

Anarcho-Neo-Marxism: A Response

Owing to the nature of the following writing (a response to a response to a reddit post), I figured to write it more as a “critical analysis” than a “polemic”, so to speak, and to relegate it to the present medium rather than making a new post about it, which I feel would’ve likely come off as vain. That said:

“First World Marxists-Leninist are deeply confused. On the one hand, within their ranks there exists an entire strata of petite bourgeois, social-entrepreneurs whose only concern is with the monetization of the class struggle — truly a sect of unqualified crypto-fascist and race-mongering running dogs whose literal job is to stunt revolutionary movement.”

As far as this assertion goes, it is mostly correct. However, what is to be kept in mind is that this phenomenon is not relegated to that of the petit-bourgeois. On the contrary, this is the prevalent ideology among the cosmopolitan bourgeoisie, and consequentially, their labor aristocrats. Otherwise, everything stated is agreeable.

“And on the other, you have a very vocal yet strangely inactive minority who may, in technicality, be principled adherents of the immortal science, but are otherwise lazy, completely unprepared to conduct the class war for which they agitate, and are only slightly less racist than their right-wing counterparts.”

I think this is a curious point. Are they “principled adherents to the immortal science”, or are they “only slightly less racist than their right-wing counterparts”? Surely, a proper understanding of the “race” question, knowledge that it is in actuality a red herring to distract from the *national* question, is a point far too contentious for one to adopt an essentially fascistic position and still consider a “principled adherent to the immortal science”?

Otherwise, I mostly agree with this point as well.

“You see this in the way they talk about the peons of colonialism; how they defame the armed peasant associations; how they proclaim revolutionary movement in the Third World is revisionist because it rejects the Eurocentric dogma of the contemporary liberal poison that has infected every level of communist party building in the imperial core...”

I found this particular person interesting, because it is, in essence, *absolutely correct*. But the problem is that it is vague in such a way that it perhaps betrays a lack of understanding as to *why* these people exist. In a few sentences, this attack on the imperial pseudo-socialists is attributed merely to “Delusion, of the highest order”, and is left at such.

This, in my view, portrays a correct ideological, but incomplete material understanding of the imperial-core nations’ “leftists”.

Why do these people exist? Is it because they don’t read, they have skipped Mao, or possess some inherent hatred for other races? These could, in cases, be factors, but no, these are insufficient reasons to describe this incredibly persistent, seemingly unshakable phenomenon of the “left-imperialist”.

The simple answer? These people inhabit a nation which stands to gain from imperialism and imperialist war. It does not matter how well read they are, how passionately they sing the Internationale, no, what matters is that *their class interests, and by extension national interests, are naturally inclined towards imperialism*. If Kautsky, at one point in time the hero of the international proletarian movement, could so thoroughly shame and disgrace himself with prophecies about the “proletarian defense of the German fatherland!”, the no western Marxist, regardless of their knowledge, is safe from this trap. It is an extraordinary case, an anomaly, for a member of the imperialist-core proletariat to support the international proletarian movement. This does not mean

it is impossible, but as a general rule, the western proletariat is not at all a proletariat, but a labor-aristocracy, and they work not for a national bourgeoisie, but for the cosmopolitan bourgeoisie and in some cases petit-bourgeoisie.

Blasphemous, surely? No, this is the essence of Lenin's entire chapter *Parasitism and Decay of Capitalism*, in my estimation the most important chapter of the book:

"In speaking of the British working class the bourgeois student of "British imperialism at the beginning of the twentieth century" is obliged to distinguish systematically between the "*upper stratum*" of the workers and the "*lower stratum of the proletariat proper*". The upper stratum furnishes the bulk of the membership of co-operatives, of trade unions, of sporting clubs and of numerous religious sects. To this level is adapted the electoral system, which in Great Britain is still "*sufficiently restricted to exclude the lower stratum of the proletariat proper*!"'

This was in 1916. A hundred years have passed, this "upper stratum" has only grown to include the vast majority of the working class in imperialist nations, in particular those in Western Europe, where national strife has been largely eliminated and the various national states' cosmopolitan bourgeoisie freely divide up the world under a "European Union".

I can go into more detail if you'd like, but for now I won't dwell on this point.

"From emancipation to reconstruction, to Jim Crow, to the Black Liberation Movement, to the presidential campaign of the soft-imperialist Bernard Sanders, the white working class, often at the direction of their chauvinist Party and Labor bosses, systematically falls in line with the neofeudal mandates of the Capitalist State."

I would actually say that this is a much more developed and accurate understanding of the western "left" than many comrades come around to. The one criticism I have is "neo-feudal". I think this was said with rhetorical intention, but if it was not then it is not really correct, there is not much feudal about the current system, any more than feudalism was "neo-communalism". It seems like an unnecessary substitution of one concept for another.

"In '*Maoism': Social-Revolutionary Primitiveness*', Comrade Frogsknecht uses a gross misunderstanding of Lenin to position Maoism as an ultra-left, adventurist cancer plaguing the colonized masses, asserting that the Communist Party Philippines and the New People's Army (CPP-NPA) — **a revolutionary peasant association waging a struggle against the brutal, amerikkkan-backed military dictatorship of Rodrigo Duterte** — were engaged in "mere terrorism"."

The bolded part is what I want to focus on, for two reasons:

Firstly, the description of the CPP-NPA as a "revolutionary *peasant* association". This is interesting to me, because the CPP-NPA itself does not claim to be a peasant organization, it claims to be a Communist Party, and thus, a proletarian party which is *allied* with the peasantry. But by calling it specifically a peasant organization, then you by yourself have demonstrated one of its greatest flaws, that it is not a proletarian party capable of carrying out a proletarian revolution, but a peasant association waging an armed struggle *against a state which is supported by the Proletariat*. At the least, the implication is that it is a peasant association *leading the proletariat to struggle*, similar to Nardoniks or other agrarian rebels, anarchists, etc. The original post I made, I feel, does plenty to illustrate why this is a flawed line.

Secondly, the description of the Philippine government as a "amerikkkan-backed military dictatorship of Rodrigo Duterte"... this is really all sorts of wrong. I will start going backwards. While Duterte is the (elected) president of the Philippine Republic, what is written here seems to indicate a lack of knowledge as to Duterte's efforts to reduce his own office's power through the introduction of federalism, which, naturally, necessitates a

reduction of the President's own powers. I won't go into this, as it's a topic in its own right, but to portray Duterte as apparently illegitimate is unfair.

If he is not being portrayed as an illegitimate leader of the Philippines, despite being the elected president of the Philippines, then you are portraying what you believe to be a "brutal, amerikkkan-backed military dictatorship" to be legitimate. Either way, I will let it speak for itself.

Calling it a military dictatorship is outright wrong, to the point where it borders offensive. The Philippines is not a military dictatorship, it is a democratic republic, and was set up by American imperialists based on the US constitution. This is why Tagalogs occupy a similar position in the Philippines to the Whites in the US. Do you know how EU uses Ukrainians against Tatars and Russians in the Ukraine? It is the same concept.

The Philippines is in the same general region as Myanmar, which is in the midst of a military junta's rule, an actual military dictatorship. I would recommend studying the differences between the two state structures, you will find they are nothing alike.

As for "Amerikkkan-backed", this is disingenuous. The most "backing" he has received from the US is some rifles and helicopters, army modernizations, so forth that were ordered to help fight Abu-sayyaf (ISIS) militants in the south.

The Philippines is, by this logic, also "China-backed", and also "Russia-backed". And if this is our criteria for what constitutes "backing", then the fact that the CPP-NPA's founder and leader Joma Sison lives in the Netherlands, gives interviews to the CIA and to American corporations like CNN, that he gave a speech in Hong Kong during the American-backed separatist protests, that the CPP-NPA often uses M14 rifles, etc., should be absolutely damning.

Where does that leave us? If the Philippine Republic is US-backed, so too is the CPP-NPA. So who are we to support, neither?

This line of reasoning is doomed to wind up at a dead end. The fact of the matter is that the Philippines is a sovereign republic which is still partially under US occupation, an occupation that is slowly losing power by the day.

"They twist the crucial analysis of *Revolutionary Adventurism* into a watered-down hymn suggesting that Maoists in general, "neither counted on nor hoped for any definite action or support on the part of the masses," that the "enthusiastic proclamations" of the Maoist guerrillas about "armed struggle, about captured weaponry, about assassinated policemen" were disenchanting the people with the movement and endangering their lives. It is only possible to make this rightist error if you have hoodwinked yourself into believing that you are the be-all-end-all of the class struggle."

It is here that honest analysis begins more and more to be substituted with enraged proclamations. I will address them one by one.

"Maoists in general 'neither counted on nor hoped for any definite action or support on the part of the masses!'" I did not assert this, this is what Lenin asserted about the Socialist-Revolutionaries. I think Maoists perhaps do count on help, or hope for it, but I think this is regardless. The outcome of their actions is the same.

"The 'enthusiastic proclamations' of the Maoist guerillas about 'armed struggle, about captured weaponry, about assassinated policemen' of were **disenchanting the people** and endangering their lives." I highlighted "disenchanting the people" because this is an awfully insincere way to say "massacring the people, attacking their state institutions without any real comprehensive plan or intention, committing regular acts of robbery in the countryside, and duping their youngest and most vulnerable to come die in the mountains for a

Dutch professor's bandit gang". It is "Makhnovism", for lack of a better word.

That "It is only possible to make this rightist error if you have hoodwinked yourself into believing that you are the be-all-end-all of the class struggle" is quite an assertion to be hurled from the side of a group which has, for five decades, unsuccessfully waged a campaign against military and farmers in the countryside.

No, on the contrary, it is only possible to refuse to recognize the very obvious lack of popular support for the CPP-NPA in the midst of pure revolutionary fervor. Violence is not bad on principle. The opposite, actually, revolutionary violence and terror is what has pushed history forwards since the beginning of time. But this is something which must be done sparingly, and *with an actual goal in mind*. There has been no sincere tactical or strategic campaign launched by the CPP-NPA in its fifty years of existence. It peaked some decades ago, and has mostly relied on sporadic terrorist actives wherein any progress won is immediately swarmed upon by state reaction.

What, in this case, would be the "rightist error"? Insistence that we should support the state in its transition towards federalism and out of unitary republicanism, so that the various nations of the Philippines may develop strong and organized proletarians capable of leading a revolutionary movement? Or insistence that we, through actions of armed terror, should seek to thwart attempts to facilitate this transition, and instead attempt by all means to preserve the dying Philippine "nation"? One of these is a development, one is a reaction. I will allow you to analyze this yourself.

"In *What is to be Done?* when Lenin speaks of "the defects in our fighting organizations," he is referring to the students and service workers who are called to arms by reactionaries to "burn everything down" even though they are completely unprepared for conflict and have no plan whatsoever to rebuild afterward, only to be brutalized and murdered by police — not the armed peasant associations waging war against empire."

This is somewhat wrong. The students and service workers were being called to arms by *communist intellectuals like Lenin*. And it was through this that they learned their mistake. Otherwise, you're right, he was describing students and service workers being called to arms even though they're completely unprepared and have no plan whatsoever, only to be brutalized and murdered by police.

Who does this sound like? Is this not the CPP-NPA, who quite literally do the majority of their recruiting on college campuses, through the Kabataang Makabayan?

The CPP-NPA cannot be said to be an "armed peasant association", although as I said earlier, this in and of itself would be damning. Lenin wrote plenty about Narodnism, the agrarian rebels, etc. I would advise further research in this field. I addressed this failure to understand the role of the proletariat in my post.

"In *Oppose Book Worship*, Mao exclaimed that "WITHOUT INVESTIGATING THE ACTUAL SITUATION, THERE IS BOUND TO BE AN IDEALIST APPRAISAL OF CLASS FORCES AND AN IDEALIST GUIDANCE IN WORK, RESULTING EITHER IN OPPORTUNISM OR IN PUTSCHISM.""

I think all I can advise here is a rereading of the quote. It is absolutely true, but I feel you are making this exact error. The CPP-NPA falls victim to the former, opportunism. This would help explain why their legal front recently formed an electoral coalition with the liberals, and why they have advocated peace talks with the liberals after sabotaging them with Duterte.

"And what have the self-styled Marxist-Leninist parties given us in Amerikkka? Idealism. Opportunism. Chauvinism. Dead initiatives. Dead Party organs. Dead workers."

Correct. There are only a couple sincere anti-imperialist parties in the United States, and they come in the form of race-nationalist (and thus, typically fascist) parties, black and white. None of the communist parties hold similarly consistent and correct lines. It's a rather bizarre dynamic.

“However, where ‘critics’ of Maoism go wrong is in seeing Maoism as Marxism-Leninism-Maoism; that is, seeing the framework of Maoism as Marxism-Leninism with the simple addition of Mao.”

If I can be honest, I really don't care about Maoists, Mao-Zedong-Thought, Marxism-Leninism, whatever. The names do not matter, the actual essence of the movements do. An analysis of any (or at least the vast majority) Maoist will inevitably turn up these types of errors.

“Maoists, in the same way, are not Marxists-Leninists. We are just that, Maoists.”

You said it, not me.

“Maoists, unlike First World Marxists-Leninists, recognize that revolution begins with the colonized peasants because it is *only* on their backs, wombs, and bones that Capital is enabled to function.”

This is interesting because, while I agree on your point that too many first world Marxist-Leninists refuse to understand revolution as an act of national liberation, I disagree that Maoists are any better about this. In some cases, particularly “Maoists-Third-Worldists”, I have seen a good understanding of nationalities and the national question, with a failure to apply that understanding as its affected by imperialism. This is a point I won't dwell on though, because I feel this section, while correct, was not exactly accurate in being addressed towards me. My personal belief is that there lies a *far* more revolutionary socialist movement in the imperialist countries of the world, Philippines included. Just only, you and I appear to disagree on where this socialist movement finds its basis, in the proletariat (as I believe) or the peasantry (I could be wrong, but this is what you appear to believe). I think my initial post discussed this, I would recommend skimming back over it with this clarification in mind.

“...that political power is seized first by the force of an armed cadre, because the Party must be formed around a militant movement if its non-fighting members and programs plan to survive.”

I would object to this. The armed seizure of political power is one of the last steps of socialist revolution. The large bulk of the process lies in raising the revolutionary consciousness of the masses, setting up workers and peasants organizations, facilitating the development of the party over the nation, etc. It was in attempting to skip this stage and go straight to revolution that led to the failures in 1905 Russia, 1920s Germany, and so on. This is the essence of so-called revolutionary-adventurism.

“...the undoing of colonialism is the necessary first step toward International Proletarian Revolution.”

This is a point we can agree on.

“The **colonized proletariat**, the peons of colonialism — are the only strata capable of leading a vanguard, because the violence of imperialism will kill us first and worst.”

This is true. So why, then, are organizations like the CPP-NPA and other “Maoist” parties putting such an emphasis on the colonized *peasantry* as the vanguard, and not the proletariat? As you said, these are “peasant associations”.

“Did the Viet Minh not employ guerrilla warfare to rid themselves of the domestic imperialists?”

“Domestic imperialists” is an oxymoron and, I believe, an attempt to blur the distinction between a national and imperialist army. The Viet Minh employed guerrilla warfare *in coordination with the whole Vietnamese people*, against a *foreign imperialist army*, and not as a small sect of disconnected petit-bourgeois intelligentsia.

The other examples make this same error.

“The Western Marxists-Leninists — who, for the most part, are actually Anarcho-Neo-Marxists as far as I am concerned— are the new infantile disorder.”

I think “Anarcho-Neo-Marxists” displays a clear disconnect between thought and words. This phrase quite literally means nothing, and in the title, I thought it was said ironically. I don't mean to be harsh, but it is what it is.

“Maoists are not afflicted with this illness, because Maoism is not an ideology: it is a scientific mode of thought concerned with the disposition of the colonized proletariat *specifically* “

I found this interesting. To be *concerned with a specific disposition*, i.e., to hold one subjective truth as higher than another subjective truth, is the opposite of everything held true by objective dialectical-materialism. That all subjective truths, collectively, when their contradictions are resolved, constitute an objective truth, is the basis of dialectical-materialist thought. And so, one disposition is, in fact, equal in importance to the opposite disposition, because it is the synthesis two which forms what we term the “objective truth”.

“Who do these people think they are? Why do these people — who cannot even bring themselves to organize their own apartment complexes, let alone a principled communist revolution — feel the need to project insecurities onto Third World revolutionaries?”

This, in honesty, feels like a panicked appeal to withhold criticism. Surely, if these boogymen can't bring themselves to organize their own apartments, you would not find it worth responding to them, because what harm are they? Your time would best be spent criticizing a party line or prominent organizer, surely?

Nobody has to read what is written, but that will not stop it from being written. I feel uncomfortable talking about it somewhat, because I do not like tokenizing, but I have received many positive responses regarding Maoism and the CPP-NPA from Philippine comrades who have lost relatives in the struggle, on both sides, and even positive feedback from a former member of the CPP-NPA. You don't have to believe this if you don't want to, it is anecdotal, but I think it speaks for itself.

“Comrade Frogsknecht goes on to make outlandish claims without evidence and disjointed arguments devoid of any meaningful substance. Referring to principled analyses and critiques of the industrial proletariat as “phrase-mongering”.”

I do like the word phrase-mongering.

“Incessantly deriding colonized people as petite-bourgeois from the comfort of his First World bedroom, and for the crime of... refusing to allow brutal military dictatorships to murder our Indigenous children with impunity.”

I see. So then, is Sison not petit-bourgeois? These groups are not petit-bourgeois? What about me and my class background, when it is these people who are leading armed rebel groups?

Surely, they are the priority here. Which begs the question: why did you refrain from diagnosing *their* class background, from pointing out that Sison, leader of CPP-NPA, just as an example, lives in the Netherlands where he parties, harasses women online, and posts pictures of himself with sex columnists in skimpy clothing? Are these people petit-bourgeois, or not?

“Tremendously confused as to what the peasantry is as a class. Blissfully unaware of the strategies and tactics of urban warfare. Seemingly not bright enough to envision how guerrillas might be enabled to subvert “high-speed travel and long-distance instant communications” to win the battles of Portland and Seattle, which

they probably did not even know would be necessary in a civil war scenario. ”

In a simpler world, this alone would be enough to debunk everything Lenin wrote about the peasantry and its relation to the petit-bourgeois. Unfortunately, being in a world as complex as ours, it comes off as only defeated rambling.

“And because this post is so ridiculous and embarrassing and anti-revolutionary, **I find no need to entertain what amounts to lies and slander with laborious research to prove something every colonized person already knows at the back of their mind to be true.”**

I think here is the golden gem of the analysis. Roughly 2/3 of the way through, we at last come to the admission that *we are being refused an analysis of the situation*. So what have we been given instead? We have not been given research, that much I think we can agree on. What are we to do now? You have gotten angry at an article, that is well and good, but what has come of it? Are people going to read this and think, “Yes, this person presents a strong case!”? Or are they going to scowl, confused. “Well, it’s not already true to me, you just talked about how offensive his article was...” and with that, the page is closed, and your writings dismissed from memory. This is not an effective tactic.

“The Marxists-Leninists know all this but I am still forced to ask: Where is the vanguard? Where are the land trusts, autonomous communities, and revolutionary housing initiatives? Where are the food depots and urban farmlands? Where are the weapons and combat training programs? Where is the “organization, agitation, [and] mass economic struggle” against the Capitalist State? Where is the socialism? What do the Marxists-Leninists have to show for all this petty intergroup conflict besides glorified book clubs?”

I will tell you. We have the People's Republic of China, which, in the aftermath of a century of humiliation, in the wake of fascist expansion and imperialist aggression, secured once and for all a destiny for the various nationalities of Asia who had long been held under the yoke of foreign colonialism. We have the Russian Federation, beaten as it may be, which still stands proud in the stead of the world's first socialist republic, a country which defeated two waves of global invasion and clung to life until it was killed from within. We have Vietnam, which threw off American and French imperialists, we have Cuba, the Bolivarians, we have a whole throng of Eastern European peoples who long for nothing more than to rebuild their lost socialist republic, and we have the brave fighters in Ukraine, who, outnumbered by world fascism, cling by a thread to their sovereignty, and so forth. And these movements are alive and well, and refuse to perish in the face of continuous imperialist onslaught and cosmopolitan aggression.

This is how it stands. Marxism-Leninism has won the oppressed people of the world a right to existence and their own destiny, whether in the form of socialist republics, people's republics, anti-colonial republics in Africa and South America, whatever it may be. Marxism-Leninism has bore fruits a thousand times over for its labors, and will continue to do so. There is a reason that every great anti-colonial nationalist, at some point in their struggle, is impelled to turn to Lenin and Stalin for their fight. Marxism-Leninism does not need to be vainly paraded as an immortal science, it commands only the most genuine and thorough respect from all the world's peoples. That is what Marxism-Leninism has to show for itself.

“EDIT: at around 11 pm on 13 Apr, not long after this polemic was posted, i was informed that the subject of this piece is an antisemite. i have edited the niceties in the post (removing the word comrade), because we should not be nice to antisemites.”

This is rather outlandish, but I won't bother disputing it. If this is the depth we have sunk to, that will only stunt your own ability to learn and argue, not mine.