by the leap some other critics made to saying we said rape accusations are fabricated. (Pseudo-feminist response: Surveys show that false reporting of crimes including rape is less than 2%. MIM response: That survey is of the people doing the accusing, people who are not likely to admit that they are liars or that they are unconsciously chauvinist or sexist. The survey has nothing to do with the actual content of the law, only the accuser's interpretation of it. Nor does the survey say anything about equal protection of the law.) In point of fact, the history of lynching shows that many rape accusations are in fact fabrications. But that was not our original argument. People who read what the ad we posted said will see that we said ALL SEX IS RAPE.

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

Meanwhile, revolutions in China, Albania, etc. did succeed in reducing rape, only to see it skyrocket when capitalism took power as in China now. The real feminists were the revolutionaries that really changed things, not the people who work on individual sexual practices without changing a thing overall. Anti-rape work can be an exercise in assuaging guilt and sanctifying one's own sexual practices in a society where no individual escapes inequality. That rationalization in gender issues is pseudo-feminism. Revolutionary feminism abolishes pornography, reconstitutes the arts, deals with nation and class, reduces society-wide sexual violence and uproots the sources of that sexual coercion. Read the facts in MIM Theory 2/3. Send \$6 to PO Box 3576, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-3576. Either cash or check made out to ABS. P.S. For those readers


## A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT

who supported George Bush's Willie Horton ads and are criticizing us, at least you're consistent. We don't expect this article to appeal to anyone who is not a communist—someone in favor of the abolition of patriarchy, classes and national oppression.

# Surprised by "Communist Homophobia"

•••••

DEAR MIM:



Thanks for the article on the RCP and homophobia, though I'm not sure that I agree that the RCP is homophobic. Their analysis of gay issues is similar to that of much of the non-Trot and

Social Democratic left (if the latter can be called left in a context other than in comparison to Ronald Reagan), and, while I don't agree with it, I don't think that makes the RCP homophobic. I think that MIM is correct in their stance, though, on the issue of gays. I was a member of the CPML's Communist Youth Organization when I was a student at the University of X, and the issue came up of whether or not to admit gays and lesbians into the CYO. It had never occurred to me before that sexuality had anything to do with being a communist, and the attitudes of many in the CYO and CPML surprised me. I wouldn't argue that homophobia doesn't exist in the RCP, just that their line is not necessarily homophobic. Hope that the bookstore in X gets in touch with

you guys and begins to carry your literature...

—Southern

reader

June, 1992



### MIM REPLIES:

Compared with the u.s. population as a whole, the RCP is not homophobic. In another article, MIM addressed the overboard attack on the RCP in this regard by the National Lawyers Guild. Sometimes so-called leftists really lose sight of what is going on

in this society overall when they focus on each other.

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

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

# Hate MacKinnon Mail

•••••

DEAR MIM:

"To her credit, MacKinnon has developed and promoted a theory of sexuality which describes rape as a sexual act inextricably linked to a continuum of coercive social activities, marking all sex as shades of rape and all rape as acts of sex." [See MIM Theory 2/3, p. 176—MC5]

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

—A reader from the Midwest

June, 1992

### MIM REPLIES:

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

MacKinnon's position is difficult to comprehend, especially in the individualist West. However,

## A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT

it should not be any more difficult than understanding Marx's idea about workers. Marx did not believe individual acts of work by proletarians under the capitalist system were the problem to be redressed through individual struggle. He looked at capitalism as a system.

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

DEAR MIM:



"Sexual pleasure is the experience of power," she [MacKinnon] says." This would seem to imply that women, lacking power, are incapable of experiencing sexual pleasure. This is so

obviously false that it is difficult to see how anyone could make such a mistake.

—A critic of MIM's gender line

August, 1992

MIM REPLIES:

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

Another answer is that some people who are biologically female nonetheless could be basically socially constructed males, because they have power to enjoy—female judges, politicians or capitalists. That's not to mention the gender aristocracy generally, which we discuss in MT2/3.

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

DEAR MIM:

"Discarding male-biased theories of gender as rooted in biological difference" [A partial quote from a MIM article—MC5] Biological difference is the basis of gender \*by definition.\* Does MacKinnon's theory mean that a person can change gender by purely social or intellectual processes? This would render the categories of "male" and "female" meaningless, and in so doing invalidate the very basis of

feminism. I can't accept this—especially when all the evidence contradicts it.

—Critic

August, 1992

MIM REPLIES:

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

## MA71 on Gender

DEAR MIM:

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

(this is the real proletariat).

In a book called *Problems of the Struggle for the Complete Emancipation of Women*, (Tirana, Albania, 1973) in the chapter called "On Certain Anti-Marxist Concepts of the Khruschevite Revisionists in Connection with Women's Participation in Social Production Work," it is stated: "Second, the Krushevite revisionists try to reassure women preaching that household work merits the same respect as work in production. But these preachings have nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism."(p.111-12)

In Capital, part 4, production of relative surplus value, chapter 14, section 3: "...now the capitalist buys children and young persons under age. Previously, the workman sold his own labour-power,

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

which he disposed of nominally as a free agent. Now he sells his wife and child. He has become a slave-dealer."

In part 5, the production of absolute and of relative surplus value, chapter 17, changes of magnitude in the price of labour power and in surplus value: "The value of labour power is determined by the value of the necessaries of life habitually required by the average labourer. The quantity of these necessaries is known at any given epoch of a given society, and can therefore be treated as a constant magnitude. What changes, is the value of this quantity. There are, beside, two other factors that enter into the determination of the value of labour-power. One, the expense of developing that power, which expenses vary with the mode of production; the other, its natural diversity, the difference between the labour power of men and women, of children and adults. The employment of these different sorts of labour-power, an employment which is, in its turn, made necessary by the mode of production, makes a great difference in the cost of maintaining the family of the labourer, and in the value of the labour-power of the adult male..."

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

Going back to MacKinnon. Her book is called something like *Towards a Feminist Theory of the State*. It therefore must be compared to *The Origins of the Family, Private Property and the State*. Male domination of women took place when society was "cleaved" into classes, i.e. when primitive society turned into slave society. In primitive society there was equality between the sexes. Therefore there can only be equality again when classes are abolished. Under socialism the first work in this area is done. Housework and child rearing must be socialized, first and foremost. Women are then drawn into production work. Under socialism there is equal pay for equal work. Another point, there is a big difference in the relations between men and women from class to class. The most exploited and oppressed classes of people also are more equal vis a vis men

and women. Attitudes of male supremacy are less. This is compared with the labor aristocracy and petty-bourgeoisie and capitalists.

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

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

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

—MA71

April 28, 1992

**MC5 REPLIES:**

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

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

For sentimental reasons, some have called for remuneration for housework. In this we must agree with Albanian communist Hoxha of 1973. Paying for housework might or might not affect the total wages paid by capitalists to workers; however, it is certain that paying for housework would reinforce its exis-

## A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT

tence and make it more difficult to eradicate. Ironically, as MA71 points out, it might also penalize single women workers who would see their wages reduced. Hence, genuine communists call for socialization of housework not its sanctification. We seek public and collective cooking and cleaning for instance, not to mention clothes mending and types of work that belong in manufacturing in any case. Some of the most revolutionary advances in the world on this issue were made during the Great Leap in China. (See the MIM reading list on women in China.)

We must also comment on those trends within pseudo-feminism which glorify "devalued" motherhood and housework as quintessentially feminine and worthy of society's respect. It is these pseudo-feminists and not redneck men or clever white-collar manipulators that are the cutting edge of "backlash"—the term for reaction against genuine progress in women's liberation. There is no shortcut to women's liberation outside of women's entry into production and all spheres of life where power is to be found and wielded. It is the patriarchy that wishes everyone to believe otherwise.

It is also interesting that MA71 raises the fact that Marx saw the family as embodying pre-capitalist modes of production. Here he refers to wives and children as "slaves;" elsewhere he refers to serfdom in domestic relations. MIM's position in this regard is that the family as an element of the superstructure continues to show these pre-capitalist influences, but it is not correct in the imperialist countries today to liken gender relations to pre-capitalist relations of production. Quite to the contrary, the gender relations between First World men and women resemble the class relations between the labor aristocracy and the imperialists—collaboration and negotiation at its finest.

### IDENTITY POLITICS:

# How Subversive is Cultural Subversion?

by a comrade

Identity politics is the name of a political trend which has emerged in gay, lesbian, bisexual, queer,

white feminist, and countercultural (e.g., punk, skin-head) communities. Identity politics place an emphasis on creating and/or maintaining a distinct cultural identity as a means of opposing the dominant culture.

The very notion of a "Queer Nation" (the name of a liberal/radical queer liberation/rights group) is an example of identity politics. The idea of queers as a nation or of national liberation for queers is a manufactured idea with no historical basis. The title is basically an appropriation of Black Nationalist rhetoric. The difference between Black Nationalism and 'Queer Nationalism' is that the idea that a Black Nation exists inside the U.S. borders has a historical basis, while the idea of a Queer Nation has no such basis. The historical basis of Black Nationalism is that there has been a colonial relationship first between the white Amerikan nation and the Black nations of Africa, then between the white nation and the forcibly relocated Black Africans. Revolutionary Black Nationalists maintain that the colonial relationship continues to this day, and that a Black struggle for national liberation from Amerikan colonization is no different from any other revolutionary struggle for national liberation for oppressed colonies.

Queer Nationalism, in contrast, is not based on a history of queers as a nation. 'Queer Nation' is a militant-sounding name for an organization whose membership do not argue that a Queer Nation exists, except as the name of their organization. Furthermore, the reason that the name 'Queer Nation' sounds militant is that it imitates the rhetoric of Black Nationalism, a political trend with revolutionary practitioners, martyrs, political prisoners, and prisoners of war. Queer Nation claims as its own the image and identity of revolution: death and glory, heroes and martyrs. But the identity is all that Queer Nation, a predominantly reformist organization, claims.

Without a revolutionary practice, Queer Nation reduces itself to all glory, no death: One 'Queer National' who plays a leadership role in Queer Nation/DC said that "every time you make love in the District of Columbia you are breaking the law. Every queer kiss is a revolutionary act! This is your revolution and Queer Nation needs you to put those kisses on the line." His speech continued with a number of reformist demands, mostly for changes in laws.(1)

To call kissing "revolutionary" when the kiss is queer—i.e., contrary to the dominant culture's

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

understanding of what a kiss is and should be—is, in my opinion, an insult to the many real revolutionaries (including queer revolutionaries) who have died in struggle or been “buried alive” in prison. Subversion is subversion, revolution is revolution, and identity politics, due to its emphasis on image over substance, often elevates cultural opposition to the status of “revolutionary.”

The difference between revolutionary politics and identity politics is that revolutionary politics emphasize material conditions and the political practices necessary to change those material conditions, while identity politics emphasize identity and cultural practices. An example of revolutionary politics is the ten-point program of the Black Panther Party (BPP), which calls for self-determination for the Black Community, repayment of financial debts owed to the Black Community, full employment, decent housing, honest education, exemption from service in the U.S. military, an end to police brutality, freedom for Black prisoners, trial by jury of racial/socio-economic peers, and “land, bread, housing, education, clothing, justice and peace.”(2)

This program does not concern itself with what is and is not “a revolutionary act.” Rather, it recognizes the material conditions of Black people’s lives in the inner cities. In the full text of the tenth point, the BPP Program quotes Amerika’s Declaration of Independence to explain that the aforementioned demands should be met by the means of national liberation through armed revolution if necessary.(2) Further BPP texts indicate that the Panthers did indeed believe that revolutionary violence would be necessary for the attainment of their goals. They did not believe that their goals could be met through cultural subversion.

The Panthers, in fact, polemicized against cultural nationalism, which was and is the New Afrikan/ Black community’s equivalent of identity politics: “The Black Panther Party, which is a revolutionary group of black people, realizes that we have to have an identity. We have to realize our black heritage in order to give us strength to move on and progress. But as far as returning to the old African culture, it’s unnecessary and it’s not advantageous in many respects. We believe that culture itself will not liberate us. We’re going to need some stronger stuff.”(3)

An organization of queer people could follow the model of the Panthers by studying what material conditions affecting queer people’s lives need to be changed, and what methods would work best to

change these conditions. Whether such an organization opted for reform or revolution, it would have no need for empty, decontextualized rhetoric about national oppression and revolution. The Panthers used such rhetoric only in the context of explaining their politics, whereas the use of such rhetoric by Queer Nation and other practitioners of identity politics tends to obfuscate, not to enlighten. Queer Nation’s use of the word “revolution,” for instance, obscures the reality of their basically reformist stance. Their use of the word “nation” obscures the differences between the Black Liberation and Queer Liberation Movements. Identity politics place an emphasis on image which interferes with the clear advancement of a substantive political agenda.

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

## Notes:

1. Text of speech given by ‘Queer National’ Greg Scott at the 10/12/91 D.C. Alternatives Festival. Printed as “Every kiss a revolutionary act” in the Washington Blade, 10/25/91
2. October 1966 Black Panther Party Platform and Program: “What We Want/ What We Believe,” as printed in *The Black Panthers Speak*, edited by Philip S. Foner, p. 2-4.
3. Huey P. Newton in *The Black Panthers Speak*, p. 50.

## Two New England Women’s Papers

---

by MC5  
8/11/92

***The Third Wave:***

***A Voice for Rhode Island Feminist Women***  
c/o Feminist Resources Unlimited  
Box 3090  
Wayland Sq. Station, RI 02906  
\$10 for 12 issues payable to Feminist Resources  
Unlimited

***She: For the Mindful Woman***  
Vol. 1, no. 9, July 14, 1992  
fax: (617) 426-8264  
\$55 for 6 months weekly

This is an interesting contrast of two papers for women in the New England area. *She* features an

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

interview with cartoonist Sylvia Edwards and a full-page ad of a model in her underwear on the back cover. In contrast, *The Third Wave* has the word feminist right in the masthead.

As one would expect, *Third Wave* is the more challenging paper. *She* is for women, but it does not claim to be feminist. From our perspective this is honest because *She* is really a paper for women focussing on femininity. It is entirely and unabashedly for adjustment to society rather than radical change. Articles about Sylvia Edwards, theater, taking music lessons, photography (in a section called "For Art's Sake," starting exercise, cats, recipes and investments all provide a way for women to avoid issues of power and hierarchy. In these articles we come to understand the theme of "mindful." The paper is basically a call on women to develop those aspects of life having to do with internal or emotional development. "Art for its own sake" should really be relabelled "art for its own escape" in this paper.

Rounding out the paper is a favorable review of Gloria Steinem's new book exalting self-esteem and an article by a Harvard psychology professor dividing the world into "logical" and "linear" people on the one hand and "mindful" people on the other hand. The paper is really miraculously consistently petty-bourgeois, white and feminine—with not one bit of challenge to the patriarchy. No wonder it sells so many ads and comes out weekly.

*The Third Wave*, on the other hand, proclaims itself a paper published by "a networking system and clearinghouse for feminist organizations and individuals throughout Rhode Island.... FRU members embrace a philosophy which includes, among other things, the following five critical issues: reproductive freedom, lesbian and gay civil rights, ending all forms of violence against women, passage of an all inclusive ERA, and true diversity in the feminist women's movement." (p. 2)

With one exception, the articles about art, music and other escapes all have an aspect addressing the role of women in society. For example, an article about Campfest and the National Women's Music Festival points out that at these events, women see that they are capable of organizing every aspect of their own lives.

Another article by *The Third Wave* mourns how mainstream the "women's candidates" are this year—the ones making all the *New York Times* headlines. "It probably will be the year for the onomatopoetic 'women's candidates.' 'Chained lighten-

ing.' 'Permanent wave.' A few women will succeed in pinching the seats of a few men, riding in on what passes for radical change on a technicality. Trim, flat, bright, and juiceless, twisted all out of all natural shape for public consumption. 'Dried apricots'; the less delectable, the more electable." (p. 3)

On the negative side, the paper celebrates "diversity" instead of opposing national oppression. It provides an ad for a "pow-wow," but does nothing in relation to the particular oppression of national minority or Third World women. Of course, the program of FRU does not really claim to be accomplishing such.

.....

**The Third Wave does not ask what it means that women are in relations where deception is the supposed necessity to begin with. Nor does it ask how men might also use privacy to deceive women.**

.....

From MIM's perspective, *The Third Wave's* greatest weakness is its lack of an anti-imperialist perspective, a sense of who friends of women's equality are and what works to create change and what doesn't. For this reason, *The Third Wave* is not able to effectively contribute to women's liberation despite its goals.

An example of where the lack of "strategic confidence" in the Third World proletariat as the vehicle of revolutionary change will lead is the front page article. Titled, "Phonesmart: How a Telephone Can Kill You," this article is by the Rhode Island Coalition Against Domestic Violence.

As we have shown in our MIM Theory magazine (Issue 2/3), the Amerikan movement against violence against women has failed miserably and would benefit from a good look around the world for better strategies—namely a revolutionary strategy in the tradition of Marx, Lenin, Stalin and Mao. Readers should get the magazine for the detailed evidence supporting this point.

In any case, the lead story features a violent graphic and a telephone. So here it is once again that supposed women's liberation fighters portray

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

women as hopelessly weak, so weak they can be killed by a telephone.

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

It boils down to saying that wives should have privacy in the phone-calls they make and that husbands should have no way of knowing who the wife calls or is called by. "Privacy has long been an esteemed American value." (p. 1) In not so many words, *The Third Wave* believes women should have the "right" to deceive their husbands as the solution to battering against women.

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

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

Hence, *The Third Wave's* strategy is mistaken on two levels. First, women's liberation does not succeed from championing privacy "rights." Women's liberation needs to be about power struggles of groups, not individual privacy, or so MIM

gathers from feminist movements more successful in world history.

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

This is an image of women as hopelessly helpless and feminine—something right out of the movies—"The Perils of Pauline" or Polly in the "Underdog" cartoons. For a counterexample of how to organize women, MIM recommends the Peruvian Communist Party (PCP, also known as Sendero Luminoso). Sendero women engage in armed struggle, co-edit the newspaper and lead prison struggles. Although the Peruvian women must also fight famine, the PCP never depicts women as helpless.

## Selective Prosecution is Justified in Rape

.....

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

**DEAR MIM:**

Isn't it obvious why of the REPORTED rapes there would be a disproportionate accusation by white women of black men: BECAUSE THOSE ARE THE KIND OF RAPES THAT CAN BE SUCCESSFULLY PROSECUTED. There are a tremendous amount of unreported rapes, most of which are



acquaintance rape, which are very hard to prove. It is true the dynamics of the information reflect the racism of our criminal justice system but there is a long leap from that to accusing white women rape victims in general of fabricating rape charges in order to be part of a conspiracy against the black

## A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT

male. What are the statistics about black female rape victims?

—Another critic of MIM on gender  
June, 1992

### MIM REPLIES:

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

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

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

Finally, this kind of reasoning discredits real feminism. It's one reason rape victims have such a hard time. The reason is that rape as LEGALLY defined is often a fabrication by white women. Why? Because in this country's legal system, we supposedly have something called equal protection of the law. Now as a revolutionary group, at a certain level, we don't give a shit about the law; although we all uphold it in our current practice. But the masses are right not to support a hypocritical system that claims to provide equal protection under the law. All sex is rape in our opinion, but we can see that if you use the patriarchy's definition of rape (as is common in this country), then people are

going to get pissed, because there is clearly no equal protection under the law. That's just another reason we think anti-rape groups that are genuine should repudiate the legal system and work like MIM to seize power to abolish pornography, disallow the use of women as objects in movies and ads, etc. and generally support a more liberating culture.

## Corrections:

### THE FOLLOWING ARE CORRECTIONS FROM MIM THEORY 2/3.

P. 22 The article "No gains for women in Taiwan" started with an incorrect sentence. It should have read: "The masses know the real answer to the question of where pseudo-feminism led the women of Hong Kong, Taiwan, south Korea, Japan and India." It had read "Chinese pseudo-feminism," instead of just "pseudo-feminism."

P. 101 should read "It could go the way of reactionary imperialist interests..." not "It that could..."

P. 116 should read Catherine MacKinnon not Katherine MacKinnon

## What Didn't Work in China

April, 1992

by MC5

The following article was cut off in the middle by accident in MT2/3. We reprint the article in its entirety here.

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

It is important to look at what happened in China both before the Maoist revolution and after. The silence left by many pseudo-feminist critics of Mao's CCP is on the question of what happened to the non-Marxist feminists before 1949. The answer is that they said a lot of things that pseudo-femi-

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

nists today think are new and like the pseudo-feminists of today, they failed in their efforts.

The women's movement in China started at least as early as 1912 with petitions and demonstrations for equal rights including the right to vote. By 1922 Communist Wang Hui-wu criticized her compatriots in written articles for allowing their women's movements to be taken over by warlords. (Warlords were local authorities, military-prince-fiefdom-bosses before China was unified as a single country.) Hence from the beginning there was a class struggle within the women's movement.

The communist women of the 1920s also thought that some of the feminists of the day had a way of destroying social change movements from within: "They were equally concerned that the women's rightists not dissipate their energies in battles between the sexes when they should be girding themselves for class warfare. Some would mock the notorious Miss Han Ying who promoted the 'hate system' which turned women against men on the erroneous assumption that their enemy was the male sex rather than an oppressor class composed of men and women."(2)

One of the problems of the oppressed is that their history gets erased or written in inaccessible places. Part of the result is the constant re-invention of the wheel. The idea that men are the supreme enemy is not a new idea restricted to the United States since the 1960s. The idea was in currency in China in the 1920s as well. Where did Han Ying and the whole anarchist feminist movement take Chinese women in the 1920s and 1930s? Nowhere.

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

One Western pseudo-feminist critic of China's revolution, Suzette Leith, describes one of the communist women close to the foundation of the CCP named Hsiang Chin-yü who had to fiercely criticize certain kinds of "feminists" at the time. "Hsiang's sharpest criticisms were for the 'romantics,' young girls who espoused free love and placed highest emphasis on individual liberty and happiness. Hsiang labeled these girls dangerous and undisciplined."(3)

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

romance, political women of the 1920s raised such self-serving behavior to a principle. The Western-educated Chinese women demanded that educated Chinese men discard their traditional wives and start over by marrying for "love," presumably "love" of educated women.(4) Then as now, the competition for men beneath the surface was concealed, but plain enough to the scientist of revolution.

.....

**One of the problems of  
the oppressed is that  
their history gets erased  
or written in  
inaccessible places.**

.....

A high point of women's liberation for pseudo-feminist Leith came when the Nationalist army (the pro-landlord, pro-U.S. army that opposed Mao's People's Liberation Army in the civil war) liberated one woman from her communist husband. Another high point for Leith occurred when a communist husband was killed so that the oppressed wife could manage to escape.(5) Transferring her own decadent Western imperialist culture to China, Leith makes a gigantic leap of logic in examining divorce in China: "The enthusiasm with which peasant women sought out divorces indicates that they, like the girl students, perceived themselves as primarily sexually rather than economically oppressed, in struggle not with the landlord but with the male."(6) What matters to Suzette Leith, who is preoccupied with the decadent imperialist family, is not that women in China were starving by the millions, but that sexual freedom be attained. Ironically, even in the case of the two women Leith cites as oppressed by communist men, the women in question went on to stay in the Communist Party. They didn't go the individualist, sexual politics route.

MIM would like to be able to make a simple case for women's liberation, especially by pointing to accomplishments of Maoism, and avoid having to say that sexual freedom is subordinate to freedom from starvation, homelessness and militarism, but decadent women like Leith make that impossible. They insist that we dot the "i" and cross the "t," so MIM does: sexual oppression is not the principal contradiction in the world today, and it hasn't been

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

in China's history so far this century. The sexual struggle is subordinate to class and nation struggle.

It is necessary to prioritize struggles that way because Leith makes comments that peasant women are not oppressed by landlords and that they look on the Nationalist (pro-landlord) Army as liberators. In the first place that is a lie as demonstrated by tens of millions of peasant women who joined the communist cause. In the second place, it is not even real feminism. The proof is in the society that people like Leith turned to—Taiwan. Mao Zedong's People's Liberation Army drove the remnants of the Nationalists out of Mainland China and into Taiwan. Later we will see what the result of efforts of pseudo-feminists like Leith's have achieved for women in Taiwan. We can't leave that job to Leith, because she is so idealist she no where takes responsibility for the outcome of her kind of politics.

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

Janet Salaff and Judith Merkle are another pair of free-love-touting pseudo-feminists. They are sympathetic to the anarchist cause celebre in Soviet history, the Kronstadt revolt of 1921. They also believe that during Stalin's reign as party leader in the Soviet Union, "the most bizarre excesses of the policy can be attributed to the aberrations of his personality."<sup>(7)</sup>

Salaff and Merkle start with the usual idealist twist on a statement that the revolutionary feminists no doubt agree with: "The Revolution vastly improved the lot of many Russian women, increasing literacy, education and legal rights. Most Soviet women work out of choice as well as necessity, and child care is available. But these accomplishments fall far short of the hopes of the women revolutionaries or the early promises of the revolution itself."<sup>(8)</sup>

Without producing any of the kind of figures which might refute those MIM has in other articles on China, Salaff and Merkle come to simply inaccurate factual conclusions that women only made token gains during the Russian and Chinese revolutions.

Nancy Milton, who lived in the People's Republic of China gave a personal testimony to rebut Salaff and Merkle in addition to analysis of the

situation in Mao's China: "During one of my teaching years in Peking, I worked with a teaching group of about thirty teachers, approximately half men and half women. Within this group, virtually all specific leadership was in the hands of women, not because they were women, but because it happened, in each case of teaching specialization, political leadership or whatever, a woman had superior qualifications of experience, ability, training or knowledge. ...No one seemed to regard the situation as particularly remarkable except for myself, and I too came to take it for granted."<sup>(9)</sup> Milton went on to thoroughly criticize Salaff and Merkle for an ahistorical and ethnocentric approach.

One interesting aspect of this is that Salaff and Merkle are some of the more correct critics of the real revolutionary feminists. They aren't as far off as some of the more reactionary ones like Leith. All the while calling for free-love, an increased role of women in armed struggle and probably anarchism, Salaff and Merkle make their "ethnocentric" mistakes.


It just goes to show how it is difficult to escape the bias of one's nationality. We must always insist on comparative research at all times, especially before we set about criticizing societies other than our own.

## Notes:

1. Jack Belden's, *China Shakes the World* is a good source of information on the struggle of women unleashed in the communist revolution.
2. Roxanne Witke, "Woman as Politician in China of the 1920s," *Women in China*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1973, p. 40-41.
3. Suzette Leith, "Chinese Women in the Early Communist Movement," *Women in China*, Marilyn B. Young, ed., Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1973, p. 50.
4. Ibid., p. 56.
5. Ibid., p. 63.
6. Ibid.
7. Janet Weitzner Salaff and Judith Merkle, "Women and Revolution: The Lessons of the Soviet Union and China," *Women in China*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1973, p. 155.
8. Ibid., p. 158.
9. Nancy Milton, "A Response to 'Women and Revolution,'" *Women in China*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1973, p. 181.

# Chapter 4

## East Block



**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT****EX SOVIET UNION****Notes from Siberia****Siberian Review**

The Independent Russian Monthly  
No. 1, June 1992, Free

review by MC86  
July, 1992

This very informative 28-page newspaper is published by Siberian capitalists with the assistance of the *San Francisco Weekly*. *Siberian Review* (SIR) is the Amerikan edition of the *Sibirskaya Gazeta*, 77a Gorky Street St., Novosibirsk, Russia 630099 (SG). SIR's 25,000 plus copies are currently distributed on the Amerikan West Coast.

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

**A FEW NUGGETS**

- The Russian state-subsidized newspaper *Izvestia* has entered into a joint venture with the Hearst Corporation.(p. 2)

- The Chair of the Parliamentary Committee on Legislation and Law predicts two million drug addicts in Russia by the year 2000. "This year alone an increase in the addict population of 20 - 25% is predicted. [The Chair] blames unemployment, price liberation and general instability for this year's dramatic increase."(p. 2)

- A "Message From the Editors" quotes Dostoyevsky, Marx and Robert Penn Warren as it urges Amerikans to "travel to and do business in Russia."(p. 2)

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

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

**CLASS STRUGGLE:****A RUSSIAN LABOR-ARISTOCRACY?**

SG's sister publication in Siberia is *Nasha Gazeta*, the voice of miners in the Kuzbass region who formed the Independent Union of Coal Miners (PNG) and its allied union Workers' Movement in 1989. (p. 6) These unions supported Boris Yeltsin during the August 1991 coup attempt by shutting down 50 mines and rushing to Yeltsin's side at the Russian White House. The central strike committee of the PNG/Workers' Movement is "planning to hire professional lobbyists to represent their interests in the oblast capital of Kemerovo and in Moscow.... They have also hired a variety of specialists to generate policy alternatives [and have] travelled to consult with academics at the Hoover Institute [and spent two weeks] in Palo Alto consulting with leaders of the United Mine Workers' Union."

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

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

"As PNG battles the state union for the confidence of the miners, the parallel contest at the top pits the dogged determination of reformers Mikhail Kislyuk and Workers' Movement leader Slava Golikov against the populist tirades and intimidation of the equally determined Aman Tuleyev, formerly the First Secretary of the oblast Communist Party and presently the head of the Soviet (legislature), and his allies in the Federation of Trade

## A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT

Unions of Russia, the old state-controlled apparatus..."(p. 7)

Tuleyev commented, "In our region, we have 700,000 retired people. In the situation that exists now those people are going to die. The allowances they get are simply not enough." *SIR/SG* comments, "This is obviously populist rhetoric; but the problem for [Tuleyev's] reformist opponents is that it is also substantially true."(p. 7)

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

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

### OPPRESSED NATIONS

Siberia holds 14 indigenous groups living in 14 Autonomous Regions and Republics holding 4,054,000 people. The indigenous population numbers 937,000 (nearly 25%) of this very northern region of Siberia. The rest of Siberia holds 18 million mostly-Russian people (12% of the SNG/CIS population).

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

The populace resents the fact that Siberia contributes more to the central Russian government than it receives back in services; and this resentment provides the fuel for separatist movements. "Separatism in Siberia does not stem primarily from the frustrated national aspirations of minority groups...the driving force has been the machinations of a nomenklatura eager to regain its power"(p. 10)—and possibly, as well, an educated middle class eager to take-over ownership and command of particular sections of industry, agriculture,

commerce and banking—for little or no capital investment.

### BATTLE LINES

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

In the Jewish Autonomous Region (currently composed of only 4.1 percent Jews), "there are some rich Arabian representatives who want to develop the region in order to stop immigration to the (Israeli) occupied territories."(p. 10)

MIM doubts that *SIR/SG* is accurately representing the political and economic needs of the indigenous groups (or of the multi-national Siberian working class). This propaganda-organ of free-enterprise freaks is calling for the loosening of attenuated state monopoly restrictions upon regional capitalist "free" development (to be achieved, naturally, at the expense of exploitable "minorities").

The new capitalists are up against some cagey Communist Party apparatchnik/bourgeoisies who are attempting to maintain their individual hold on regional social wealth by firing up nationalist sentiments and using the vanishing shell of the old state/police/media apparatus to maintain their grip on the means of production.

Unfortunately for the nomenklatura, the lack of central planning (such as it was) has liquidated its ability to keep even a semblance of balance between the production and consumption sectors. Whole enterprises and productive forces are de-linked from each other. The machinery of production remains in place; but neither raw materials nor wageable labor-power nor markets are guaranteed and monopolized production for profit has ceased because there are no profits to be had in the old way.

On the other hand, this fragmentation releases the forces of production for use by independent and autonomous smaller regional capitalists content to eke out initially small profit margins by supplying necessary commodities for consumption by the starving masses. In such a way they accumulate not only whatever hard currency is at hand; but by actually using the state-abandoned, or under-utilized, forces of production, the small capitalists lay a claim to ownership and are actually accumulating capital in its broadest sense during a time of scarcity and

## A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT

economic dis-articulation. Possession is nine-tenths of the law.

The new capitalists are not against the separatist movements, per se; they just want to control the movement of splits themselves. This is a class struggle between emerging national capitalists and a class of semi-compradors. The latter are casting about for foreign imperialist capital to invest in their de-coalescing regional economies and keep themselves in semi-colonial-style affluence and positions of political power.

In opposition to this—the nationalist capitalist bourgeoisies do not seem eager to invite the imperialist multi-nationals in to take-over through majority investments and loans—although they also do not seem to be loathe to refuse smaller injections of foreign capital which carry fewer iron strings attached to them than investments by monopoly-capitalist groups. Hence the almost sexual solicitation by SIR/SG to individual Amerikan investors and small businesses.

SIR directs itself towards individual Amerikan entrepreneurs and small companies for essential infusions of hard cash. It is not appealing to Mobile, Shell or Mitsubishi. The class interests of the Siberian national bourgeoisies lie in keeping imperialist capital locked out of whatever shape the Siberian nations take through further splits and amalgamations. The Communist Party old guard, grasping at the waning power of the SNG/CIS, seems bent on selling off state assets as fast as possible to the multi-nationals. These wealthy "ex-state" enterprise managers lack the economic vigor of rising capitalists and the allegiance of a mass social base. They are interested in perpetuating some form of the previous state monopolies; whereas the new capitalists are the only class truly interested in and capable of instituting an unrestricted "free-market" in their areas.

Of course, the establishment of such "free-markets" within the splintering economies will inevitably result in the erection of trade barriers and the development of monopoly price controls in production and distribution. The end result of this movement will be civil war. It is difficult to see how civil war and/or imperialist invasion can be avoided in the "prison-house of nations," short of communist revolution.

### SURROUNDING SHARKS

It is interesting to consider how the multi-nationals have been holding back from investing in

the SNG/CIS until the ruble is "stabilized" and the continuing political shake-down pops up legal entities that can accept exorbitant pound-of-flesh IMF-type loans and direct investments. The multi-nationals supported Gorbachev & Perestroika because glasnost greased the process of the piece-meal selling off of the people's assets through joint-ventures and other capitalist tricks.

With the recent upheaval and the nationalist fragmentations and the certain inability of Yeltsin & Bush to guarantee political and economic stability—the monopoly capitalist groups are not eager to make direct infrastructural investments that may eventually be seized by nationalist movements. Nor are they eager to make loans that can be repudiated. Yet, they foam at the mouth in anticipation of the enormous super-profits to be had in the former social-imperialist formation that has shattered into about 150 potentially exploitable nations.

What remains of SNG/CIS military (nuclear) strength is probably sufficient to deter Western imperialist invasion at this time; although we should not discount the possibility of Japan or China biting off a chunk or two in the east and the EEC/Amerika in the west. Imperialism prefers to rule by proxy and economic clout when possible; but nuclear blackmail (and the exemplar vaporization of a few Third World cities) may be the wave of the near future. There is an unquantifiable amount of potential surplus-value (and raw materials) to be extracted from the 250 million residents of the fragile SNG/CIS lands, and imperialism is surely plotting to get it all by hook and by crook.

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

Humpty Dumpty has really fallen this time and not even imperialism will be able to put him back together again. In fact, imperialism has its hands full in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Perhaps the most

## A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT

imperialism will be able to obtain from the warring nation/states of the SNG/CIS is a bonus in profitable arms sales and a dumping ground for over-produced industrial and agricultural commodities.

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

So the struggle shapes up as between the institutions of decaying state-monopoly capitalism and the arising needs of the national bourgeoisies and their nascent capitals to expand. The instruments of rule may still rest, if tenuously, in the hands of the opportunist, nomenklatura class of state-capitalist semi-compradors. It is these instruments that must be forcibly seized by the national bourgeoisies if they are to live and thrive to oppress the workers and farmers.

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

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

Ultimately, class war will resolve these issues one way or another over a certain period of time. This continues to be a revolutionary situation and we must not discount the initiative of the proletariat. So far the changes have actually been in the interests of the masses of the world. An imperialist

power has collapsed and its cousins cannot be far behind. The situation in the SNG/CIS is ripe for revolutionary class alliances based on material interests and determined Marxist-Leninist-Maoist parties could, once again, demonstrate the universal applicability of proletarian alliances with suffocating national bourgeoisies in the working out of the world contradiction between imperialism and the oppressed nations. Fortunately for the people, the situation is too complex and composed of too many variable arising strengths for Western imperialism to step right in and take over.

### THE BEAR

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

Although Great White Russia is still a force to be reckoned with, it is a sign of its weakness and internal stresses that different currencies are coming into usage throughout the continent. The ruble represents nothing but idle promises. The oppressed nations which Czarist & Revisionist Russia historically dominated may have grown too coherent to colonize as in the past. Beside, it appears that the SNG/CIS Armed Forces are multi-national and no longer in the service of Russia alone.

### THE WAGES OF PROFIT

Konstantin Zatulin, head of the International Association of Enterprise Managers (based on the framework of the old Soviet Union) and founder of the Moscow Commodities Exchange says, "Only a thief or a madman could start a new business in the present economic situation. Because a thief gets everything for free, and a madman is incapable of understanding the realities of life. There is no credit, [there is] an unreasonable tax system, there are no conditions conducive to privatization, no understanding local authorities, no sympathy on the part of the population, no goods or resources—nothing. Political stability is not guaranteed either. Regions do what they like: interrupt deliveries, impose restrictions on the circulation of goods." (p. 13)

The KGB has started a school for businessmen interested in security. "Colonel Novinkov, an instructor, explains the need for industrial counter-intelligence with the claim that 'U.S. intelligence has already made \$6 billion stealing Russian industrial

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

'secrets.' The staff no longer trust their own government either and will offer instruction in 'how to protect yourself if threatened and how to protect your enterprise against unlawful actions by state power structures and authorities.'" The KGB is offering popular courses in how to protect intellectual property. They are catering to "the fears of new Russian businessmen trying to survive in what has practically become the realization of the communist dream of a stateless society."(p. 15) Of course that is only a joke. There are several states or fragments of states in formation and locked in battle.

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

"Yeltsin's Democratic Russia Movement has split asunder. Key elements of the coalition: the Russian Democratic Party, the Constitutional Democratic Party, the Russian Christian Democratic Movement among them, are already in opposition. Of the approximately 600 deputies that made up Democratic Russia's majority in the 1100 member Congress of People's Deputies, just over half have defected. Yeltsin has also lost the support of the Cossacks. . . Ataman (chief) Vladimir Doroshchenko had this to say: "Many of us defended the White House during the coup, but now we ask ourselves—did we take the right side?"(p. 11)

"For the Christian Democrats and their allies, 'historic Russia' includes most of the territory of what was previously the Soviet Union: a transcendent Russian state, independent of the ideology of its changing governments. This was one reason they scuttled an effort to write the new constitution without a clause affirming Russia's membership in the USSR. Another reason, less problematic than the claim that Russia and the USSR are co-extensive, is that Yeltsin, Ukrainian President Leonid Kravchuk and Byelorussian President Stanislav Shushkevich violated both the constitution and the will of the people in forming the SNG (CIS), and abrogating the USSR. In a national referendum on March 17, 1991, 75% of the population of the Soviet Union voted to maintain the Union in some form or another. Had the now independent republics left the Union on the basis of the constitution's secession clause, they would have been forced to hold referenda, and regions with predominantly Russian populations would have been able to opt out.... The system of republics created by Moscow to more easily divide

and rule has turned on its creators, assuming a role in the fate of Russia its creators had never intended."(p. 11)

"Of the 24,000 state farms slated for reorganization, only 1,156 have actually been privatized in some form."(p. 12)

"Total tax burdens for companies under the new regulations will range from 45% of profit for the construction and manufacturing sectors, to between 75% and 85%, according to some estimates, for trading houses and wholesalers.... the brunt will fall on the new entrepreneurs, who lack the easy credit available to the state sector."(p. 12)

**MORE NUGGETS**

"In April *Siberian Option* was founded, "the first newspaper for gays and lesbians in all of Siberia and the Russian Far East and among the first in the country. So far the newspaper has printed three issues of 2000 copies each."(p. 19)

"On March 17 in Manezh Square in Moscow there was indeed a pro-communist demonstration involving some 100,000 people."(p. 25)

Whit Mason, one of the Amerikan publishers of *SIR*, interviewed Sergei Krupenko, First Secretary of Novosibirsk chapter of the United Labor Front ("non-Stalinist communists"). Krupenko is obviously a Trotskyite who believes that the "deviations began [before 1936] with the separation of the people from power with the transition from Lenin to Stalin."(p. 25)

Although students at Siberia's Higher Military School have devoted "about one quarter of their lifetime's educations...to the study of communist political ideology...yet when asked today for an example of something valid in all the thousands of pages they've at least half digested, the students...can only suggest vaguely, 'Marx's economic analysis, his understanding of labor.'"

**YUGOSLAVIA****Class War in Yugoslavia**

by MC86  
August, 1992

Amerikan imperialism has been calling the shots in its ex-Yugoslavian dependency since 1948.

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

Concentration camps, the forcible relocation of millions of poor people and "ethnic cleansing" follow on the heels of Amerikan investments everywhere in the world. The motivating force behind the Balkan wars is not religion, ethnicity, tribal warfare or national liberation: it is, purely and simply, profit.

With the retreat of Soviet social-imperialism, Amerikan capital's main competitors in the eight-nation, artificial "slavic homeland" of ex-Yugoslavia are Germany, Italy, France, Czechoslovakia and Great Britain.(1) In April, Germany rushed to stake a claim with the Croats and "recognized" Bosnia & Hercegovina as an independent republic; thereby deliberately inflaming the ongoing imperialist-approved war for regional domination between the Serbian and Croatian ruling classes.

Amerika held out for continued Serbian domination and assisted Serbia in the creation of a phoney "rump-Yugoslavian" federation on April 17 in order to guarantee Amerikan control of its multi-billion dollar export/import pipeline in the Balkans. To oversee Amerikan interests, Milan Panic, a Belgrade-born Amerikan pharmaceutical millionaire was set up as Prime Minister of the rump-Yugoslavia, which is composed of 10 million Serbs and 500,000 Montenegrins. Suddenly, with belated cries of "genocide" raised against the Serbians by his political rivals in Amerika and Europe, George Bush found himself in the peculiar position of having to condemn Amerika's trusted Serbian allies at the same time Amerika maneuvers to hold the entire eastern Adriatic region in its economic grip.

**BLOOD IN THE EYE**

Bush knew of the mass-executions long before the media began to howl. Not only can Amerikan spy satellites spot a flea from 180 miles up; but *The Economist* magazine had been casually remarking on the "ethnic cleansing" as early as May 2, 1992.(2)

Extermination of humans is pivotal to Amerika's cruel land-reform plan for the masses of poor peasant farmers in all of ex-Yugoslavia. With the invasion of 14,900 troops in February, Amerika's United Nations puppet positioned its divisions to oversee the expropriation of more than 2 million poor farmers from their small plots throughout Bosnia & Hercegovina, Serbia and Croatia.

Bush well knows that the 500 "killing fields" are run by Croatian, Muslim and Serbian paramilitary forces armed in part by the Amerikan-financed Bosnian weapons industry.(3) The Muslims are not a

separate nation. They are either Serbs or Croats and they are also divided by class.

**PARTY HACKS**

The bureaucrat-comprador bourgeoisies of Croatia, Slovenia and Serbia have run profitable manufacturing industries financed by Amerikan capital along the banks of the Danube and Driva rivers ever since Tito was kicked out of the international communist movement by Josef Stalin in 1948 for serving as Amerika's outpost in the newly liberated Eastern Europe.

The Croatian port of Rijeka and Serbia's Belgrade are vital shipping facilities serving European and Amerikan corporate merchants. Without free access to the Adriatic sea, the Danube river and seven Yugoslavian maritime "free-trade zones," European and Amerikan corporations would be subject to unfavorable tariffs and increased costs of transportation.(4)

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

These bureaucrat-compradors cast aside the old Yugoslavian republic as the post-World War II order crumbled. They broke into nationally-delineated bourgeois factions murdering the masses and stealing means of production and land in proportion to their strength.

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

**THE STAKES**

In the regional population of 23.8 million, the labor force of 9.6 million breaks down into 27% working in mining and manufacturing, 29% in agri-

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

culture and an incredible 44% in bureaucratic and military/police jobs.(5)

Despite an pre-war annual inflation rate of 2,700% a year (now 36,000%), the \$13.1 billion in regional exports during 1990 nearly balanced against \$13.8 billion in imports.(6) A mere \$700 million trade deficit demonstrates that the region is a giant sluice for foreign monopolists as they have sloshed value-laden goods in and out of the extensive Danube and Adriatic markets.

The USSR, Germany and Amerika collusively used the area as a huge dumping ground for over-produced commodities, even as they engineered the purchase of these useless wares by contracting high-interest loans with the ex-Yugoslavian government. In return for dumped consumer goods and industrial machines, the imperialists received underpriced raw materials and access to highly-exploitable underemployed female labor for piece-assembley of semi-processed imperialist-originating products for regional distribution.(8)

The regional per capita income of \$6,540 and the drippings from a Gross National Product (1990) of \$154.1 billion has accrued mainly to the managerial classes and the labor-aristocracy. The 53.5% of the population composing the rural poor have principally born the costs of inflation through constantly decreasing living standards and the cheapening of their wage-base. The region exports food crops and irreplaceable raw materials to imperialist countries even as it imports subsistence foods from these same parasitical countries.(1)(7) Ex-Yugoslavia also serves Amerika as a source of strategic weapons-grade metals and as an espionage listening-post.

**WAS YUGOSLAVIA A SOCIALIST COUNTRY?**

The greatest service that revisionist Yugoslavia provided to finance capital was its abandonment of the socialist road in 1948 after two short years of proletarian dictatorship. Tito's counterrevolutionary political economy actually served as a model for the traitor Khruschev's economic policies during the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union.

In fact, "the Tito regime...set up many fascist prisons and concentration camps, where tens of thousands of revolutionaries [were] tortured to death..." Tito elevated the kulak (rich peasant) class to powerful political and economic positions in the

countryside through the promotion of "free competition" and hired labor.(8)

It is sections of the bribed working-class and the rich farmers that now form the reactionary shock-troops who murder and expel the poor peasants from the land. The assets of millions of poor farmers and urban proletarians have been seized as regional capital is concentrated for expropriation by competing imperialists and their ultra-nationalist capitalist running dogs.

Euro-American cultures cringe when the techniques imperialism uses every day against the Black masses of the world pop up in white on white. One problem for the imperialists is that with the current world war-driven global migration of laboring populations, the major European industrial centers are not willing to absorb more refugees than they can control: hence, the death camps and the immigration quotas.(9)


When the smoke thins in Slovenia, Croatia, Serbia, Bosnia & Hercegovina, Kosovo, and Vojvodina, the road will have been cleared for the European Economic Community and Amerika to continue dumping massive amounts of out-dated and de-valued analytical and scientific instruments, electrical power generators, telecommunications equipment and avionics on the region through joint ventures financed by imperialist loans and paid for by the cheap labor of starving refugees.(10)

**Notes:**

1. *Exporters Encyclopedia* 1991-91, p. 1510.
2. *The Economist*, 5/2/92, p. 18.
3. *The Economist* 6/20/92, p. 50.
4. *Official Export Guide*, 1992, p. 694.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 697.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 697; *The Economist* 5/2/92, p. 59.
7. *Compton's Encyclopedia*.
8. Is Yugoslavia A Socialist Country? *Renmin Ribao & Hongqi*, 9/26/63.
9. *The Economist* 5/23/92, p. 53.
10. *Official Export Guide*, 1992, p. 695.

## Chapter 5

# The Cuba Question



**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

## A Brief Summary of MIM's Line on Cuba

---

MIM's line on Cuba has the following parts: 1) The Cuban Revolution was a blow against U.S. imperialism, which had a choke-hold on the Cuban economy. 2) As the Cuban Revolution developed and brought some gains for the Cuban masses, especially relative to other societies oppressed by U.S. imperialism in Latin America, it eventually replaced U.S. imperialism with Soviet social-imperialism. 3) It is important to note that the Cuban military strategy of "focoism" has succeeded nowhere else and has in particular brought tremendous losses in Latin America. 4) Cuba is a state-capitalist country. 5) Currently, Castro is a lackey without a master. MIM doubts that he can lead the transition to independent development. 6) Such independent development was possible in Cuba's case. Had it pursued socialist development, Cuba's revolution would have been in a better position than Albania's socialist revolution, which started from an even weaker economic position than Cuba did. 7) Like all Third World countries oppressed by imperialism, Cuba must be defended against imperialist attack.—MC5.

## Interview With a Member of the July 26 Coalition

---

by a comrade

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

MIM credits this activist as one of the most well informed of the people working to support the revolution in Cuba. Too many of those who proclaim the need to support socialism in Cuba have not even

bothered to study the history of Cuba. This activist does not fall into many of the typical failures of the pro-Cuba movement, but does well to represent the most significant disagreements MIM has with those who support Cuban "socialism."

**WHAT IS THE JULY 26 COALITION?**

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

**WHY JUST CUBA?**

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

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

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

**SUPPORT FOR CUBA?**

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

Activist: "Cuba was founded on the concept of socialism and has not yet privatized....No revolution has developed the way revolution should and needs to develop. The system that has successfully com-

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

peted with capitalism is no longer there, but there are still small problems in the way of capitalism."

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

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

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

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

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

This was one of the significant disagreements between MIM and this activist, a point on which many pro-Cuban activists would side with the activist interviewed. S/he made an analogy to a powerful person saying to a powerless person, "You will say what I tell you or your house will fall down

and you will have no food tomorrow," saying that this is the situation Cuba was in with relation to the Soviet Union. This supports the activist's view that "You can't have socialism in one country."

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

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

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

**WHY NO SIGNIFICANT PRO-CUBA MOVEMENT IN THE US?**

The activist had stated at a talk that there is no significant pro-Cuba movement in the United States, so MIM asked him/her why s/he thought this was so.

The activist responded that there is "no significant support for any revolutionary process in the world, not just around Cuba." S/he suggested that this is because of an "alienation of the masses....Intellectuals work constantly to revise ways of alienating people from any concern."

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

## A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT

country. MIM referred the activist to the first issue of MIM Theory which dealt with this question with economic arguments.

The activist concluded that, "there is tremendous disarray in the so-called progressive forces because defeats have been so overwhelming." S/he blamed a lot of the left's failure to organize the Amerikan masses on "Great divisions among ourselves and an inability to discuss them and find common ground."

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

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

### "History Will Absolve Me"

---

*Fidel Castro's courtroom speech in his own defense, October 16, 1953*

review by MC17

#### THE HISTORY

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

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

There he gave a six hour speech in his own defense. He later wrote this speech down and it

became a major theoretical-ideological document to unite the masses against the Batista dictatorship. Fidel was sentenced to 15 years in prison and then amnestied on May 15, 1955, as a result of popular clamor.

#### THE SIGNIFICANCE OF CASTRO'S SPEECH

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

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

#### CASTRO'S FAILURE IN HISTORICAL ANALYSIS

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

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

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

Here he clearly shows the belief of the revolutionaries that democracy and freedom existed before the Batista coup on March 10, 1952. He ignores the long history of Cuban oppression by foreign and domestic powers and hopes to unite people around a fight against one particularly corrupt leader rather than a corrupt system that has been oppressing them throughout history. Had Batista not taken power through a coup, Castro assumes that the masses would have voted out the Machado regime

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

of which he says "the civil government's prestige had dwindled to its lowest ebb." According to him, with a constitution, democratic rights will always be restored in an election year.

**THE FAILURE OF MILITARY REVOLT WITHOUT THE POWER OF THE MASSES**

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

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

**CONCLUSION**

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

**"The Political Economy of Cuban Dependence"**

from Theory and Society 9/7/80.

by Kosmas Tsokhas

Review by MC17

send \$4 for a copy

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

**THE HISTORY OF CUBAN DEPENDENCY**

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

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

Cuba did have a bargaining position of strength in its relationship with the Soviet Union, unlike its pre-revolution relationship with the United States. The Soviet Union needed sugar and it was

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

cheaper for it to import sugar from Cuba than to produce it in the Soviet Union.

Cuba was dependent on the USSR for supplies of petroleum, sulphur, asbestos, fertilizers and equipment, including trucks, automobiles, and metal cutting lathes. But contrary to popular myth, the USSR did not serve Cuba well in these needs. Soviet machines sold to Cuba for use in harvesting sugar cane were virtually useless on Cuban land—no research was done before the sale—and the Cubans were not allowed to return the machines or get a refund. These machines, in fact, damaged a lot of Cuban land and made it impossible to grow cane for years afterwards.

To exercise political control, the USSR punished Cuba when it refused to conform to the Soviet viewpoint. Examples include the rationing of petrol supplies in January, 1968; the USSR's delayed signing of the annual trade agreement and its beginning to charge interest on credits. This was all a result of Havana's ideological criticism of Soviet foreign policy.(p. 325) Soviet aid was only restored in response to Castro's endorsement of the Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968.

**SOVIET SUBSIDIES FOR CUBA**

It appears to be true that the USSR paid a price

higher than the average world price for Cuban sugar, except in 1963. This, combined with Cuba's failure to deliver the required amount, leads to estimates that the USSR subsidized Cuban sugar for the period 1960-1970 up to \$US1,168 million. According to Soviet statistics Cuba had a debt of 1,900 million rubles in 1972.(p. 327)

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

**GET A GRIP!**

Is pulp culture turning your mind to mush? Does reactionary news get you down? Then subscribe to MIM Notes and MIM Theory.

MIM Theory, the Party's new quarterly theoretical journal, is your tool to tackle the tough issues of revolution. Struggle with MIM—in person, by computer, by mail; just do it somehow because the imperialists are already struggling with you by television, newspapers and radio. No one can advance their own thinking and the cause of revolution by themselves. The most progress is brought about in the challenge of a revolutionary collective—a vanguard party.

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

**Wow! Heavy stuff, but I'm ready to argue with MIM....**

- 1 year/4 issues, \$12. (□ Start with No. 1.)
- Better yet, make it 2 years for only \$20.
- Hey, I know MIM is better than the bourgeois journals. Here's \$100 to prove it. I'm a lifetime sustainer & subscriber of MIM Theory.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City, Zip \_\_\_\_\_

**Mail to:**

MIM, P.O. Box 3576, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-3576.

**Important: Send only cash or check made out to "ABS."**

## A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT

327) Because the USSR was exchanging products with Cuba, rather than paying cash for the sugar, these figures cast doubt on the "aid" given to Cuba by the Soviet Union.

Regardless, even if the USSR was subsidizing the Cuban economy, this was not socialist aid. Aid from socialist countries must be given with no strings attached and with careful survey of the needs of the recipient country so that they are not given useless products. Subsidizing the Cuban economy may have been the price that the Soviet Union paid for political dependence and allegiance from Cuba.

### DEPENDENCE ON THE SOVIET UNION AND ITS ECONOMIC RAMIFICATIONS

Tsokhas points out that the difference between dependency on the United States and dependency on the USSR is significant. The United States owned the means of production throughout the Cuban economy. The dependency on the Soviet Union is based on "a division of labor in trade, technology transfers, co-ordination of planning, joint ventures..." He points out that the relationship between Cuba and the Soviet Union is similar to relationships between imperialist countries and their satellite colonies. "Soviet bloc advisors had the decisive say when differences arose with Cuban representatives."(p. 333)

"In the case of Havana's relations with the Soviet Union the failure of industrialization and diversification was due to a combination of the bureaucratic, formalist approach of Soviet bloc advisors, the inappropriate plant and technology purchased by Cuba, and the hasty, naive policies of the Cuban government. To the extent that bargaining occurred over the nature, cost, and design of Soviet plants and industrial projects, Cuba was at a disadvantage for two reasons: there was no other country willing to establish public sector heavy industries, and U.S. corporations had never been interested in such a development; and Soviet state organizations were determined to extract the maximum commercial advantage by overcharging, exporting inappropriate and at times obsolete equipment, and centralizing much of the designing and equipping of plant in the Soviet bloc."(p. 335) By 1972 the Soviet plan took over as Cuba fully implemented a coordinated economy, material incentives and wage differentials: collective ideological incentives were out.

This was not without opposition. For instance, Che Guevera's role in the Cuban revolution is often

confused by analysts. Many people do not know that Che adopted many ideas of Maoism. Tsokhas offers several situations in which Che opposed the Soviet Union and its supporters in favor of ideological incentives and a Cuban method of accounting. He was also criticizing the monoproduction of sugar encouraged by the Soviet Union.

### POTENTIAL FOR SELF-RELIANCE

For those who believe that Cuba could not have resisted U.S. imperialism so long without dependence on the Soviet Union, Tshokas provides the following: between 1965-66 Cuban sugar production was lower than it was before the revolution. This was with Soviet technology.

"Although diversifying agriculture towards food production for domestic consumption as well as export, and building some manufacturing industry, would be slow and 'inefficient' in terms of the world market or criteria of profitability, it would strengthen self-reliance and political independence. And these were important political nationalist objectives of the revolution. Finally, this decision to favor sugar rather than rice was based on criteria of 'profit' and 'comparative advantage,' rather than what was needed for a politically independent Cuba."(p. 343) Tshokas also points out that Cuba was rich in mineral resources.(p. 329)

### SOVIET MANIPULATION OF CUBA

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

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

"Castro's compliance [with the USSR system of economy and government] came after the failure of the 10 million ton zafra [projected harvest of sugar cane]. He had played a major role in galvanizing the nation around sugar production harvested to cut the Soviet debt, building the basis for Cuba's continued

## A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT

independence and placing her on the verge of socialism. When the target of 10 millions tons was not reached, his personal authority was weakened."(p. 352)

By 1973 Castro had retreated from criticizing Soviet imperialism in Latin America, to the point of ignoring Soviet economic aid and political relations with local oligarchies and dictatorships.(p. 353)

.....

**Aid from socialist countries  
must be given with no  
strings attached and with  
careful survey of the needs  
of the recipient country so  
that they are not given  
useless products.**

.....

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

In 1970, "Right now in Chile I believe that it is possible to arrive at socialism through the polls, that is, by election victory."(p. 355) Of course, the socialists did win at the polls only to be crushed later in a U.S.-backed coup which resulted in the killing of at least 20,000 people suspected as leftists. This coup vindicated the earlier Castro on the naivete of attempting to gain power for the working classes without military struggle. The Third World masses have two choices in bourgeois elections: to vote their conscience and see a bloodbath by the imperialists or accommodate themselves to imperialist-comprador rule.

Another evolution in Cuban support for Moscow's strategy was in military contention with U.S. imperialism. Cuban troops were "waging Moscow's battles in the Third World."(p. 357) They aided the MPLA in Angola and the Mengistu military dictatorship in Ethiopia. Cuban troops in Ethiopia engaged in battles against both the Eritrean Liberation Front and the Somalis.

### STATE CAPITALISM IN CUBA

Tsokhas concludes: "In marxism, a basic distinction is made between two modes of production: the capitalist and the communist. 'Socialism' refers to the period of transition from the former to the latter. Although the Cuban leadership claims to be pursuing the goal of communism, the road they have taken will not lead them there, but to the type of repressive society we find in the USSR. Cuban economic dependence has enabled the USSR to insert its own particular form of 'socialism' in Cuba."(p. 359)

MIM encourages all who support Cuban "socialism" to at least read this essay by Tsokhas and review the facts for yourself.

# Chapter 6

## China



## A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT

**MIM Gets Anti-Mao Mail**

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

**DEAR MIM:**

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

—Student from the People's Republic of China  
June, 1992

[When the critic saw that we were serious, s/he sent us another letter—MC5]

**DEAR MIM:**

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

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

—Same Chinese student  
June, 1992

**DEAR MIM:**

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

—Another Chinese student critic  
June, 1992

**MC5 REPLIES:**

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

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

**Long Live Maoism!!**

by a comrade  
May, 1992

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

As our first contribution to the U.S.-China dialogue about Maoism, we would like to discuss the Rodney King verdict. Many people speak of the United States as a "free" country, but the fact is that

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

Black people in the USA have always lived under slavery or quasi-fascism.

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

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

.....

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

.....

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

The next point we would like to make is that the situation of Black people and other oppressed nationalities within the United States raises the obvious question very important to Chinese students: "How did the United States become so wealthy and 'free'?" As you can see, the answer to the first question is that white nation people are "free" only at the expense of Third World peoples—two million killed in Vietnam, tens of millions of indigenous peoples killed in settlement of this country and recently several thousand Panamanians

killed in the invasion of Panama to remove Gen. Noriega, the man the U.S. imperialists set up in the first place when they wanted a stooge in power there.

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

P.S. No we do not support the revisionist Deng Xiaoping regime. We do support Mao and the Gang of Four, so please feel free to hold us accountable for that—but not the June 4, 1989 massacre. We have called the Deng Xiaoping regime fascist and social-imperialist since our foundation in 1983, and we are only following Mao's theories in so doing.

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

**MIM REPLIES:**

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

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

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

their own personality cults (as Mao did after 1971). Most importantly, we don't know any emperors who led the collectivization of agriculture and liberation of women.

*MIM also started a correspondence with an Appalachian from a coal mining town based on what s/he had seen of our polemic on Mao Zedong. It just goes to show that the most direct road to the person of proletarian background is not necessarily through wage appeals. Our correspondent agreed to pick up a copy of Sakai's book and read it.*

**MIM REPLIES:**

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

## Chinese Engineer in Canada Criticizes MIM

---

**DEAR MIM:**

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

First let me cite a short paragraph from



"Maoism": "Many times we have seen criticism of Western Maoists, because Western Maoists don't live in China, and therefore supposedly don't know anything about China. But if that is the case,

then Chinese people don't know anything about the real history of the United States."

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

.....

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

.....

Now let me turn to the Maoism. Maoism is actually a strange mixture of Chinese traditional centralism and the Western Marxism, Stalinism. From 1949 to 1976, Mao controlled almost everything in China and destroyed almost everything which he did not like, whether it was good or bad. He did not like the people to have their independent ideas; then he managed to destroy a large number of people, particularly intellectuals, who were smart enough to be able to think independently. He wanted to catch up with the Western world economically but hated the economic discrimination which he suffered in 1920s; then he adopted a Marxist-Stalinist centrally controlled economy and launched a series of strange campaigns, such as the Great Leap and Cultural Revolution, which actually destroyed the Chinese economy and starved millions of people to death. He hated everybody who ever dared to challenge him and he managed to kill his political enemies, such as Mr. Liu Shaoqi, Mr. Peng Dehuai, Mr. Lin Biao, and Mr. Deng Xiao-ping. [For the record, Peng and Deng did not die under Mao and are still alive, ruling China.—MC5] Mr. Mao also did not like some old evils like drug dealers, prostitute-dealers,

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

etc. and destroyed them. Above all, Maoism is a modern dictatorship which has done much more bad than good to China and the Chinese people in 40 years.

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

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

**ANOTHER MIM CRITIC:****Chinese Can't Even Express All the Horror of Maoism**

May, 1992


**DEAR MIM:**

I visited Kent University in 1990 with some friends of mine. A local friend brought us to the site

where four students were shot to death by the National Guard in 1970. We discussed a lot, comparing that event with what happened in China.

There are surely many "dark sides" in this and any

country. However, one thing we all agreed upon is the freedom of expression. Yes, I know there are many restrictions, written or unwritten, to express the anti-regime opinions here. However, the point is: You CAN openly express them. For example, the



author of this "Maoist Internationalist" article would not be put into prison for distributing the article. In contrast, anyone openly denouncing the government's action on June 4, 1989 will definitely be jailed. The situation would be even worse during Mao's era: Anyone openly denouncing Mao would almost surely be executed. The death of 20 to 40 million people during 1958-1961 is still a taboo even now, and so is the genocidal killing in Guangxi during the Cultural Revolution. The era of Deng is, in comparison, much more civilized.

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

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

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

# Long Live Maoism II!

## The Need for a Comparative Approach

.....

by a comrade  
May 19, 1992

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

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

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

More importantly however, is how does that violence and pain compare with that in other countries? Many people believe 20 million starved to death during the Great Leap, which may be true. (I would just point out that the figures are actually for the aftermath of the Great Leap, 1960-2, not the Leap itself. Furthermore, the figures are based on population estimates not actual countings of dead people. I would suggest that if you lived in a tumultuous period like the Great Leap, you would not be arranging to have babies. You would conserve your strength, but that does not mean there was mass starvation, only 15 million fewer babies than usual.)

In any case, suppose the 20 million starvation figure propagated widely by the CIA and its hacks in academia is true. THE REAL QUESTION IS "HOW DOES THAT COMPARE WITH OTHER IMPERFECT SYSTEMS IN THE WORLD?" Is it fair to compare Mao's China with countries that had been industri-

alizing republics since the 1800s—USA, France, Germany and even Japan? Obviously not.

The fair comparison is with countries that started in a similar position to China's in 1949. Let us note that before 1949, China also endured a starvation of 22 million during World War II thanks to KMT (Guomindang). That is proportionately greater than 20 million in 1960-1.

The real comparison is with India. India was ahead of China in 1949. It achieved its independence in 1947. It had a higher life expectancy and per capita income than China did. It was also 75% peasant like China.

Yet, give Mao's system one generation and China goes ahead of India in life expectancy; even though, India is a parliamentary democracy with much more capitalism than China. Based on a comparison of mortality rates, India suffers 3 million deaths a year, mostly from starvation, because it does not do as well as China, thanks to Maoist revolution.

Indeed, every year 14 MILLION CHILDREN DIE FROM STARVATION IN THE CAPITALIST ASIAN COUNTRIES.(1) What those children need is more Maoism not less Maoism. LANDLORD oppression is still very real for the world's majority of people.

Some point out the exceptions in the international sweepstakes known as the capitalist system—Taiwan, Korea, Hong Kong and Singapore. One of the most disconcerting things is to hear well-educated scientists and mathematicians speak of such exceptions without counting the failures for every success under the world capitalist system. Taking a statistical average, China will always come out near the top in crucial life expectancy figures.

But let's count those exceptions. Where are they? Two cities and two countries. Well the two countries succeeded again BECAUSE of Maoism and class struggle. If Maoism had not swept the Mainland of entrenched landlord class interests allied with U.S. imperialism, the PRC would look a lot more like India or the Philippines. Southern Korea also had its landlord class's influence greatly reduced thanks to the revolution that swept the peninsula before U.S. intervention. Wherever such landed interests are still dominant, it does not matter whether there is democracy, pseudo-democracy or military regime, the economy stagnates and the peasant masses starve at high rates. That means places like El Salvador, Philippines, India, Bangladesh etc.

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT****FREE SPEECH**

The United States wised up and did not reinstall landed interests in Taiwan and southern Korea after class struggle knocked the landlords down a few pegs. Meanwhile, in the rest of the world it backed every petty dictator already in power—whether that dictator represented landlord interests or not. We are talking about the Shah of Iran, Somoza, Marcos, the Salvadoran death squads and the corrupt Vietnamese regime.

It remains true today that the largest obstacle to free speech in the world is the U.S. government, not so much for what it does domestically but because of all the Chiang Kai-sheks it still supports

globally. "Free speech" is allowed to the bought-off working class of the white nation at the expense of "free speech" in the Third World. The U.S. imperialists give its own working class a break in exchange for peace at home and for support of its foreign and military policies.

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

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

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

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

MIM is for the ability of the masses of the world's people to have political discussion and debate. We can't talk about such "free speech" when the United States is willing to kill two million or more people to stop communism in Vietnam or slaughter 3,000 people just to remove Noriega in Panama. What happened to

**TABLE:  
IF THE UNITED STATES IS A "FREE" COUNTRY, THEN PRISON  
IS FREEDOM**

**Number of people in prison per 100,000 people**

USA	426
South Africa	333
Former U.S.S.R.	268
Hungary	196
Malaysia	126
Northern Ireland	120
Hong Kong	118
Poland	106
New Zealand	100
United Kingdom	97
Turkey	96
Portugal	83
France	81
Austria	77
Spain	76
Switzerland	73
Australia	72
Denmark	68
Italy	60
Japan	45
Netherlands	40
Philippines	22

**Imprisonment rate of Black males per 100,000 Black males**

United States	3,109
South Africa	729

Source: "Penal Reform International using data from the Council of Europe and the Australian Institute of Criminology," in William Dan Perdue, *Systemic Crisis: Problems in Society, Politics, and World Order* (NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers, 1993), p. 515, 516.

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

their free speech? And the free speech of people oppressed by U.S. backed apartheid? Death squad El Salvador? Etc., etc. Oppressed people who don't want to be slaughtered will only use "free speech" the way their U.S. imperialist masters want.

The world is full of Chiang Kai-shek—com-pradors—ready to cut a deal with the U.S. imperialists to stay in power. To get to a society with real free speech we need to get rid of the incentive people have to kill each other for land or money or resources. Communism is still the only logical goal for those who want real free speech.

Now we must compare what movements have been most successful in making real-world steps toward those goals. The answer is Maoism. Maoism did not make China perfect over night but it brought faster progress than any other movement, ideology or system. That's what counts, how it compares with other REAL-WORLD EXISTING SYSTEMS. That method of comparing realities is what we Marxists call materialism.

Notes: Ruth Sivard, *World Military and Social Expenditures 1987/8*

**MIM CRITICS DISAGREE WITH "LONG LIVE MAOISM III!"****Maoists are Inhuman**

**DEAR MIM:**

One interesting point in the Maoist's second article is that though Americans may give their own working class the freedom of speech, but it is accomplished only by imposing the restriction on other peoples' freedom.

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

A few years back I went to a seminar given by a visiting Nobel Laureate from South America (I don't remember exactly which country he was from, maybe Peru). Although the wide spread anti-U.S.



sentiment among Latin American intellectuals were known to me, I was still surprised that the whole seminar became an anti-U.S. chorus. The theme was actually not unfamiliar to me. The U.S. imperialism was at the root of every evils in their countries. Once they could get rid of U.S. imperialist control, sun would shine and birds would sing and everything would be fine.

I didn't know how much the Latin American intellectuals were influenced by Maoism, but their mode of thinking was so similar to the "Three Mountain Theory": Once we overthrew the Three Mountains (imperialism, feudalism and reactionaries), all the bad things would be unrooted.

China is probably the country which had once rid itself of the "evil foreign influences" to the most thorough extent. However, our experience tells us that, although the "Three Mountain Theory" can be used to mobilize the masses easily (blaming others is always easy, right?), it is too naive, self-deceiving and self-destructive. We face today similar sentiment. Many people believe that the rule of Communist Party is the root of every evil, and the only thing we need to do is to overthrow CPC. I hope we wouldn't be so stupid as to forget the lesson of recent history.

One thing I don't like about this second Maoist article is the way he/she is talking about the 20 million human sacrifice as a revolutionary experiment. We cannot even talk about to sacrifice 20 million dogs for some experiment.

I am not against social or political experiment. But it should be tested in small scales and subject to constant monitoring of criticism, so that if anything goes wrong, it can be corrected immediately. Even Mao himself wouldn't dare to call the death of 20 million people as an "experiment." I wonder where is the humanistic tradition of Marxism in our Maoist writer's heart?

According to the revolutionary theory of Marx, Lenin, or Mao, a true revolution must be a people's revolution, when people have understood their fate and mission. Now, I am curious about what our Maoist writer or his/her Movement has done in deeds (not only in words!) to educate the people in Latin America (where there is widespread of anti-U.S. imperialism sentiment), in China (where there was the most thorough Maoist education), in other countries of the world, or in this country, the number one evil of the people of the world? You may

## A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT

enlighten us quite a bit if you could share with us your experience of educating working people.

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

The people Mao Zedong hated most were not KMT or foreigners, but those communists came back from Soviet Union such as Wang Ming, because they pretended to know more about communist theory and China when they had not done any social investigation. They actually killed more key CPC members than KMT did. However, they had at least the guts to go to Jiangxi Red Region to fight with KMT troops. I hope I would not be disappointed to learn that our Maoist article had done nothing but lessoning us what they still think as pretty neat ideas but which we had heard more than 3000 times.

—A Chinese  
May, 1992

### MC5 REPLIES:

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

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

## Another MIM Critic Talks about Kent State

### DEAR MIM:

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

In contrast, our Maoist writer's knowledge about what happened in Mao's era seems much poorer than I originally thought. He/she seems to imply that the figure of 20 to 40 million death is "merely" calculated from some statistics, and we all know how statistics is prone to error. Well, to my generation, it is not merely a number. I would like to suggest that our Maoist writer and his/her Movement send some people to the countryside to do some social investigation, as Mao advocated. Without social investigation (She4 Hui4 Diao4 Cha2), one is not qualified to speak. The starvation started the same year as the Great Leap Forward—1958—in at least Gansu, Anhui, Henan and Shanxi Provinces, and exacerbated quickly and spread to larger areas in the following three years. The severity was gradually reduced only when the policy of Liu Shaoqi and Chen Yun were implemented to replace the radical "communization" craze, as Mao was disposed to the "second line" after 1959 (meaning he was no longer responsible for the routine work of the Party Center and the government). The policy was similar to the one implemented around 1978 (later development was far beyond this policy's original scope and depth).

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

I say all these not for the purpose of laughing at our Maoist writer. Whenever I recall these things, I feel like crying in my heart. I already know quite a lot for me to draw the overall picture. But I know that my knowledge is so insignificant compared

## A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT

with what happened in those years. I do sincerely hope that our Maoist writer and his/her Movement could do China and mankind a service to go to China, talk to people in villages and factories, ask them about their experience and feelings. Foreigners in China have some advantages which ordinary Chinese do not have, although this is not due to the "imperialism of white nations," so long as you don't openly advocate to overthrow the current system or leadership.

—Same writer as above

May, 1992

### MIM REPLIES:

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

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

When someone makes an accusation of starvation death, they are the ones burdened with proof.

20 million don't disappear without a trace. It's fine to use the population figures as evidence, but we are just pointing out that that method should be used consistently, and if you do, you will find that China comes out on top and the United States on the bottom. We are not among those who say it doesn't matter 2 million or 20 million, just because either way there was a lot of suffering. In all societies there is suffering.

Again, with regard to "freedom," if you read our newspaper, you will learn of many other examples of censorship and repression. One of our prison members recently chopped off his thumb in protest of such censorship.

We consider ourselves rationalist progressives, so if there is anything you would like us to read, let us know. We have yet to find any literature that shows that Mao or the Cultural Revolution leaders ordered mass violence. We find many documents to the contrary.

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

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

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

Actually, I don't think it needs debate that the world's majority of people has already spoken against starvation and world war. Who is respecting their wishes by ignoring the issue of which system does a better job of ending violence?

[MIM received some replies to this rebuttal. However, our critic did not care to explain further or document what s/he was talking about in the Guangxi genocide. Nor did s/he respond to our criticism that there is a difference between civil war and ordering someone killed. It is makes no difference morally speaking, but it makes a big difference in

What is the  
Maoist  
Internationalist  
Movement?

A new pamphlet  
containing MIM  
founding  
documents and  
fundamental  
principles.

Only \$2.00  
postage-paid

Overseas, \$3. Institutions, \$5.  
Bulk discount: 10 copies for \$10.  
Send cash or check payable to "ABS" to  
MIM Notes, P.O. Box 3576, Ann Arbor, MI  
48106-3576.

## A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT

terms of what to count when you are comparing the violence of various societies.]

# Long Live Maoism III! "Consistent Use of Statistics"

May 19, 1992  
by a comrade

In the United States we collect what are known as "excess death" figures. If you take a Black person and a white person and one dies because of a difference in medical treatment, we call that an excess death.

The death rate for Blacks in 1986 was such that they suffered 75,980 excess deaths from their oppression in the United States. There were 29.223 million Blacks in 1986. (See Statistical Abstract of the United States 1989, p. 74 for mortality figures.) If Black people numbered 1 billion, then the excess death figure would be 2.6 million deaths EVERY YEAR. So we are glad people use statistics in talking about the Great Leap, so that people can get an overall sense of comparative violence going on.

.....  
**The death rate for Blacks in 1986 was such that they suffered 75,980 excess deaths from their oppression in the United States.**  
.....

Now let me ask you a moral question. It doesn't matter to dead people how they die, whether it be McDonalds serial murder or June 4th massacre. They are victims and every person's life is as good as every other's.

But which system do you expect more of, the country with the richest economy in the world or the

system that is still 70% peasant? In Shanghai under the Gang of Four, according to a Western doctor who went there, the infant mortality rate was lower than it was for Blacks or whites in New York City. The deaths per 1,000 infants by age 1 was 12.6 in Shanghai (1972), 18.1 for whites in NYC (1971) and 27.1 for "non-whites" in NYC (1971).<sup>(1)</sup> That speaks volumes about the superiority of socialism, even when one country starts much poorer than another.

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

Notes: Victor Sidel, M.D. and Ruth Sidel, M.S.W. *Serve the People: Observations on Medicine in the People's Republic of China*, NY: Josiah Macy Jr. Foundation, 1973, p. 257.

# A New Critic Responds to Long Live Maoism III!

May, 1992

DEAR MIM:

Do you know people who live in Shanghai enjoy a lot of privileges in China? To use Shanghai's statistics to generalize to whole China is like to use the upper class' statistics to generalize to whole U.S.A.

By the way, you claim your Maoist stance, you should show us that Maoism will solve USA's problems, rather than say it works well in China, (as this point, we do have different opinions) do you know



that Mao had said that Marxism must be modified to fit China's situation, otherwise it would not work? So you should make Maoism fit to USA. The person who said that Maoism fits everywhere in this world without modification, is Lin Biao, but unfortunately Mao had declared that he is a traitor.

No system is flawless, that there are problems in USA doesn't prove Maoism is the right prescription. Your argument is based on that Maoism works well in China, by your standard, it works well means comparatively well, for example, if 1 person dead in

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

USA, then unless at least 6 persons dead in China we cannot say China is worse than USA, since China's population is 5 times of USA's, more, if count the development level, then 6 should be 60,600. (remember your argument about black people's death rate) Do you suggest that Chinese lives are cheaper? My friend, when you talk 20 million Chinese starved, please don't treat it too easily: life is life, no matter where people live. If you think life is nothing compare to your great idea, that fits Maoism too, since in 1957, Mao was willing to sacrifice half of China's population (325 million) to destroy the ugly American imperialism.

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

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

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

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

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

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

—Another Chinese critic

May, 1992

**MIM REPLIES:**

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

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

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

**MCS ADDS, JANUARY, 1993:**

In this sort of debate, it is always galling that people have such low regard for social analysis—or what we at MIM call science. No one would imagine that if there were two new drugs for AIDS—one that will save all but two million patients and one that will save all but 20 million patients—that which drug you pick doesn't matter because it is "our" family relatives who died and please not to be so inhuman as to talk just about the numbers! It's absurd but often effective demagoguery employed by those who wish the oppressed not to think too seriously about their oppression.

A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT

# Amerikan Writer Chimes in, Prefers "Freedom" to Life

DEAR MIM:

This is yet another inconsistent use of statistics. It is claimed that Maoism is superior to capitalism on the basis of one set of

statistics: infant mortality in Shanghai and New York. The fact that infant mortality is lower in Shanghai than for both whites and blacks in New York only proves one


thing: infants die at a slower rate in Shanghai than New York. It does not tell us any reasons, which we would all be interested in. This does not prove the superiority of socialism. In fact, Communist regimes do tend to have a good track record in public health and literacy. This is in large part due to the regimentation of these societies.

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

#### MIM REPLIES:

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

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



MIM responds to query about RCP in midst of polemic exchanges:

If you want to pick based on the line toward the Gang of Four, you are right you are better off with the RCP, because they call Jiang Qing "subjective" and the Gang of Four "maybe not as good as Stalin" in their book *Revolution and Counterrevolution*. [Some around the RCP now say those statements were a joke, but it would be hard to take the quote on Jiang Qing that way.—MC5]

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

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

# Request for Definition of Maoism

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

DEAR MIM:

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

After all, how much does Maoism differ from the current ideology of CCP? Did Mao follow or even mean what he preached? Was Mao a Maoist?

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

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

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

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

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

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

—Chinese student critic

June, 1992

## **Long Live Maoism II! "A Response to the Question of Definitions"**

---

by a comrade

June, 1992

*The following was a response to the above letter.*

Maoism is a kind of communism, an ideology and theory that supports a movement for the abolition of classes, patriarchy and national conflict—the power of people over people. We also mean the

same thing when we say it is a movement to end oppression.

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

According to Mao himself, he had two main accomplishments—things we believe made him stand out in the communist movement. One was his development of People's War against numerically and technically superior landlord-comprador regimes. This contribution had world-wide impact after 1949 in decolonization and liberation struggles around the world.

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

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

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

The Right attacked the masses the way the bourgeoisie does and the ultraleft attacked the masses for not being politically correct enough. Both the Right (Liu and Deng) and the ultraleft (like 516 Red Guard factions) attacked the masses in the name of Mao, but neither was Maoist. The Right stirred up attacks on the masses to divert attention from Liu-Deng-Peng Zhen, etc. The ultraleft was probably just foolish, and often well-intentioned. The ultraleft was manipulated by the Right so well that the GPCR (Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution) was discredited and Deng Xiaoping came back to power.

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

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

work so hard to provide numbers on life expectancy, infant mortality, etc.

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

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

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

It's like this: you have a choice between two hospitals: Hospital A takes in 1000 patients and 100 end up dead in a month. Hospital B takes in 1000 similar patients and 50 end up dead in a month. The 50 dead is still a tragedy, but it does not follow that Hospital B-ism is an "offensive" ideology and "defending" tragedy. We've already demonstrated that in previous articles by using the only method possible to prove our point—comparison. When you continue with demagogic arguments, you let the CAUSES of tragedy slip away. And every time you say that Chinese history is just full of bleakness, you allow those tragedies to continue. You must distinguish between Hospital A and Hospital B.

Your argument about communists seeking personal power is typical anti-communism. The reason is that it is easier to see someone who has state power than someone who has market power. Here all you say boils down to saying someone has state power. So what? In capitalism, someone has market power. Then look what you do. You say Mao is a god; yet, he lost his power and needed the GPCR. Well, make up your mind. Did Mao have absolute power or not? If he had absolute power, why did he need the GPCR? Did he cause the GPCR with his

absolute power or did he need it because he had no power?

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

## **Long Live Maoism U!**

### **"The reality of imperialist exploitation: no democracy for the exploited"**

.....

by a comrade

Banks in the Western monopoly capitalist countries pulled in \$325 billion more than they loaned out to the Third World in the 1980s. In 1988 alone, the figure was \$50 billion.(1) Fifty billion dollars is a hefty sum, even by Amerikan economic standards. It would be over \$3000 a year for every starving child in the world.

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

The world's Chiang Kai-sheks, (the leader of the Guomindang, China's reactionary nationalist organization that Mao overthrew and sent packing to Taiwan), conduct a "free trade" in human lives.

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

They are all too willing to help with the exploitation of Third World people in exchange for U.S. military backing and a share of imperialist lifestyle.

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

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

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

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

The only people who get a vote on U.S. domination of the world are the imperialists, the bought-off working classes of the First World and the middle classes. They supported Reagan/Bush, etc. They supported the invasion of Panama and the killing of millions in Vietnam before the U.S. military was defeated. And we, at MIM, are not surprised because they get the benefit of that \$325 billion from one avenue of exploitation alone every ten years. For those interested in more facts and calculations proving that the U.S. economic system does not generate the wealth enjoyed here, send \$3 cash, (check to "ABS"), to MIM and ask for MT1.

Notes: New York Times, 9/18/89

**Long Live Maoism VI!: USA is Number One!**

by a comrade

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

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

1. Number one in mass murders (known as serial killings in "street crime") e.g. the infamous McDonald's killing.)
2. Number one in teenage suicide (and please no one say that young people kill themselves for any reason other than an imperfect system).
3. Number one in rape rates (recorded and available statistics).
4. Number one in pornography consumption.
5. Number one in processed cocaine consumption.
6. Number one in imprisonment of Black people per 1000 (even surpassing South Africa in this).
7. Number one in ordinary murder (in rates per 1000 people compared with all societies for which such figures are collected including Europe, China, the former Soviet Union and Japan)
8. Number one in arms exports.

All Right USA all the way!!!!!! Whoop it up!

Voice of America (VOA, Amerika's world-wide propaganda radio station) will never admit this, but

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

we Amerikans have a hard time understanding Chinese ideas about violence, so I make self-criticism in advance for this national characteristic of ours.

Many, many Chinese have told us that the Cultural Revolution was bad because some people committed suicide. Now of course the VOA propagandists agree with this, because VOA loves to criticize other cultures and political systems. (By the way, we know that most Chinese students do not put much stock in VOA—if they listen to the propaganda news at all. We just use VOA as an example of what Americans stereotypically think.)

But from the MIM perspective, suicide happens in a lot of societies for a lot of different historical reasons. Suicide is of course bad, but the existence of suicide does not prove the Cultural Revolution is bad. Speaking as a society, Amerika should say to China: "Pardon our insensitivity, but you complain about the Cultural Revolution because you had it so good before the Cultural Revolution. We as Amerikans have much higher rates of violence including suicide." No matter how poignant the suicide story, it can say nothing about which system is better unless there is a comparison made. Here once again, the U.S. system just falls on its face. We think Mao Zedong was very correct to guard vigilantly against becoming a U.S.-type system during the Cultural Revolution. According to Deng Xiaoping, the arch enemy of the Gang of Four, the Gang of Four executed 35,000 people in the Cultural Revolution, their supposed crime. Yet, we have over 20,000 ordinary murders here every year. That would be 80,000 every year if we had a billion people, given our murder rate. Over ten years that would be 800,000.

Why is it that people like Fang Lizhi blame Mao for the 35,000 suicides and other deaths, but they don't blame Bush for the 800,000 would-be murders over ten years? Sure the historical context is a little different, but it makes not the slightest difference to the dead people. A fair comparison between the U.S. system and the system in China under Mao would blame Mao for the Cultural Revolution violence but also credit him for violence avoided relative to the United States. Either do that or don't blame any violence on the political system, which is the custom here. (When someone commits suicide here, it is not thought of as an indictment of an entire age/policy or system. That's another reason we are Number One, number one in psychiatric care. We think everything is an individual problem,

so we have psychiatrists and social workers working on individuals, always without result.)

MIM does not support individuals who killed each other in the Cultural Revolution or violence against intellectuals without state power. We do not think of the Cultural Revolution as the sum total of such experiences so traumatic to Chinese individuals, because we think of the Cultural Revolution in comparative light. We understand the Cultural Revolution theory put forth that the bourgeoisie does exist right inside the party—hence today's Deng-Li-Yang clique and capitalism in the Soviet bloc. It's the top power-holders in the party who can become corrupt and really mess a country up once it is on the socialist road. We do not support any aspect of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution that did not show the differences between the Maoists and the Liu Shaoqi/Lin Biao/Deng Xiaopingists.

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

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

## A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT

# Long Live Maoism III!

## "The Right to Talk About China"

.....

by a comrade

Occasionally people tell us that we have no right to talk about China, because we don't live there. (Many incorrectly assume that we never did.)

It is indeed a big task just to understand one's own country when you live in a place like the

United States or China—really big places. So we can sympathize with the sentiment and we certainly agree that the oppressed people within a nation must liberate themselves and come up with their own leadership and theories for doing so.

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

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

So if Fang Lizhi's are going to say how great the U.S. system is in books and articles mostly for

## MIM'S READING LIST

TO ORDER SEND CASH OR CHECK MADE OUT TO ABS  
MAIL TO MIM DISTRIBUTORS P.O. BOX 3576 ANN ARBOR, MI 48106-3576, USA

Andors, Phyllis. *The Unfinished Liberation of Chinese Women, 1949-80*. \$30 (hardback). Progress and setbacks, especially recently, for women.

Andors, Stephen. *China's Industrial Revolution: Politics, Planning and Management from 1949 to the Present*. \$5. Massive empirical work.

Bettelheim, Charles. *China Since Mao*. \$8 (hardback) \$4 (paper). The most well-known demonstration that a revisionist and counterrevolutionary coup took place in China since 1976.

Bettelheim, Charles. *Cultural Revolution and Industrial Organization in China*. \$4. How things actually changed in Beijing and Shanghai factories.

Colorado Study Group. *The Capitalist Roaders Are Still on the Capitalist Road*. \$10. An excellent theoretical treatment of

the capitalist counterrevolution in China within months of its occurrence! Excerpts from best of Cultural Revolution arguments against Deng and company.

Daubier, Jean. *A History of the Chinese Cultural Revolution*. \$8. A complete, if uncritical, history of the 1966-69 period and a standard in the study.

Esmein, Jean. *The Chinese Cultural Revolution*. \$5. The best comprehensive look at the 1966-69 period.

Gurley, John. *China's Economy and the Maoist Strategy*. \$9. Political economy in critique of bourgeois economic theory.

Hinton, William. *Fanshen*. \$6. Eye-witness account of the Chinese Revolution (1949) against landlords and Japanese imperialism with a focus on one village where Hinton lived.

Hinton, William. *Shenfan*. \$10. Hinton revisits the village he lived in during the Cultural Revolution 20 years later.

Hinton, William. *Hundred Day War*. \$6. The battle at Tsinghua University as a center of the Cultural Revolution, interesting factional details.

Hinton, William. *Turning Point in China*. \$5. An introduction to the Cultural Revolution.

Hunter, Neale. *Shanghai Journal*. \$5. Eye-witness accounts of 1966-67, description of the plurality and democracy of the Cultural Revolution and the efforts to crush and overthrow the new exploiters.

Lotta, Raymond. *And Mao Makes Five*. \$10. Translations from China preceding and after the coup, debates, biographical information, events of 1976.

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

U.S. audiences, then we are going to do the same for a few hundred or thousand Chinese intellectuals getting these essays.

Because Fang has the backing of many Western capitalists he will tell the oppressed in America much more about America than we will ever tell Chinese about China. So we think people who complain about our articles, but don't complain about Chinese comments on America in American media are hypocrites.

Chinese intellectuals need to realize that they do have power even in this country. They do affect the struggles of the oppressed here whenever they talk about the U.S. system.

We do sympathize with people who say both sides should shut up, but that just isn't going to happen. It's a dream.

In the end, MIM actually agrees a little with Fang Lizhi, too. He is right to try to learn things from other countries. And he knows that it is impossible to do that without making comparisons and talking about both countries.

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

So again, people who disagree with us: what are the CAUSES of violence that happened under Mao and how do they compare with CAUSES of violence in the United States?

**ON CHINA**

TO ORDER SEND CASH OR CHECK MADE OUT TO ABS  
MAIL TO MIM DISTRIBUTORS P.O. BOX 3576 ANN ARBOR, MI 48106-3576, USA

**Macciocchi, Maria Antonietta.** *Daily Life in Revolutionary China.* \$10. A 500 page discussion of every facet of China at its revolutionary height in 1970 and 1971. Macciocchi was one of the first Westerners allowed into Cultural Revolution China. As a member of the Italian CP who leaned towards Mao, she was allowed to see whatever she wanted in China.

**Milton & Schurmann, eds.** *People's China.* \$6. Anthology of writings by Chinese revolutionaries and foreign observers from 1966 to 1972.

**Milton, David & Nancy.** *The Wind Will Not Subside.* \$8. First hand account of the political experiences of the Red Guard movement in the Cultural Revolution. The Miltons support the revolution without cheer-leading for anyone.

**Myrdal & Kessle.** *China: The Revolution Continued: The Cultural Revolution and the Village Level.* \$5. A study of one village.

**Nee & Peck, eds.** *China's Uninterrupted Revolution.* \$6. A critique of modernization theory, revisionism and bourgeois economic theory.

**Organization for Revolutionary Unity.** *New Democracy and the Transition to Socialism in China and The Cultural Revolution in China.* \$10. Analytical defense of China against Hoxha by a splinter from the Hoxhaite movement.

**Park, Henry.** "Post-Revolutionary China and the Soviet NEP." *Research in Political Economy.* \$3.

**Revolutionary Communist Party (RCP).** *Revolution and Counterrevolution.* \$7. About the coup in China and subsequent debates in the U.S.

**Sidel, Ruth.** *Women and Childcare in China.* \$5. An important first-hand account of Cultural Revolution practices marred only by one hasty chapter which compares China to Israel and the Soviet Union.

**The Political Economy of the Counterrevolution in China: 1976-84.** \$10. Historical roots of the counterrevolution: counterrevolution in science and technology, agricultural appropriation by the state capitalist class, capitalist industry, trade union farce, sexism, coercion of labor out of labor-power, the anarchy of production, worsening of the division of labor.

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

# Long Live Maoism VIII!

## "The Cultural Revolution and Mao: The Real Fighter for Democracy"

.....

by a comrade  
June, 1992

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"The fervor with which the Red Guards devoured books had to be seen to be believed."(1)

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

We at MIM say, what's wrong with that? Wu Man and other ultraleft Red Guards blame Mao for shutting down the Cultural Revolution in 1969 by sending in the PLA. Wu Man had faith in the Chinese people to this extent. Most commentators today take the Rightist view that such a period never should have occurred, that the Cultural Revolution should have been shut down right away. In their minds, it is the emperor's fault that widespread masses-on-masses violence took place during the Cultural Revolution.

.....

**We at MIM do not buy into any emperor logic and from our reading of Mao we know that Mao hated emperor logic.**

.....

But what did Mao really say about violence during the Cultural Revolution? 1. "It is normal for the masses to hold different views. Contention between different views is unavoidable, necessary and beneficial. In the course of normal and full debate, the masses will affirm what is right, correct what is wrong and gradually reach unanimity."

"The method to be used in debates is to present the facts, reason things out, and persuade through reasoning. Any method of forcing a minority

## A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT

holding different views to submit is impermissible. The minority should be protected, because sometimes the truth is with the minority....

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

We at MIM ask all those who supposedly uphold "human-rights" what was wrong with that? The real Maoists were the ones defending this principle of interaction amongst the masses.

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

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

The masses rightly wanted the fighting with guns, spears and knives, etc. to end. It was just masses-on-masses violence and the Red Guard factions on campus showed no sign of getting beyond it. The Ultraleft was unhappy, but it had blown its chance to really mobilize the masses for change and oust Deng Xiaoping types for good. (We have books on this subject such as William Hinton's *One Hundred Day War*.)

3. While Mao obviously launched the struggle against Liu Shaoqi/Deng Xiaoping, et al, he also criticized the Ultraleft in July, 1967. "Personally, I think we can see the first signs at present of giving up the struggle against the enemy, the struggle against the biggest power holders in the Party who are taking the capitalist line.... At present this contradiction is not concentrated; it is widely dissipated."(2) Mao added that revolutionary cadres must be righteously defended against indiscriminate

attack. Mao criticized such indiscriminate attacks in the Shanghai People's Commune of 1967, taking a stand against what the masses had done and were being led to do by ultraleftists. When these ultraleftists raised the unrealistic slogan of "no chiefs," Mao said, "This is extreme anarchism; it is most reactionary."(3)

4. Mao took a clear line against violence amongst the masses, even when that violence did not cause any lasting damages! In the winter of 1966 he sent Zhou Enlai a letter that was published. "Recently, many revolutionary teachers and students and revolutionary masses have written to me asking whether it is considered struggle by force [wu-tou] to make those in authority taking the capitalist-road and freaks and monsters wear dunce caps, to paint their faces, and to parade them in the street. I think it is a form of struggle by force [wu-tou]. These goals cannot achieve our goal of educating the people. I want to stress here that, when engaging in struggle, we definitely must hold to struggle by reason [wen-tou], bring out the facts, emphasize rationality, and use persuasion before we can reach our standard of struggle and before we can achieve our goal of educating people."(4)

We at MIM don't know how much clearer Mao could have been about violence amongst the masses. He opposed it. To the extent that it happened, it was perpetrated by non-Maoists masquerading as Maoists. So some people ask, why didn't Mao end the Cultural Revolution sooner then? But that is just asking the



A poster from the Cultural Revolution

emperor to take care of everything. Mao stressed that the "masses must liberate themselves." That's why he did not move in the PLA until the masses very broadly became disgusted with the shallow politics of the Ultraleft and their manipulators on the Right. It is a tragedy that Red Guard ultra-leftists killed unarmed workers and soldiers rather than end their "hot war." They only brought violence on themselves and let Deng Xiaoping, Peng Zhen, Yang Shangkun and other top capitalist-roaders off the

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

hook. These Rightists pushed the ultraleftists into violence to discredit the Cultural Revolution. Those confused by the violence blamed the emperor and all the Red Guards and hence the Right had an easy time coming into power with Deng Xiaoping after Mao died.

## Notes:

1. Kan San, *China: The Revolution Is Dead—Long Live the Revolution*, Montreal: Black Rose Books, 1977, p. 211.
2. "Mao Zedong Analyzes the Cultural Revolution," Jean Daubier, *A History of the Chinese Cultural Revolution*, p. 310.
3. David Milton and Nancy Dall Milton, *The Wind Will Not Subside*, NY: Pantheon Books, 1976, p. 197.
4. Ibid., p. 185.

**Long Live Maoism IX!**

.....  
by a comrade  
June, 1992

Some Chinese students have raised with us the tragedy of the Great Leap under Mao, which estimates say saw the death of 20 million Chinese from starvation. We already explained China's history of starvation and some problems with the approach used in condemning Maoism based on the Great Leap. Perhaps in future articles, we will deal with the causes of starvation during the Great Leap.

Before we go further, we would like to refute the claim that the Third World would be worse off if it had more Maoist revolutions. While Third World countries often endure tragic conditions of famine or medical neglect, Maoism has proved to be a superior solution in a less-than-perfect world.

We already explained why it is not fair to compare Mao's China with the United States, which was richer than China before Mao ever took power. Maoists only had state power for 27 years in a country that had been very poor for hundreds of years (although China was once the richest civilization.)

To judge Maoism, we suggest making real world comparisons. Then we will find that Maoism made up for a lot of poverty. Countries starting in a similar position as China's did not do as well as China after 27 years of Maoism, because Maoism was indeed superior.

In this article we will make use of facts from a bourgeois, anti-Mao book by Martin Whyte and William Parish. The facts generally collected by the World Bank show that Maoism's accomplishments

were so great that China's masses had better social services than countries several times richer on a per capita income basis.

In 1979, China's infant mortality was 49 per 1,000 live births, compared with 48 for countries averaged in the "middle income" category. It also compared with 134 for India in the "low income" category that China was in.(1) The bourgeois scholars found that free market societies with China's level of income were vastly inferior in this regard and China came out on top.

The life expectancy story was the same. It was 68 in China, 60 in the "middle income" countries and 50 in the "low income" capitalist countries averaged together. In earlier articles we showed readers that China started behind India in income and life expectancy and surged ahead under Mao, which is not to say that China ever left the "low income" category in Mao's mere 27 years of rule. When it comes to population per Western doctor, population per secondary doctor (like barefoot doctors) and population per hospital bed, China outdid the average of both the "middle income" capitalist countries and "low income" capitalist countries. Only the most advanced free-market, capitalist countries did better than China on average when it came to health care issues. These are exceptions in the world, not the majority of capitalist countries or countries with more free market than China.(2) Only by making the unfair comparison of China with very rich countries, countries that were much richer than China even before Maoism took power, only then could you make the distorted conclusion that Maoism was not a good strategy for health care in the Third World.

.....  
**Countries starting in a similar position as China's did not do as well as China after 27 years of Maoism, because Maoism was indeed superior.**  
.....

The same is true when it comes to education. China surpassed the averages of "middle income" countries in the world only because it had the Maoist strategy. Adult literacy was 70% in China, 71% in "middle income countries" and 38% in the average of "low income countries." China surpassed

## A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT

both the middle and low income country averages in primary school enrollment, secondary school enrollment and pupil-teacher ratios.(3) (It had lower pupil-teacher ratios.)

Even in Maoist China's weakest area—housing—China surpassed the average of the developing countries in rooms per house, smallest number of people per room, electricity and piped water available.(4)

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

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

### Notes:

1. *Urban Life in Contemporary China*, Martin K. Whyte and William L. Parish, Chicago: U. of Chicago Press, 1984, p. 63.
  2. Ibid.
  3. *Urban Life in Contemporary China*, p. 60.
  4. Ibid., p. 78.

# Long Live Maoism X! State ownership and Development

by a comrade  
July, 1992

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

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

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

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

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

**BELOW ARE THE FACTS:**

- % of production from state-owned firms

0-3%: Nepal, Philippines, Guatemala

3.1-6%: Columbia, Thailand, Argentina, Paraguay, Bangladesh,

6.1-10%: Benin, Botswana, Kenya, Liberia, Mali, Sierra Leone, Korea, Sri Lanka

10.1-15%: Ivory Coast, Tanzania, India, Taiwan, Bolivia, Chile

15.1-20%: Senegal


20.1-30%: Guinea, Tunisia

Above 30.1%: Zambia, Guyana

(Gillis, Perkins, Roemer, Snodgrass, *Economics of Development*, 3rd ed. (NY: WW Norton, 1992), p. 299.)

Recalling that Hitler's Germany, apartheid South Africa and European countries like France have had a state role in the economy exceeding one-half of all investment made, we see that the "com-

## A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT



A poster from the Cultural Revolution

mand" versus "market" distinction is pretty useless, except to promote the myth that an elite makes economic decisions only in "command" economies.

Lest anyone wants to argue that Nepal, the Philippines and Guatemala are the most developed countries economically, we should drop the idea that private ownership brings about development. Those three countries have the highest share of private ownership in the economy.

From this list, we should also see that for other purposes, it is misleading to refer to very many Third World countries as socialist. Only a tiny handful have state-ownership of even more than half the economy. The vast majority of the world's population, which is poor, LIVES UNDER CAPITALISM.

To compare capitalism with socialism, we must include what happens in those countries that still allow private ownership to predominate in production. That means we must count what happens in most Third World countries as capitalism, often with semi-feudal remnants of the kind Mao did the whole world the favor of leading struggle against.

As we argued in previous essays, without arduous and violent communist struggles, Taiwan and Korea never would have had land reform. It was the communist movement that broke the landed classes in those countries, which were then able to serve as lynchpins in the U.S. sweepstakes-development strategy. The United States opened its import market to the Taiwanese and Koreans and made sure it could point to them as "winners" in the sweepstakes of general imperialist exploitation and "development."

## Long Live Maoism XI!

"Mao or George Bush:  
Trade in China"

Review of *Head to Head: The Coming Economic Battle Among Japan, Europe and America*, Lester Thurow, (NY: William Morrow & Co., 1992).

by a comrade  
October, 1992

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

According to Thurow, "While China will always be important politically and militarily, it will not have a big impact on the world economy in the first half of the twenty-first century, even if it successfully resumes its progress toward becoming a market economy. The reasons flow from the numbers. China has a per capita annual income of \$300. Suppose it were to grow 10 percent per year—a rate equal to the very highest rates achieved in Japan or Korea. That would amount to \$30 per person. Multiply 1.2 billion Chinese by \$30 per person and China would have \$36 billion in annual extra output—most of which would neither be imported nor exported but used to feed and house its people. But even if all of it were to be used to buy goods from the rest of the world, \$36 billion is just 0.7 percent of the American GNP. Until China gets to much higher income levels, its economic impact on the rest of the world is going to be small." (p. 210-11)

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

How's that for a twist! The United States is the unreliable trading partner!

The problems the United States is having internally are going to stop it from being a dynamic trade

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

partner. It already has a huge trade deficit in addition to a budget deficit, which is going to cause some serious readjustments.

Today we see all the difficulties that Cuba is having because it relied on a Soviet Union-based trading bloc. Now Cuba must spend years just adjusting its economy—its internal division of labor. Thurow cannot be accused of being a Marxist, but according to him, prospects for the little dragons are not good. "Moving from a \$120 billion deficit to a surplus of \$80 billion (the sum necessary to make interest payments on America's international debt) would cost the Pacific Rim a minimum of 10 million jobs.(p. 213)

"Between 1981 and 1986, 42 percent of Korea's growth and 74 percent of Taiwan's growth could be traced to exports to the American market. While America represents only 23 percent of world GNP, in 1987, it took 48 percent of the manufactured exports from all of the Third World countries combined. In contrast, the EEC took 29 percent and Japan, 12 percent."(p. 62)

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

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


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

The world capitalist system is like a sweepstakes. There are successes and failures. The fail-

ures are necessary to the successes. Only so many capitalists can win the "law of the jungle" economic competition. Only so many countries can be rich within the capitalist system. Chile and Argentina used to be in the top 20 richest countries in 1870.(p. 204) They both fell out after decades of imperialist exploitation.

## Chapter 7

# Four Tigers



**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

# Korean Student Studying in USA Writes MIM

**DEAR MIM:**

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

The problems that you guys (I am assuming that you guys are actually more than one person) point out about this country and capitalism throughout the world seem to be fairly on the mark. I am no expert myself, especially when it comes to huge polemics where people are throwing facts and not-exactly-facts back and forth, but I do know "what time it is."

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

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

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

Still tho', what you guys are doing is pretty cool. It definitely does not do any harm to be distributing these articles so people may possibly wake up to some of the things that might screw them over when they least expect it.

—A Korean student in the usa  
August, 1992

**MIM REPLIES:**

We would not propose communism if there were no historical basis for seeing its existence as possible. It would indeed be a crime to propose an idea that could only cause strife and never get anywhere.

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

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

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

It is true that capitalist society's human-nature is as you say. That is not the same thing as condemning the animal homo sapiens for all history.

**MAOIST VIEW OF SUCCESS OF SOUTH KOREA, JAPAN AND TAIWAN:**

## The United States on the Bandwagon of Class Struggle

by a comrade, August 9, 1992

Now we will return to the subject of Korea. South Korea is very important because it is an exception in the post-World War II period. It has been a Third World country that has successfully developed. People should realize that the "four tigers" or "little

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

dragons"—Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore are exceptions in the history of development in the dependent capitalist orbit. Even if capitalism "worked" for these four, it would not prove anything about the possibilities for development under imperialism. The reason is that you would have to count all the failures that went with the successes. And as we have already documented in the section on China, those failures account for massive starvation, death, and inadequate health care that amounts to a virtual genocide for "low-income" countries where most of the human race lives.

.....

**People should realize that the  
"four tigers" or "little  
dragons"—Korea, Taiwan,  
Hong Kong and Singapore are  
exceptions in the history of  
development in the dependent  
capitalist orbit.**

.....

At least 22 capitalist-dominated countries have suffered an actual decline in per capita income in recent years according to the U.S. Statistical Abstract. The imperialists can still exploit most countries mercilessly, so a few exceptions are allowed by the system to develop while other countries decline in the international capitalist sweepstakes. The winners and losers change from time to time, but the system stays the same.

OK, but south Korea is an exception. Why? The reason is that the United States and East Asian capitalists jumped on the bandwagon of class struggle at a crucial point at the completion of World War II and the Korean War. Without much fanfare, these capitalists and the United States had the sense to copy what Mao was doing in China wholesale. What did they copy? They copied land reform. Why did they copy it? Because the communists had just kicked capitalist ass in China and were starting to do the same in Korea and Vietnam. The capitalists learned their lesson and when they got the chance, they ditched their landlord oppressor partners. It is important to note that the dependent bourgeoisie is afraid of unseating the landlord class if it means mobilizing peasants that could rise against the bourgeoisie as well. For this reason, the bourgeoisie is unable to carry out successful land reform in the

Philippines or El Salvador. The capitalist class is generally only able to take advantage of the quirks of history like the situation created by World War II in East Asia. Requiring a world war to get land reform and development off the ground is nothing to brag about as the "success of capitalism."

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

**KOREA**

As most people reading this probably know, the communists came very close to winning the civil war in Korea by sweeping south before the United States troops landed in the Korean War. There was really only a toehold for capitalism left on the very southern tip before the United States landed in 1950.

The nearly complete communist victory gave the U.S. imperialists and southern capitalists their chance to leave their landlord partners in the dust, historically speaking. Listen to the bourgeois economists lump south Korea in with the communist countries for copying land reform: "The best-known successful land reforms have commonly involved little or no compensation for confiscated assets of landlords. Such was the case in Russia after 1917 and China after 1949, as well as in Japanese and South Korean reforms after World War II."(1)

**JAPAN**

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

Of course, Japan was already quite developed earlier in this century—so Japan is not relevant to our development discussion here; but Japan is relevant in regard to its role in the war and class struggle. Again in Japan, we see the United States copy the communists; although no one would know it based on how little attention the issue of land reform gets. "The Japanese land reform that followed World War II was different in important respects from the Chinese experience. Land reform

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

in Japan was carried out by the U.S. Occupation forces. The Occupation government believed that the landlord class had been an important support of the forces in Japanese society that brought about World War II....Since the Americans had won the war, Japanese landlords were not in a position to offer resistance to reform, and a thoroughgoing

reform was carried out. Compensation for landlords was provided for in legislation, but inflation soon had the effect of sharply reducing the real value of the amounts offered. As a result Japanese land reform also amounted to confiscation of landlord land with little compensation."(2) Notice that the significant difference with the Chinese communist land reform was that U.S. Occupation forces carried it out instead of a communist army!

In contrast, land reforms in places like India failed. The political mechanism was not there.(3) Basically, the communists in India did not succeed well enough to do all the work for the capitalists.

**"I am a revolutionary..."**

*—Fred Hampton, Chairman of the Chicago Black Panther Party,  
assassinated at age 21*

**Are you?**

The Chicago Police murdered brother Fred Hampton in his bed as a young man, but he has left his mark on revolutionary history. Hampton ran a breakfast for children program, recruited many young comrades to study Mao Zedong Thought and polemicized with the Young Lords, a street gang, to work inside the movement—to name just a few things. Hampton also said,


**"Theory with no practice ain't shit."**

Real revolutionaries recognize that reading a few newspapers isn't enough. They want to learn the lessons of the Panthers and work with MIM. "Learn through practice," as Mao says.

That's right, so send me:

- A poster on the Panthers so I can paint the town red, \$1.**
- The Black Panthers & Mao Zedong Thought, pamphlet, \$5.**
- The Black Panthers Speak, edited by Philip Foner, \$13.**
- A bundle of 100 MIM Notes to hand out in my community, \$5.**
- Hook me up with a year of MIM Notes, one a month, \$12.**
- I want to argue with MIM about Maoism and revolution—gimme a one-year/four-issue subscription to MIM Theory, \$12.**

Send cash, stamps or a check made out to "ABS" to:  
MIM Notes, P.O. Box 3576, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-3576.

**TAIWAN**

People reading this probably realize that when the Guomindang moved to Taiwan, it was uprooted from its land on the Mainland. In this case, exile by the Maoist communists was the best thing for these ex-landlords. Having had their ties to the land cut, these people could now take up a new life. In their new home, the Guomindang, again with U.S. backing, learned their lessons. They did not allow the old patterns of landlord domination to occur in Taiwan and, in fact, they saw to a very high level of income equality generally. The gini coefficient in Taiwan is one of the lowest in the Third World—.326.(4)

**THE U.S. ROLE IN BACKING LANDLORD-REGIMES**

The U.S. foreign policy is basically opportunist but consistently supports U.S. interests. When the United States needs stable allies it allies with landlord-dominated regimes—like El Salvador's

**A SPIRAL TRJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

Christiani or Marcos/Aquino in the Philippines. When the United States and its ruling class friends get their butts kicked, then the United States gets on the bandwagon at the first available opportunity.

.....

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

.....

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

The United States will never act as a real agent for modernization in the Third World. It chooses not to rock the boat, because it seeks landlord-dominated regimes as allies. The U.S. imperialists have no inherent interest in land reform like communists do. If landlord and bureaucrat-capitalist Somoza can get the job done (backing the United States, assuring resources, etc.) then Somoza will get U.S. aid. It is U.S. support to landlords and capitalist-bureaucrats in the Third World, who Mao dubbed "compradors," that makes the United States the number one prop of "order" and the number one public health menace.

**EAST-WEST COMPARISONS**

One remaining question is why did Taiwan and south Korea diversify and industrialize more successfully than China and north Korea? We will leave out issues like south Korean massacres in Kwangju and the mass starvations that didn't happen in the north, but did happen in the south. What about the economy? Part of the answer is found in our review of the book by Lester Thurow.

People will recall that we Maoists have had doubts about north Korea. We don't believe it is

socialist and few people have much real information about it. Still, it is clear that north Korea did not have the option of export-led development to the world's largest economy—the United States. The same is true of China. China, Taiwan and Korea were predominantly agricultural societies, but the United States and the ruling classes copied the communists on agricultural issues. Hence south Korea and Taiwan garnered the benefits of intense class struggle led by communists. What south Korea and Taiwan had that China and north Korea did not have is the world's largest industrial market available. Indeed, China and north Korea had to devote large resources to defending themselves against U.S. imperialism.

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

.....

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

.....

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

**Notes:**

1. Malcolm Gillis, Dwight Perkins, Michael Roemer, Donald Snodgrass, *Economics of Development*, NY: W.W. Norton & Co., 1992, p. 499.
2. Ibid., p. 497-8.
3. Ibid., p. 498.
4. Ibid., p. 76.


**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

# Taiwanese Criticizes MIM View of Export-led Development

.....

**DEAR MIM:**

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



No argument on the first sentence. But the second sentence is very questionable. It depends on what the exact definition of "socialism" is.

The success of the little dragons are mostly due to the capitalistic incentives to the owners and employees of numerous privately owned businesses, big or small, who work extremely hard trying to get a better living. China's economy had been stagnant under Mao mainly due to lack of incentives to work hard until Deng's reform. The access to the U.S. market and the high regards to the education helped four little dragons, too. Mao had nothing to do with their success. On the contrary, Taiwan and S. Korea had to devote much of their resource (around 40% of their GNP) into military due to Mao's China. Their success could have been closer to Japan's, if they had not been impeded by the communists.

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

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

—Taiwanese critic

August, 1992

**MIM REPLIES:**

Other countries in the world have a similar capitalist incentive system as Taiwan, but most of them do not develop. We must recall that Taiwan and south Korea are the exceptions. In fact, if you are a hard-core, pro-capitalist thinker, then you

should believe that the higher the inequality, the more incentives to work hard. The gini coefficient in Taiwan was closer to the PRC's than the vast majority of developing countries. That is why it doesn't have much to do with the incentive structure in this highly political sense. Lenin was also for "he who does not work, neither shall he eat," when the Soviet Union was just in its initial phase of development. As I argued, Taiwan's development had to do with getting the break that most developing agrarian society's don't get to work with—a pre-smashed landlord class. Then having gotten that break the next break was a cooperative relationship with a nervous imperialist West, made possible by super-exploitation of Korean and Taiwanese workers for export-led development. Other export-led developing countries fail relative to Taiwan and south Korea, because they didn't get the break on the landlord class.

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

.....

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

.....

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

The next duty is to rearrange world trade and investment on socialist terms, so that no country is left out of cooperation. Economic development should not be a matter of countries ganging up on each other to form "trade blocs" and the like. Already we've seen that World War I was caused by precisely such blocs and that World War II was

## A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT

largely a result of World War I. In the United States, we see rising Japan-bashing. (And Amerikans can't tell the difference between Japanese and Koreans and Chinese.) However, this kind of chauvinist X-bashing is a feature of competitive, cut-throat capitalism. The names may change, but the game stays the same since World War I. (Given what is happening in Bosnia/Croatia, etc., sometimes the names don't even change in this reactionary setup.)

## Maoism on International Trade Relations

by a comrade

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

1. The bourgeois media simplifies Maoist views on trade, saying Maoists simply favored autarchy (totally independent economic development). That is basically correct, but only under conditions where imperialism dominates. Those of us who are in the United States now should realize that foreign nationals here have different responsibilities than they did in their original countries. If we U.S. residents could bring down U.S. imperialism, that would be the biggest service to Third World peoples that we could render. Then autarchy would not be required because there would be no imperialists making war and superexploiting the Third World masses.

The examples of Korea and Taiwan prove a very simple point: there is a benefit to economic specialization, where terms can be rendered more fairly. Korean and Taiwanese workers were superexploited by U.S. imperialists, but the U.S. imperialist-bloc was under tremendous pressure ever since World War II to put East Asia on a sound economic footing. That is, the U.S. imperialists needed desper-

ately to let a minority of countries develop successfully while the majority stagnated or regressed.

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

2. People who say China had new landlords after Mao came to power can not explain why China outperformed all countries in its income category in public health and education. (See previous articles.) The "low-income" countries averaged a life expectancy of 50, while China garnered a life expectancy of 68 and surpassed the average of 60 for "middle-income" countries. Those middle-income and low-income countries are the world's majority and should be counted as capitalist failures.

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

**The "low-income" countries averaged a life expectancy of 50, while China garnered a life expectancy of 68 and surpassed the average of 60 for "middle-income" countries**

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

3. The situation of newly emerging capitalist successes is not happening for the first time with Japan, Korea and Taiwan. It also happened with Germany in the late 1800s and early 1900s. Germany rocked the Anglo-French boat and World War I was

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

the result of economic alliances. This magazine is not about World War I, but the same thing is happening now, so MIM suggests people go read a book like Richard Krooth's *Arms and Empire* for more information on this subject.

## **From Chapter 22, "Mutual Aid and Exchange" Fundamentals of Political Economy, PRC, 1974**

**ON AID—**

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

**ON MONOCULTURE DEVELOPMENT—**

"The socialist country first of all does its best to help them develop a diversified agriculture which aims at satisfying domestic needs, gradually altering their dependence on imports of major agricultural products and making their national economies develop healthily on the basis of gradually strengthening agriculture."(p. 480)

**ON PRINCIPLES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AID,  
1964:**

"1....Regard aid as mutual assistance. [MIM: They are right. When friendly and cooperative countries develop other cooperative countries benefit because of the advantages of economic specialization and the impetus to peace.] 2. See above. 3. Provide economic aid without interest... 4. The purpose of aid is not to create the recipient country's dependence... 5. Projects chosen for aid in the recipient country should require low investment and short gestation... 6. Provide the best possible equipment and raw materials we produce and negotiate prices according to international market condi-

tions... 7. In providing any technical aid, guarantee that the personnel of the recipient country will fully master this technical know-how. 8. Experts sent to the recipient country to help with construction should receive the same material treatment as the experts of the recipient country. No special requirements or treatment are allowed."(p. 481)

The above is especially relevant to those of us in the United States. These eight principles are impossible within a capitalist system.

"Actively develop the socialist state's foreign trade"

"There are new characteristics in the Foreign Trade of the Socialist State"(p. 482)

"Chairman Mao pointed out: 'We must endeavor to do business first with the socialist countries and the people's democratic countries as well as with the capitalist countries.' We must carry on planned commercial exchanges among the socialist countries under the guidance of the principle of proletarian internationalism and according to the spirit of active cooperation and no nonsense."(p. 484-5)


Basically you can see it is an oversimplification to say Mao wanted no trade. He saw its potential, but he also realized that it was difficult to have cooperative trade in an imperialist-dominated world.

## **Student Challenges MIM Political Economy on "Four Tigers" and International Trade**

.....

**DEAR MIM:**

The places which are doing badly economically are the ones that have not been "superexploited." Look at your typical American house, half the things there are marked "Made in Taiwan" or "Made in China." Almost nothing there is marked "Made in El Salvador" or "Made in India." You make



**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

it sound like the United States is running everything. A lot of the problems of the third world are not due to the United States, but rather are due to poor decision making in the third world. The United States did not develop India or Africa's economic policies. India and Africa developed those policies. It's [successful dependent capitalist development—MC5] possible in Mainland China today. Latin America is also taking advantage of this. India is trying to.

—Joseph Wang

August, 1992

**MIM REPLIES:**

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

.....

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

.....

With regard to his comments on El Salvador and India, the main problem that we Maoists have in arguing with East Asian intellectuals is that for some reason they perceive only the successes of capitalism and not the failures. The comparisons of the "little dragons" with the socialist states were the best propaganda that money could buy. Our critics advocate on behalf of capitalism without being willing to admit those cases where capitalism has failed—unlike the case of someone like business professor Lester C. Thurow of the Sloan School of Management at MIT.

Typically, our East Asian critic seems unaware that El Salvador is a country with 5.1 million people compared with Taiwan's population of 20 million

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

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

When the economy succeeds, the pro-bourgeois East Asian intellectual sees the success of capitalism. When the economy fails, s/he sees only "policy" mistakes. It's impossible for capitalism to be wrong this way.

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

In 1989, GM had sales twice as big as the entire national income of Thailand. Furthermore, Thailand had the 10th largest economy amongst the developing countries! The vast majority of the world's countries are in even weaker position vis-a-vis U.S. imperialism.

When U.S. imperialists want to set up puppet political and BUSINESS leaders in the Third World, they have both economic and military power at their disposal—bribery and force. It is simply unrealistic to think that virtuous and unselfish bourgeois classes will arise in the Third World and lead it to development instead of simply assisting in superexploitation. Those that do seek independent capitalist development, Mao called the national bourgeoisie, but this class is generally too weak to stand up to giant monopoly capitalists—like GM—alone. Most Third World countries need the type of struggle Mao led to have the leverage sufficient to run their own economies in their own interests. Hence, we at MIM don't think it is an accident or generalized stupidity

## A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT

when Third World "policies" do not contribute to development.

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


Notes: Malcolm Gillis, Dwight Perkins, Michael Roemer and Donald Snodgrass, *Economics of Development*, NY: W.W. Norton, 1992, p. 388.

eyes) plays more of a role in Africa or Latin America than in Taiwan or Korea. In contrast MIM doesn't see any countries where there is a dictatorship of the proletariat—socialism. Nor is it factually correct to say that the portion of the state-controlled sector in the economy is what determines the success of the economy as other articles will show.

# Taiwanese Points Out Taiwanese Difference

**DEAR MIM:**

Taiwan's model is very different from S. Korea's model and Latin America and China are not following exactly what Taiwan and S. Korea have done. First of all, Taiwan only allows small scale business for private, and government controls the giant industries, such as power plant, phone company, gasoline, steel industry, etc. While S. Korea allows giant industries to be operated privately. So, S. Korea has about 13 companies ranked among the largest 500 companies in the world, but Taiwan has none. S. Korea is more like another Japan, but Taiwan is



far from another Japan. The model of Latin American and China is that government controls almost everything before, and now is loosening up a little bit for tiny private companies. This situation is not even close to Taiwan or S. Korea's case. Besides, China's currency is valued the highest among all these countries, this will cause China lots of effort to develop its economy than the other three countries.

—Taiwanese critic of both Wang and MIM  
August, 1992

## **MIM REPLIES:**

As usual, our East Asian critics seem to think that the state (equalling "socialist" actor in their

Chapter 8  
**Sectarian Reviews**



## A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT

# *Workers World:* Inconsistent Socialists or Consistent Opportunists?

.....

by MC49

September, 1992

The Hoover Institution, a right-wing think-tank, calls Workers World Party's (WWP) political line a "bizarre mixture of Trotskyism and Maoism." (1) MIM thinks that's pretty accurate. However, Trotskyism plus Maoism equals opportunism, so perhaps the blend of contradictory views is more repulsive than bizarre. MIM hopes this is not the case, and encourages WWP and its members to drop Trotskyism in order to advance socialism.

WWP's politics are more muddled than consistently bad. The 4/16/92 *Workers World* newspaper (WW) played Peru's declaration of open fascism on page 8, NOW's pseudo-feminist march on Washington on page 1, and white working-class wage struggles on pages 1, 2, and 3. Doing this seemed to show that WWP was more interested in first-world reform than in Peru's real-world revolution. The next week, however, WW put Peru on page 1. WWP's schizophrenia manifests itself not only in their twin support for national liberation and the Amerikan labor aristocracy, but in their stance, or lack thereof, on the Maoist revolution in Peru: "Revolutionary groups like Shining Path and Tupac Amaru have rallied support in the countryside and urban areas. Although their programs differ, these groups challenge the legitimacy of a system that keeps the people in dire conditions. They call for the ouster of U.S. imperialism from Peru, and the overthrow of bourgeois politicians who do the bidding of the rich against the poor." (2)

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

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

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

WW reports on "mass public celebrations of the 80th birthday of President Kim Il Sung, the leader of the Korean Revolution." At this celebration, "Sam Marcy, chairperson of Workers World Party, led the highest-level delegation from the United States...In addition to Marcy, other participants from the U.S. included Scott Marshall of the Communist Party [and] James Warren and Estelle Debates of the Socialist Workers Party...Socialism is alive in People's Korea." (5) Unlike WW, the SWP and CPUSA are consistent. Both condemn the Maoist revolution in Peru and support its enemies in north Korea and the ex-USSR. (6) Again, *Workers World* tries to have it both ways.

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

MIM challenges the Workers World Party to answer their own question. Which side are you on, *Workers World*? Are you on the side of the Amerikan labor aristocracy, or are you on the side of the Third World proletariat? Are you on the side of Trotskyism or the Castroite Tupac Amaru, which fail to liberate people and which instead attacks successful movements from the sidelines, or are you for

## A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT

national liberation and the PCP? Are you on the side of the DPRK and exUSSR, or are you for the Peruvians fighting a people's war against those countries' weapons and training? MIM encourages you to take clear stands on these and all other issues. If you opt for Trotskyism, revolutionaries will know to look elsewhere for leadership. If you opt for Maoism, MIM looks forward to working with you in the future.

### Notes:

1. *Yearbook on International Communist Affairs*, 1991, Hoover Institution, p. 144.
2. *Workers World*, "U.S paves way for repression in Peru," 4/23/92, p. 9.
3. *Ibid*, p. 1.
4. Committee Sol Peru—10b Homestead Rd. London SW6 7DB, England, May 17, 1991, "The Prospect of Power for the People's War in Peru."
5. WW, "Worldwide support for People's Korea," 4/30/92, p. 11.
6. CPUSA's *People's Weekly World*, 11/30/91, "Peru and Sendero Luminoso charged with terrorism." and SWP's *Militant*, 4/24/92, "Peru's Shining Path uses terror to impose reactionary policies on working people."
7. WW, "Solidarity needed for Peru revolutionary struggle," 5/7/92, p. 10.

## Slingshot

Summer 1992

Free

Published by a collective at University of California, Berkeley

700 Eshleman Hall, Berkeley, CA 94608

review by MC86

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

*Slingshot's* real strength lies in its alliance with the oppressed nations. The 16-page Summer 1992 issue features numerous articles in solidarity with the Los Angeles uprising. Other pieces expose INS sweeps, police brutality by the Oakland Police

Department and the history of the Amerikan genocide against the oppressed nations. A two-page prison spread and essays on homosexuality, heterosexism, the patriarchy and Bay Area demonstrations round out this revolutionary read.

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

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

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

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

Overall, *Slingshot* tries to take the point of view of the international proletariat and oppressed nations; but by its reliance on small individual actions, and loathing of the efficacy of disciplined vanguard people's parties, *Slingshot* dooms itself to

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

remain a lonely voice in the wilderness of the current world war.

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

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

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

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

planted by individual "freedoms" for industrial capitalists, merchants and their ruling functionaries.

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

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

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

MIM applauds *Slingshot* for not glorifying the false "revolutionary potential" of the Amerikan white working class; as many anarchists and revisionists do. The practice of the *Slingshot* collective is indeed more politically "advanced" than the practice of all the phoney Marxists in the world. Individuals in the collective (and the collective as a whole) are urged to struggle with MIM around the questions raised here. You have nothing to fear but the loss of your individuality!

In conclusion, MIM notes that *Slingshot* calls for a society "free of hierarchy, domination, and all forms of coercive social relations." *Slingshot* states that, "Reality can destroy the dream; why shouldn't the dream destroy reality?" Continuous mass revolutions will destroy hierarchy, domination and coercion. MIM shares this dream with the anarchists; but MIM is no dreamer. MIM is a materialist force for organizing the oppressed to build independent power and to seize and use state power and to edu-

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

cate the masses to rise-up against capitalist-roaders in positions of state-power. Only reality can change reality. The reality of anarchism is that it is old-fashioned and looks to the past—not the present and the future. Anarchism glorifies the non-existent "rights" of the individual in a reality in which only group power-struggles exist.

## Socialist Workers Party Sells Its Secrets to Imperialism

---

by MC86  
July, 1992

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

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

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

**MIM INTELLIGENCE TEST:**

1. The smartest communists believe \_\_\_\_\_.
  - a) that Mao Zedong was a secret admirer of Trotsky.
  - b) that Fidel Castro is and was a communist.

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

## 2. Typical Trotskyists are so smart because

- a) they were born that way
- b) they became smart after reading the writings of Trotsky.
- c) they became really, really smart after reading the 75,000 hours of annotated speeches by Fidel Castro.
- d) the workers are deformed.
- e) the masses are dumb.
- f) capitalism is really a type of deformed communism and it is better to join the enemy than to beat the enemy.
- g) mighty brains at work in the bowels of the Hoover Institution will help to establish the Fourth International.
- h) the Hoover Institution has offered Stefan Trotsky a job annotating the annotations of Fidel's speeches and now that the SWP no longer has to support Stefan (who shares an eight-bedroom walk-up with fellow-Trot Bob Avakian in the Champs Elysee) SWP can afford to free-drop *The Militant* in Pentagon vendo-mats.
- i) rather than organizing the oppressed and exploited to seize power, they sit back and make anarcho-criticism of those who do so successfully.
- j) Bill Clinton just adopted the SWP programme lock, stock and barrel.

Notes: San Francisco Chronicle 7/16/92, p. A20.

## A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT

# MIM polemicizes with *The Truth Hurts*

---

*The Truth Hurts*  
P.O. Box 3111  
Amherst, MA 01004

by MC17  
October, 1992

## TO THE TRUTH HURTS:

The Maoist Internationalist Movement (MIM) is sending you the following critique of your newspaper in the hopes of entering into struggle and dialogue with your organization. Enclosed is a copy of our paper.

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

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

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

"It is unlikely that the educational system will ever be more than a grim affirmation of class and racial structure unless we overcome this selfish atti-

tude. ... For true change to occur, upper and middle class white parents will have to acknowledge that it is time to stop hoarding resources and start thinking in a more communal manner."

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

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

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

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

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

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

in. Why mislead people into thinking that boycotting a small part of this system will significantly change the system?

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

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

Back page: "What's your share of the wealth?"

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

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

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

In reality white Amerika has an interest in seeing the current political system in the United States perpetuated. Sure, the majority of the white masses don't get the millions that some Amerikans do, but they get plenty of profits from the exploitation and

oppression of the Third World. Their wages are so high because of this exploitation. This is why the lower-class whites voted for David Duke in droves—he offered them the best imperialist deal: a bigger share of profits from imperialism.

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

After tax profits in 1989 amounted to 172.6 billion<sup>(1)</sup>. This means that 3.9% of GNP is profits. These profits can easily be explained by the exploitation of national minority workers within U.S. borders. These workers get about 70% of what white workers get, and that's only if they're documented. About 20% of the GNP is accounted for by national minority workers within U.S. borders. Giving 70% of that amount to minority workers leaves 6% of GNP as the difference in pay between white and national minority workers generated by discrimination alone. Six percent of GNP is nearly all the profits before taxes. That leaves the labor aristocracy (the white nation) to get paid for all its dead labor while receiving all the superprofits from exploitation of the Third World outside U.S. borders. (See MIM Theory for more specifics on this argument and these calculations).

Organizing in the interests of the middle-class in Amerika will only result in greater oppression for the majority of the world's people and support for the imperialist status-quo. Printing figures like those on the back of your paper supports the un-researched claim that middle-class Amerika is oppressed and exploited and should be getting a bigger share of the Amerikan imperialist wealth—a claim that works counter to the interests of the oppressed of the world.

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

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

Notes: Statistical Abstract of the U.S., 1991, p. 548.

A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT

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

.....

For a copy of the "Call," write  
*People's Tribune*,  
PO Box 3524, Chicago, IL  
60654 or call 312-486-3551

*A friend of MIM's sent MIM the "Call," so this response is the letter sent to our friend.*

by a comrade  
January, 1993

Thank you for the page from the *People's Tribune* with the "Call to form Organizing Committees..." The party printing this call is the Communist Labor Party (CLP).

CLP is out there doing a lot of work on police brutality and the conditions of the poor. The story on the Detroit cops is a case in point. The "Call" seems very much in the spirit of CLP work.

.....

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

.....

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

We also don't see that the CLP has retracted its book on the Soviet Union which said that capitalist restoration is impossible. The Communist Labor

Party took on Maoist overtones at one time, before Irwin Silber and crew decimated the communist movement back in the early 1980s. Line of March, CWP and CLP were all saying get rid of Maoism. Of course, Line of March and CWP are defunct. History quickly vindicated the Maoists on this point.

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

The "Call" says the new organization should "root itself among the oppressed, the exploited, the homeless and the hungry of all colors and nationalities." That pretty much sums up the extent of the clarity of the "Call." How does this differ from the Rainbow Coalition? Those who share our view on the failure of the Jesse Jackson strategy have things to say about that strategy historically. In particular, we believe the greatest advances have been made where there have been vanguard parties. However, you can't say that with no study of the international history of the communist movement.

The time for struggles over the interpretation of history is at the beginning of organizing drives, not when they are already splintering or failing outright. MIM is not going to waste the time and resources of the oppressed on a movement that does not explicitly recognize why it is that the white nation working class is not an ally. How can you root yourself in the "exploited," if you don't define "exploited"? And where in the "Call" is the call for reparations to the Third World from Amerikkka?

We agree with a lot of what is said in the "Call," but there is no free lunch in organizing. The tough issues require a science. If we can't recognize in the history of this century when advances have been made and when history, broadly-speaking, went backward; we won't be able to unite now in practice, since we won't have the benefit of hindsight as we carry out our practices now. If we can't recognize what happened when history went backward in the Soviet Union and China, and if we can't recognize the historical lessons of attempting to hitch the oppressed to the settler class bandwagon—then we will have an even harder time recognizing opportunities, victories and losses in the current context.

Notes: *People's Tribune*, 12/21/92.

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

REPRINTED FROM MIM NOTES #70, NOVEMBER,  
1992

## *Guardian bites the dust*

by MC5

In September, 1992 the *Guardian: Radical Newsweekly* apparently published its last issue. According to a bookstore that used to carry the paper, the *Guardian* made no press release or explanation for its dissolution.

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

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

In the late 1960s, the Maoist upsurge radicalized the *Guardian*, which carried favorable articles about socialist China. At this time it garnered the largest circulation of any newspaper on the "left;" although, the Black Panther papers and the Progressive Labor paper (circ. 90,000 in 1970) were also very large.(1)

The Panthers were smashed; and PL careened into Trotskyist oblivion, but the *Guardian* chose a slow opportunist death. As such, the *Guardian* is an excellent example of what MIM calls the problem of "sizeism" and "pragmatism"—bourgeois influences that say moderating one's political line and watering down the truth are the best way to unite large numbers of people who can then fight for a watered down goal. By this "rightist" version of the "masses-are-asses" arrogance, people "are not ready" to hear the whole truth of revolutionary science and can only fight for a small fraction of the things that the bourgeois class is able to fight for at any one time.

In 1973, the *Guardian* had "sponsored a series of forums... 'What Road to Building a New Communist Party.'" At that time, a Maoist-influenced, but eventual turncoat, Irwin Silber, said,

"Today, Marxist-Leninist forces in the U.S. are moving inexorably towards the creation of a new communist party."

One thousand people attended one meeting of these conferences on building an anti-revisionist, non-Trotskyist, non-anarchist party. It appeared that Maoism was going to lead the "movement" inside U.S. borders forward; however, as we have detailed elsewhere, a lack of political development and rampant rightist and ultraleftist opportunism crushed the Maoist forces who were trying to regroup after the state smashed the Panthers.

At this time, the *Guardian* had quite a presence, including coin-operated newspaper boxes and a professional staff.

.....

**Eventually the *Guardian*  
gave up its "Marxist-  
Leninist" pretensions and  
simply adopted the word  
"radical" in its masthead.**

.....

To get to this point, the *Guardian* had to break with something of a more opportunist past. However, by 1973, the *Guardian* was having other kinds of internal breaks: The Maoists from the Revolutionary Union were kicked out of their jobs on the *Guardian*.

The articulate Irwin Silber of the *Guardian* also took to bashing Maoism, almost as a lecture-circuit profession. In particular, Silber took advantage of naive and moralizing revolutionaries who thought the world ended when Mao shook Nixon's hand.

Silber's efforts were to culminate in the early 1980s when a number of Maoist-influenced forces like the Communist Labor Party and Communist Workers Party lined up more clearly with the pro-Moscow revisionists. Other previously Maoist forces lost their orientation completely or dissolved. Irwin Silber steered the *Guardian* onto a course for the rocks and then went on to the Line of March journal which he also steered into non-existence.

Eventually the *Guardian* gave up its "Marxist-Leninist" pretensions and simply adopted the word "radical" in its masthead. Many fence-straddlers, individualists and opportunists have asked MIM to do the same thing—incorrectly viewing the legacy of

## A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT

Marx, Lenin and Mao as an albatross that must be tossed aside.

Time and again we revolutionaries are told we isolate ourselves by taking definitive stands on the large historical questions of our time. Yet, while the *Guardian* was watering down its line and taking an eclectic stance—attempting to tail pseudo-feminism, reformism and anything that moved—*MIM Notes* was growing with a tiny fraction of the budget that the *Guardian* had. The more it watered down its line and confused its readers, the more the *Guardian* itself went down the drain. Despite the support of some key wealthy backers, the *Guardian's* eclecticism only encouraged the lack of political commitment and confusion that ended its existence.

It is not likely that racist and pro-white working class social-democracy will die. Nor will idealist nihilism in the forms of Trotskyism and anarchism die. These ideologies have solid material bases. However, the niche of the far left claiming to be eclectic, anti-anti-communist, "radical" and "effective" is sustained only when the bourgeoisie seeks to undermine successful and genuine communist movements.

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

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

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

With the collapse of the *Guardian* and a number of other radical organizations, our own commitment to building *MIM Notes* is underscored. The blatant slide of the ex-Soviet Union into pro-Western capitalism is winnowing the field of "radical" organizations. MIM welcomes aboard ex-*Guardian* peo-

ple and others who have analyzed the relative success of genuine communist movements compared with mushy, opportunist movements.

Notes: Jim O'Brien, "American Leninism," Radical America.

## Unraveling the Political Economy of the Revolutionary Communist Party, USA

.....

Book review of *America In Decline*  
by Raymond Lotta with Frank Shannon  
Banner Press, 1984

by MC86  
**FAMOUS LAST WORDS**

"Leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union have the famous theory that even a tiny spark can cause a world conflagration and that a world war must necessarily be a thermonuclear war which means the annihilation of mankind ... (In contradiction to this theory, it must be noted that) large scale and small scale revolutionary wars against the imperialists and their lackeys, which have never ceased, have hit hard at the imperialist forces of war, strengthened the forces defending world peace and effectively prevented the imperialists from realizing their plan of launching world war . . . In short, according to the leaders of the CPSU, with the emergence of nuclear weapons, the contradiction between the socialist and imperialist camps, the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the capitalist countries, and the contradiction between the oppressed nations and imperialism have all disappeared. The world no longer has any class contradictions." (Communist Party of China, *Polemic*, 1963, p. 197, 244.)

"Revolution in the 80's: Go For It!" (RCP slogan)

## II SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT

### THE SORCERERS AND THEIR SOURCES

The heart of Revolutionary Communist Party theoretician Raymond Lotta's *America In Decline* (AID) is summed up in the following quote from his book:

"(T)his (capitalist) mode of accumulation . . . is critically and inextricably bound up . . . with the extensive and intensive exploitation of the masses in the oppressed countries; on the other hand, it is anchored to a strategic national base in the home country . . . There exists a basic division in the imperialist-dominated world between the imperialist countries, where finance capital is rooted and controlled by the metropolitan bourgeoisies, and the oppressed nations, which are controlled by foreign finance capital. At the same time, capital, which roams the world in search of higher profits remains profoundly national - this represents an essential feature and contradiction of the imperialist epoch." (AID, p. 101)

The political economy of AID is based on two related theses. The first thesis is that "movement compelled by anarchy is the principal form of motion" conditioning the revolutionary resolution of the main contradiction of capitalism (between socialized mass production and the appropriation of surplus-value by a few owners). The second thesis is that imperialist capital is "profoundly national," and therefore the "inter-imperialist" contradiction is principal over all others. (AID, p. 125) Lotta's synthesis is that modern possibilities for revolution are dependent upon impending or actual nuclear war between competing blocs of imperialist countries.

Glossing over the Marxist law that capital concentrates in ever fewer hands, Lotta sums up the foundation for his first thesis by quoting Engels:

"(I)t is the compelling force of anarchy in the production of society at large that more and more completely turns the great majority of men into proletarians ..." (SUS, p. 61, AID, p. 50)

Lotta's cite from *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific* (SUS) neglects to credit the flip-side of Engels' analysis of the anarchy/organization contradiction in 1892:

"In the trusts, freedom of competition changes into its very opposite - into monopoly; and the production without any definite plan of capitalistic society capitulates to the production upon a definite plan of the invading socialist society." (SUS, p. 66.)

Engels never lost sight of the class struggle. For Engels, anarchy in production was simply one aspect of a contradiction which includes its opposite

aspect: the organization of the capitalist workplace. This is the historic struggle between the owning classes and the producers of value. In AID Lotta never proves that anarchy is principal over organization. He simply assumes it and carries on from there. By focusing on intra-class conflicts between owners he loses sight of class struggle.

As "proof" of impending nuclear war between the Soviet Union and the United States Lotta's inter-imperialist thesis relies heavily on the 1963 Communist Part of China's (CPC) *The Polemic on the General Line of the International Communist Movement*, (*Polemic*), for authority.

.....

**For Engels, anarchy in production was simply one aspect of a contradiction which includes its opposite aspect: the organization of the capitalist workplace.**

.....

This is an error since the *Polemic* itself considers the inter-imperialist contradiction to be of less weight than the others — except as how it's development might condition the global process of war and revolution. The CPC bases its overall argument concerning the dangers of nuclear war on the existence of a socialist camp. Neither the CPC, Lenin, Stalin, nor Mao ZeDong stress the inter-imperialist contradiction. Rather, they methodically stress the primacy of class struggle and the domination of the oppressed nations by monopoly capitalist groups. They stress that imperialism means continuous war punctuated by revolutions.

In the period leading up to 1963 the CPC's *Polemic* identified four basic contradictions in the global process of that time:

- between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp
- between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the capitalist countries
- between the oppressed nations and imperialism
- among imperialist countries and among monopoly capitalist groups.

The CPC also remarked that, "Nobody can obliterate any of these fundamental contradictions or subjectively substitute one for all the rest."

**R SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

(Polemic, p. 7) They stated that, "While the U.S. imperialists are actually preparing such a (world) war (against the socialist camp), they also use this propaganda as a smokescreen for their oppression of the American people and for the extension of their aggression against the rest of the capitalist world." (Polemic, p. 12)

While MIM understands that the majority of Amerikans are not very oppressed at this time, MIM agrees with the *Polemic* that:

"It is impossible for the working class in the European and American capitalist countries to liberate itself unless it unites with the oppressed nations and unless these nations are liberated ... unite all the strata that can be united ... oppose monopoly capitalism, defend democratic rights, oppose the menace of fascism, improve living conditions, oppose imperialist arms expansion and war preparations, defend world peace and actively support the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed nations." (Polemic, p. 14-18)

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

By elevating the inter-imperialist contradiction to a principal and determining position Lotta attempts to obliterate the contradiction between imperialism and the Third World oppressed nations in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Along the way Lotta attempts to liquidate the theoretical basis for Maoist support of revolutionary nationalist struggles.

If one accepts Avakian's infamous statement from his "Conquer the World ..." that "Maoism without Leninism is nationalism ..." ("CTW," p. 38) than one must be prepared to demonstrate that "Leninism" is somehow separate from revolutionary nationalism. Since Lotta is fond of dogma — lets examine his use of dogma.

#### **MONOPOLY-CAPITALISM & NATIONAL OPPRESSION**

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

"The capitalists ... divide the world ... in proportion to 'capital,' in proportion to 'strength,'

... (which) varies according with the degree of economic and political development. In order to understand what takes place, it is necessary to know what questions are settled by this change in forces. The question as to whether these changes are 'purely' economic or non-economic (e.g. military) is a secondary one, which does not in the least affect the fundamental view on the latest epoch of capitalism. To substitute for the content of the struggle and agreements between capitalist combines the question of the form of these struggles and agreements (today peaceful, tomorrow war-like, the next day war-like again) is to sink to the role of a sophist." (Lenin, *Imperialism*, p. 75)

The Third World is the primary source of surplus value for the monopoly groups today. The one hundred-fifty plus wars since the annihilation of Hiroshima and Nagasaki have simply punctuated the ongoing daily world war against the people in which, on a good day, only 40,000 children die of starvation. World war has never ceased since it began for the "political features of imperialism are reaction all along the line, and increased national oppression, resulting from the oppression of the financial oligarchy and the elimination of free competition." (Lenin, *Imperialism*, p. 110)

The international imperialists stand naked and exposed to the masses of the whole world as jackals. To obliterate their identity as a group is to abandon the revolutionary potential of national liberation struggles and Maoism's practice of the united front against imperialism. Abandoning national liberation struggles is to make impossible the two-stage new democratic revolution which is a principal form of struggle available to the masses trapped in the oppressed nations and internal colonies.

Lotta is not the first communist theoretician to do this.

"Having failed to understand that, Kievsky bypasses the central question . . . namely, how will we Social-Democrats abolish national oppression? He shunts the question aside with phrases about the world being "drenched in blood," etc. (though this has no bearing on the matter under discussion). This leaves only one single argument: the socialist revolution will solve everything!" (Lenin, *The Nascent Trend of Imperialist Economism*, p. 65-66)

#### **COMPETITION**

Imperialist entities are united not only by their common struggle against the masses but also by competition: which must not be considered alone in

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

it's anarchic aspect, but must also be considered as a form of organization, i.e., capitalist competition is an objective motion by which surplus value is allocated and distributed to the class of capitalists. Monopolists compete, contend and collude with each other for command of the social wealth. This motion is at once anarchic and organizational.

Without competition between capitalists, capital movement would not exist at all and capital could not be centralized, concentrated - or short-circuited. Engel's anarchy/organization paradigm is two-sided and contains two opposite movements: repulsion, which is anarchic and is expressed in the anarchy of production based on profit, and attraction, which is organizational and expressed through the socialization of production and concentration of capital. It is not this contradiction, however, that creates surplus-value. *Surplus value only arises from the antagonism between the exploiters and the exploited.*

Historically, the internal contradictions and stresses leading to imperialist wars have perpetuated and organized imperialist capital; even as external conditions favorable to communist-led revolutions have been created inside oppressed national formations. Overall imperialist class collaboration before, during, and after their wars can easily be seen in the annals of their "armistices," treaties," and secret agreements. Recently the monopoly groups carved up sections of the Middle East before the first bomb was dropped on Iraq.

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

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

"The anarchical movement, in which rise is compensated by fall and fall by rise, is regarded by them (the bourgeois economists - ed.) as chance. With just as much right one could regard the fluctuations as the law . . . The total movement of this dis-

order is its order. In the course of this industrial anarchy, in this movement in a circle, competition compensates, so to speak, for one excess by means of another." (WLC, p. 26)

For the RCP anarchical movement is not compensated by competition and the warring monopoly-capitalists (and their capital) are "rooted" not at the sites of production in the Third World but at the sites of consumption inside imperialist fortresses. In reality, the opposite is true. The monopolists constantly flit from government to government and from one form of monetary exchange to another. The RCP forgets to consider the real object of the struggle between the monopoly-groups as it fetishizes "anarchy."

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

As a group the imperialists, ably assisted by the populations of imperialist countries, tend to unite as an international class against the exploitable masses who are their sole source of income. Consider the record of armament sales to "friends" and "foes" alike by the multi-nationals in this century of war. Consider the inter-locked banking system.

**MONOPOLY VERSUS FREE COMPETITION**

" . . . (T)he most deep-rooted economic foundation of imperialism is monopoly . . . which has grown out of capitalism and exists in the general environment of capitalism, commodity production and competition, and remains in permanent and insoluble contradiction to this general environment." (Lenin, *Imperialism*, p. 99)

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

The contradiction between finance capital and free capitalist competition is the contradiction between imperialism and the oppressed nations. Imperialism is not only external to the oppressed

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

nations; it also exists materially within them as it restricts the ability of national bourgeoisies to engage in capitalist competition.

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

Lenin's "trusts" are today's multinationals. Imperialism not only means outbreaks of war; it also means that war is an violent economic phenomena experienced hourly by the exploited and oppressed. But, for the RCP, war is not based in economics.

"War, however, is not an economic phenomenon . . ." (AID, p. 150)

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

Says Lotta, "(Imperialist) rivalry, Lenin stressed, (sic) ultimately develops into the struggle for a new political division of the world, which subsumes the struggle over economic division." (AID, p. 116.)

AID addresses the political features of imperialism, reversing, as we can see, the relation between politics and economics. Politics springs from and is a continuation of the economic struggle, not the reverse. After trying to trash certain trends in political economy that emphasize the Third World and challenge AID's firstworldism, Lotta states that, despite uneven development, "a conceptual starting point of this work is that the world economy must be treated as an integral whole." (AID, p. 18) In this "whole," the several thousand million exploited masses are the "oppressed periphery."

Should the reader question Lotta's Leninism, Lotta reminds us, "However, as Lenin himself reminded his readers, (Imperialism) was only an outline." (AID, p. 18.)

Lotta obscures the very economic basis upon which imperialism thrives. He obscures the source of the loot over which imperialists fight each other and the masses. It is not the actual extraction of surplus value at the site of labor (and revolution) that concerns Lotta. He is interested only in what proportions super-profits are distributed among imperialist nations. For Lotta the imperialist class is irretrievably fragmented into national units cohering only in

political "blocs."

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

"Monopoly is exactly the opposite of free competition . . ." (Lenin, *Imperialism*, p. 88.)

Says Lotta, "The competition to which Lenin refers is not mainly within the non-monopoly sector or between monopoly and non-monopoly but among these enormous imperialized blocks of capital." (AID, p 85)

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

**REVISING LENIN**

It is now necessary to examine Lotta's quotations from Lenin's political economy in the context from which they are lifted.

To substantiate his own arguments Lotta quotes selectively from Lenin's thesis concerning the oppositional relationship of imperialist capital to non-monopoly capital. AID's quotes appear in plain text. Lenin's context is added in bold text.

"Imperialism emerged as the development and direct continuation of the fundamental characteristics of capitalism in general. But capitalism only became capitalist imperialism at a very definite and very high stage of its development when certain of its fundamental characteristics began to change into their opposites, when the features of the epoch of transition from capitalism to a higher social and economic system had taken shape and revealed themselves all along the line. Economically, the main thing in this process is the substitution of capitalist monopolies for capitalist free competition. Free competition is the fundamental attribute of capitalism, and of commodity production. Monopoly is exactly the opposite of free competition ... (it) does not abolish the latter, but exists over it and alongside of it, and thereby gives rise to a number of very acute, intense antagonisms, friction and conflicts. Monopoly is the transition from capitalism to a higher system." (AID, p. 25; *Imperialism*, p. 88)

From the get-go Lotta ignores and deletes the dialectical essence of Lenin's analysis. He does not

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

attempt to refute Lenin; he simply mutilates him. This is his standard procedure throughout AID. Whenever Lenin mentions concentration, monopoly, or ownership, in such a way that might dilute Lotta's "anarchy of competition = inter-imperialist rivalry = World War Three" theory, Lotta simply deletes, glosses over, or excludes the elements of Lenin's analysis that do, in actuality, contradict Lotta.

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

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

Production becomes social, but appropriation remains private. The social means of production remain the private property of a few. The general framework of formally recognized free competition remains, but the yoke of a few monopolists on the rest of the population becomes a hundred times heavier, more burdensome and intolerable. The extent to which monopolist capital has intensified all the contradictions of capitalism is generally known. It is sufficient to mention the high cost of living and the oppression of the cartels. This intensification of contradictions constitutes the most powerful driving force of the transitional period of history, which began from the time of the definite victory of world financial capital." (AID, p.26; Imperialism, p. 25)

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

apply.

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

**MIM calls this revisionism.**

Another obfuscatory technique employed by Lotta is the Incredibly Reappearing Tautology. Here is an early example from a quantity limited only by the number of pages in the book.

"Independently organized labor processes are dominated by the pursuit of profit... The law of value unites these fragments into a social whole." (AID, p. 27)

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

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

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

"... (W)hile the tendential laws of capital force their way through the process of accumulation, including, for instance, the tendential decline in profitability of international capitals, it is the anarchy of a single global reproductive process which drives imperialism into crisis, exactly because accumulation depends in a qualitatively new and greater way on the functioning of interdependent and financial links which are drawn more tightly by finance capital." (AID, p. 110.)

Beneath the verbiage this sentence actually says: *while the tendency of the rate of profit to fall exists, it is the tendency of the rate of profit to fall which drives imperialism into crisis, exactly because*

**R SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

*accumulation depends on a new system in which there is a tendency for the rate of profit to fall.*

Along the way the masses disappear from the equation and the economies of the oppressed nations/colonies are doomed to extinction by a "global reproductive process" which is really only the development of productive forces somehow divorced from the producers. In this mess the actual organizing tendency of the rate of profit to fall is tautologically vaporized as a real consideration.

But the worse is yet to come:

"Building on Lenin's systematization of the political economy of the epoch, Bob Avakian has given a more precise meaning to this change in world relations and, in particular, to its significance for the international class struggle..." (AID, p. 81.)

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

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

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

**LENIN RISES FROM THE GRAVE**

"A detailed examination of the errors the author of the 1915 theses commits . . . is impossible, for every line is wrong!" (Lenin, *Nascent Trend*, p. 8.)

"We have analyzed only a fraction of P. Kievsky's arguments. To analyze all of them would require an article five times the length of this one, for there is not a single correct view in the whole of what Kievsky has to say. What is correct - if there are no mistakes in the figures- is the footnote data on banks. All the rest is an impossible tangle of confusion peppered with phrases like "driving a stake into the quivering body", "we shall not only judge the conquering heroes, but condemn them to death and elimination," "the new world will be born in agonizing convulsions," . . . These phrases are, at one and the same time, the cover and expression of two things: first, their underlying "idea" is imperialist Economism, which is just as ugly a caricature of Marxism, and just as complete a misinterpretation of the relationship between socialism and democracy, as was the late and unlamented Economism of 1894-1902." (Lenin, *Nascent Trend*, p. 67.)

Nor is Capital sacred. The following passage, quoted in AID, is from *Capital Volume One*, the chapter entitled "Division Of Labor And Manufacture." What Lotta leaves out is in bold.

"The different spheres of production, it is true, constantly tend to an equilibrium: for, on the one hand, while each producer of a commodity is bound to produce a use-value, to satisfy a particular social want, and while the extent of these wants differ quantitatively, still there exists an inner relation which settles their proportions into a regular system, and that system one of spontaneous growth: and, on the other hand, the law of value of commodities ultimately determines how much of it's disposable working time society can expend on each particular class of commodities. But this constant tendency to equilibrium, of the various spheres of production, is exercised, only in the shape of a reaction against the constant upsetting of this equilibrium. The a priori system on which the division of labor, within the workshop, is regularly carried out, becomes in the division of labor within the society, an a posteriori, nature imposed necessity, controlling the lawless caprice of the producers, and perceptible in the barometrical fluctuations of the market prices." (AID, p. 29; *Capital*, Vol 1, p. 336)

Lotta is trying to prove that competition is "an internecine battle ... (and is not) comprehensible on

**A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT**

the basis of some immanent equilibrium." (AID, p. 29) So he singles out one aspect in the operation of the law of value in order to prove that there is no "immanent equilibrium" in the motion of capital and he tosses us a quote from a passage which, in its totality, demonstrates that there does exist an immanent equilibrium in the motion of capital. (1)

To paraphrase Mao: there is no balance without imbalance.

But the RCP gives us a theory of imbalance without balance, anarchy without organization, monopoly without free competition, rival nation-bloc imperialists without binding international imperialist class interests, and, finally, since the basis for revolutionary nationalist class struggle is liquidated: revolution without the Third World. (2)

**WHERE DID THE 80'S GO?**

"The attitude of a political party towards its own mistakes is one of the most important and surest ways of judging how earnest the party is and how it in practice fulfills its obligations towards its class and the toiling masses. Frankly admitting a mistake, ascertaining the reasons for it, analyzing the circumstances which gave rise to it, and thoroughly discussing the means of correcting it - that is the earmark of a serious party; that is the way it should perform its duties, that is the way it should educate and train the class, and then the masses." (Lenin, *Left-Wing Communism, An Infantile Disorder*, p. 50-51)

In the "RW" and "Revolution," since 1989, Avakian & Co. have indicated that the principal contradiction, as they defined it in *America In Decline* may have "shifted," although they continue to "uphold" the political economy of AID. Such waffling is not surprising coming from the author of "Conquer The World ..." who casually dismissed Lenin's incredibly clear warnings regarding imperialist economism as "bourgeois logic" and "opportunism!" ("CTW," p. 11)

The authors of AID and the leadership of the RCP have constructed a superficial economist analysis of world political economy to conform to their *a priori* agenda for making revolution in an imperialist country. "Working from the revolution back" they forgot that the revolution is a Third World revolution that will surround and annihilate imperialism one country at a time if need be. Did they learn from this mistake?

"An important ideological question is involved here. The majority in this society, let alone world-

wide, have no interest in this decadent, moribund imperialist system. This certainly applies to the overwhelming number of workers in this country ... We have no need for some 'lonely voice in the wilderness' mentality, or some ultimately pessimistic, Bundist (nationalist) lines." ("Charting the Uncharted Course," RCP, USA, April 3, 1981)

"When you have a period when things begin getting sharper, when there is more turmoil, when people's ears are beginning to tune themselves more toward the music that we sing, then there is more of a role for being out there on the streets and in sort of a spirit of prophets ... there's no other way to describe it." (Avakian, "Revolution," Fall/Winter, 1989)

The really weird thing about all of this is that if modern capital was "profoundly national," then it would still make sense to support revolutionary national liberation struggles.

**WHERE ARE THE 90'S GOING?**

The following is a summary of an article appearing in *The Economist* (May 30, 1992, p. 63):

"In June Motorola [based in Chicago] will break ground for a new \$120m [semi-conductor] factory in Tianjin, a port city near Beijing. ... Trying to match global quality and productivity standards in China will not be easy. But Motorola is ... ever willing to take risks. The reason is simple: Asia is where markets for the company's products will grow fastest for years to come. ... Last year Motorola had sales of \$11.3 billion; of that, 49% was outside the United States ... The company now has one marketing headquarters, seven manufacturing plants and 11 sales offices scattered through ten Asian countries ... The turning point came in 1987 when Motorola formed an alliance with Toshiba ... The chip business is so capital-intensive—a new chip factory can easily cost \$1 billion—that almost nobody can afford to go it alone ... (F)inance and production are directed from the centre [Chicago]. Recruitment, marketing and operations are controlled locally. Mr. Tam runs the Hong Kong chip factory as he thinks best, but a third of its output is exported to America for sale by Motorola's sales force there, and 20% to Europe."

The above description of collusion and combination between monopoly-groups is the main motion of global finance capital at the moment. Bankruptcies and mergers are happening worldwide. Just look at IBM/Apple, the torrent of bank mergers in the summer of 1991, the rush into the

## A SPIRAL TRAJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT

Third World by the Big Three automakers, the immolation of large units of fictitious (and real) capital controlled by Olympia & York, Robert Maxwell, the ex-Soviet monopoly entities as well as the unification of Germany and the EEC into a formidable imperialist dragon—to name but a few examples.

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

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

Again—as Lenin saw, "... the division of the world between two powerful trusts does not remove the possibility of redivision, if the relation of forces changes as a result of uneven development, war, bankruptcy, etc." (Lenin, *Imperialism*, p. 70)

It would not surprise MIM if Motorola eventually moved its corporate headquarters from Chicago to Hong Kong or Singapore. Although the Chicago headquarters is still directing the global allocation of its exchangeable products into the still profitable imperialist consumer-societies, Motorola has obviously recognized that the increasing volume of production and sales and trade in the unevenly-developing "Pacific Rim" can alleviate, for a time, the tendency of the rate of profit to fall and allow it to escape the non-productive and stagnant waters of a parasitical Amerika where it can no longer even technically exploit the majority of industrial (or "service") workers.

This is a profoundly inter-nationalist perspective no longer "rooted" in a national formation—but de-centralizing and expanding away from it to concentrate on higher levels. Nor is this evidence of anarchic movement as principal. In fact, *it is the anarchy of production* that compels the imperial-

ists to roam the planet in search of exploitable labor and value-heavy markets and this demonstrates just how profoundly international finance capital has become as it *re-organizes* to clamp down even more on the oppressed countries. This does not demonstrate that finance capital remains locked into national formations or that imperialist competition is always principally antagonistic: *but the unity of opposites*.

So even if we were to accept Lotta's "anarchy" premise—we see how the conclusions he derives do not accord with reality. However, MIM chooses not to elevate Engel's anarchy/organization contradiction to such fallaciously deterministic heights. MIM continues to look to the class struggle as key.

In coming to an understanding of patriarchal imperialism it is not enough to simply state, as the RCP does in much of its recent literature, that the imperialists found some "maneuvering room" and "temporarily avoided" nuclear holocaust. *Imperialism is war*.

### Notes:

1. Serious students of the Marxist science are recommended to struggle with the chapter "Simple Reproduction" in Marx's *Capital*, Volume 2 in which social overproduction of commodities is shown to be inherent in reproduction of constant and fixed capital (as opposed only to the production of surplus value itself) and in which the "anarchy" of overproduction—which is also one aspect of "competition"—is described as a balancing mechanism to the normal depreciation of fixed capitals. As the aggregate means of production will normally increase and decrease in value over a period of time, "[T]his can be remedied only by a continuous relative over-production. ... This sort of over-production is tantamount to control by society over the material means of its own reproduction. But within capitalist society it is an element of anarchy. ... Such surplus is not an evil in itself, but an advantage; however it is an evil under capitalist production." (*Marx, Capital, Volume 2*, pp. 472-473)

Lotta fails to ground his anarchy thesis in the economic spheres in which it actually does operate. He deals only with its outer political form without touching upon the real underlying economic contradictions within capitalist reproduction and production in which anarchy is also a socially organizing form of motion, i.e., Engel's "definite plan of an invading socialist society." (SUS, p. 66)

Communists recognize, however, that this "invasion" can only be developed by conscious socialist planning. Revisionists sit back and wait for the "invasion" to "develop the productive forces" and do organizational work in the base that can only be done after seizing power in the superstructure—when anarchy is consciously turned into its opposite.

2. The opportunist "three worlds" theory simply reduces the four fundamental contradictions of our time into just one: the one among the various imperialist states and monopoly groups . . . By erasing the fundamental content of this contradiction—the opposition of the oppressed peoples and nations of the world to the imperialism which exploits them, and against internal reactionaries on whom it relies for its domination . . . (the Chinese revisionists) reduce it to the contradiction between the two superpowers and their respective

## A SPIRAL TRJECTORY: THE FAILURE AND SUCCESS OF COMMUNIST DEVELOPMENT

military and economic blocs, subordinating the proletariat and the people to this inter-imperialist contradiction . . . (This) intentionally denies the role of the class struggle as the motive force of history. It divides the world in a mechanical and one-sided way and with an economist criterion . . . " (Joint Declaration of Marxist-Leninist Parties of Latin America), September, 1978, p. 21-22)

### Sources Quoted:

- Engels, F., *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*, International Publishers, New York, 1935.
- Marx, K., *Capital*, vols 1, 2 & 3, International Publishers, New York, 1967.
- Marx, K., *Wage Labour and Capital*, Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1978.
- Communist Party Of China, *The Polemic On The General Line Of The International Communist Movement*, Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1965.
- Avakian, B., "Conquer The World ...", RCP Publications, Chicago, 1981.
- Lotta, R., *America In Decline*, Banner Press, Chicago, 1984.
- Lenin, V., "Left-Wing" Communism, An Infantile Disorder, Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1975.
- Lenin, V., *The Nascent Trend Of Imperialist Economism*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1969.
- Lenin, V., *Imperialism, The Highest Stage Of Capitalism*, A Popular Outline, International Publishers, New York, 1985.
- Communist Party of Columbia (Marxist-Leninist), Marxist-Leninist Communist Party Of Ecuador, Revolutionary Communist Party Of Chile, Red Flag Party Of Venezuela, *Joint Declaration Of Marxist-Leninist Parties Of Latin America*, RCP Publications, Chicago, 1979.
- RCP, "Charting The Uncharted Course," April 3, 1981, USA
- Avakian, "Revolution," Fall/Winter 1989.
- The Economist* - 5/30/92.

# SUBSCRIBE

# MIM Notes

THE OFFICIAL NEWSLETTER OF THE MAOIST INTERNATIONALIST MOVEMENT

MIM Notes provides monthly Maoist analysis of international and domestic news and culture. MIM Notes regularly features news from prisoners, letters from our readers and a cultural page of movies, video, music and book reviews. Issues also include theoretical articles on the development of Maoism in the United States and the most effective way forward. Don't miss another issue!



#### INDIVIDUAL

- 1 year, domestic, \$12
- 2 years, domestic, \$20
- 1 year, overseas, \$36

#### INSTITUTIONS

- 1 year, domestic, \$48
- 2 years, domestic, \$90
- 1 year, overseas, \$60

#### Yes, I want to subscribe to MIM Notes!

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

City&Zip: \_\_\_\_\_

Country: \_\_\_\_\_

*Important: Send cash or  
a check payable to "ABS."*


Mail to:  
MIM Notes,  
P.O. Box 3576,  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-3576



# REVOLUTIONARY READING

To order send cash or a check **made out to ABS**, Mail to:

MIM, P.O. Box 3576, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-3576




## What is the Maoist Internationalist Movement?

**\$2.** MIM's founding documents and main principles with articles and polemics on organizing a Maoist party in Amerika. Tackles single-issue organizing, feminism, "pig questions." (16 pages)

Produced & Edited by MC©  
**Twisted Socialism Or  
The Capitalist System?**  
MIM Notes' State Capitalist Study Pack  
Contents - Mao Zedong Critique of Soviet Economics - W.B. Bandy, The Revolution of Capitalism in the Soviet Union - Charles Bettelheim China Since Mao - Chinese Leadership Murders Students - The Case Against Stalin - Stalin Was 70% Correct - The Crisis in Soviet Capitalism  
September 1991  
Price: \$15.00


## Twisted Socialism or the Capitalist System

**\$15.** MIM's readings on state capitalist countries. Includes works on Soviet economic structure, Chinese capitalism, the murder of students and Mao's Critique of Soviet Economics. (200 pages)



## Peru Study Pack

**\$15.** Explains the work of the Communist Party of Peru, the most successful Maoist party in the world today. Contains PCP documents and articles from MIM Notes on U.S. military presence in Peru. (150 pages)




## Retaking History

**\$5.** MIM's assessment of Soviet Leader Josef Stalin. Includes discussion of the collectivization of agriculture, the USSR's battle against the Third Reich and Stalin's place in world history. (40 pages)

# If you missed MIM Theory No. 1, or Nos. 2&3 —a special double issue on revolutionary feminism —it's not too late.


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



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

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

Maoism is very deep thought. It requires study, struggles and arguments, arguments, arguments. The imperialists print millions of pages a day telling their side of the story. MIM has as many thoughts as the imperialists, but not as much paper, especially the green kind.



## Wow! Heavy stuff, but I'm ready to argue with MIM....

### MIM THEORY

I can't do without a sub. I know to send only cash or a check made out to "ABS."

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

City&Zip: \_\_\_\_\_

Country: \_\_\_\_\_

Mail to: MIM, P.O. Box 3576, Ann Arbor,  
MI 48106-3576, USA.

- Start me up with No. 1 and a year's sub, \$18.
- Better yet, make it two years for only \$35.
- Hey, I know MIM is better than the bourgeois journals. Here's \$100 to prove it. I'm a lifetime sustainer & subscriber of MIM Theory.
- Artsy fartsy? I know art is not enough; send me some ideas to draw MIM cartoons.
- Some countries aren't lucky enough to have a MIM, let me help translate MIM Theory into \_\_\_\_\_.
- Institutional subscription, \$48 per year;
- With MIM Notes for one year, \$90.