

MAIN LINE

TRANSFORMING THE CRIMINAL MENTALITY INTO A REVOLUTIONARY MENTALITY

ISSUE #3 part 2
of 2

JAN. 2018

Introduction

In this second part of *Main Line* issue #3, we set out the NABPP's deeper analysis, (than we've previously made), and adoption of Huey P. Newton's theory of "Revolutionary Intercommunalism," (RI) which advances from our initially embracing revolutionary nationalism and internationalism, when we were founded in 2005. The articles that follow will allow our readers to follow the logical progression of refining and embracing RI, once we'd recognized the limitations of revolutionary nationalism and internationalism as we did in 2010, which we demonstrated in the first part of this issue, in "Black Liberation in the 21st Century: A Revolutionary Reassessment of Black Nationalism."

Like every revolutionary line, RI has always had its detractors—typically people who did not grasp it or rejected it simply because it did not conform to more "traditional" or popular theories. But going against the tide is what revolutionary struggle is about, and certainly no less in the realm of guiding theory. Hence, the NABPP doesn't hesitate to resist trends and struggles to remain on the cutting edge of advancing correct ideological and political lines.

Comrade Huey P. Newton and the original Black Panther Party's experience and work in struggling against and analyzing the U.S.-based imperialist system in this era was defining and pathbreaking. It was this experience and work that produced RI which illuminates the lines along which today's revolutionary struggle must be directed.

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

Kevin "Rashid" Johnson



In Search of the Right Theory for Today's Struggles: Revisiting Huey P. Newton's Theory of Revolutionary Intercommunalism (2015)

Kevin "Rashid" Johnson

"Without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement."

Lenin [1]

INTRODUCTION

Revolution is the complete rupturing of established relations between an oppressed and oppressor class, whereby the oppressor is overthrown and the oppressed seize and exercise power with the purpose of preventing themselves from being oppressed again. To have even a chance of success, the oppressed must be united and guided in their struggle by a correct understanding of who are their actual enemies and friends, and what are the true nature, causes and methods of their suffering. Only then can they hope to develop the right tactics with which to fight and defeat their enemy. This in essence is what revolutionary theory is all about, and why getting it right is vital.

With this understood, we want to look at those theories that guided the most far-reaching revolutionary movements against the viciously oppressive capitalist system as it has evolved. We will then closely analyze the theory that we find most correctly analyzes it as it is now and should therefore guide today's struggles against it.

YESTERDAY'S REVOLUTIONARY THEORIES

The rise of the Industrial Revolution and capitalism in 18th and 19th Century Western Europe, has produced a system that has perpetuated history's greatest continued concentrations of socially-produced wealth into the hands of an oppressive ruling minority, while causing unprecedented social and environmental destruction and devastation. And the suffering grows worse by the day.

This misappropriated wealth is produced by the socialized labor of vast numbers of working people across various industries, who are denied any control over the productive system and the tools and resources they must use to produce that wealth, and over even their own labor power, how it is used and to what ends. During its early stages of development, Karl Marx and his comrade Frederick Engels gave capitalism a close and systematic study. From this they found that capitalism is predicated on a particular relationship and type of class oppression, between the oppressor capitalist class (bourgeoisie) and the oppressed working class (proletariat), in which the bourgeoisie, who owns the productive system, compels the proletariat to sell his or her labor power at less than its actual value to produce goods that the bourgeoisie then sells at their true value to reap immense profits, which the bourgeois pocket as their own private wealth.

They found that the only way to eliminate this oppressive relationship and condition is for the proletariat and its allies to unite, overthrow, and then seize and exercise power over the productive system and all other social institutions against the bourgeoisie until all social oppression is eliminated; which means a proletarian revolution. The concept was simple, however the undertaking proved extremely complicated.

By studying capitalism in its formative years, they witnessed and documented the proletariat's early struggles against it, such as the Paris Commune of 1871. But as a young class, the proletariat had not yet developed the organizational forms, class consciousness and cohesion, nor grasp of their oppressed condition needed to plot out the appropriate stratagems and stages of struggle to overthrow the bourgeoisie. But it was learning. Based on his studies and participation in these struggles, Marx developed a distinctly proletarian theory of revolutionary class struggle, political economy and philosophy which came to be called Marxism.

Meantime, capitalism continued to evolve and grow, as the bourgeoisie in its insatiable greed for ever greater profits, expanded its domain beyond the regions of Western Europe, where it first developed, to encompass the entire globe. Capitalism thus evolved from a system of many

highly competitive decentralized enterprises (laissez-faire or 'free market' capitalism) to a system of a few highly centralized monopoly enterprises (monopoly capitalism or capitalist imperialism).

Having expanded into Eastern Europe, including into Russia, V.I. Lenin lived through and closely studied these developments, alongside the works of Marx and Engels. From this, he developed a comprehensive understanding of this evolving system, the world social forces within it, (and their alignments), and the organizational forms the proletariat must take and develop to defeat it, which he elaborated in many works. He thus advanced Marxism in each of its principal areas. His theories came to be known as Marxism-Leninism (M-L), and became the guiding principles of history's first successful proletarian revolution—in Russia in 1917—which Lenin and his Bolshevik Party led.

Also, under his leadership, and that of his successor J.V. Stalin, the world's people (especially across the Third World), began rising up against the Western European based imperialist powers that were colonizing them, by waging struggles for national independence. In fact it was Stalin who applied M-L and developed the theory of national liberation which was adopted by revolutionary nationalists across the Third World. Lenin led socialist Russia and allied parties to support these movements—including on behalf of New Afrikans/Blacks in the U.S., whom they recognized as a distinct historically constituted nationality of people who therefore enjoyed the right to self-determination up to and including secession from Amerika.

In China, Mao Tse-tung, also an apt student of Marx and Engels (and of Lenin and Stalin)—proved to be the Third World's most advanced revolutionary leader and M-L strategist. He also advanced M-L theory with respect to liberation struggles in the predominantly peasant Third World, in the area of continuing the class struggle under socialism, and in applying the mass line to revolutionary struggle and maintaining the working class integrity of the revolutionary party and socialist state.

As a co-founder and leader of the Chinese Communist Party, he led China's national liberation struggle and civil war, which overthrew imperialist and semi-feudal domination in 1949. He further led China's subsequent development as the most far-reaching socialist (or proletarian-led) society until his death in 1976, following which, bourgeois forces regained power and derailed the socialist revolution.

Mao advanced M-L in its principal areas. His overall contributions to M-L theory came to be known as Marxism-Leninism-Maoism or simply Maoism.[2]

But as class forces and history would have it, (and as Mao predicted could occur and led the struggle to prevent until his death), each of these revolutionary successes was reversed through the tireless maneuverings and schemes of the bourgeoisie and their minions, who fought without relent to regain power in and over those nations. These reversals produced and were attended by major changes in the alignment of forces and balances of power between 1) the proletariat and bourgeoisie everywhere, 2) the imperialist versus the socialist camps, and 3) the various existing imperialist powers.

Indeed, the socialist camp was routed, causing the Third World to lose its socialist rear support bases in China and the Soviet Union. Meantime, the imperialists spared no resource, opportunity nor treachery to purge the proletariat everywhere of its revolutionary leadership, its class consciousness and of the very notion of waging revolutionary struggle. They also waged a relentless campaign to vilify and slander communism and socialism, and its leading theorists.

In the process, Amerika outmaneuvered its imperialist rivals and allies alike to become the world's sole imperialist superpower, with military bases/enclaves and strategic armaments encircling the entire globe; and its economic, cultural, political and ideological influences and controls penetrating everywhere. Thus eliminating the basis for any society, (from the First to the Third World), to exercise or claim genuine sovereignty or national independence. Amerika thus became a global imperialist empire.

Consequently, the world order today differs substantially from the times when Marx, Engels, Lenin or even Mao

analyzed it and formulated their revolutionary theories. Yet, many who continue in struggles against imperialism, still continue in those analyses and methods based on them, in mismatched and failing attempts to graft them onto now.

HUEY'S THEORY OF INTERCOMMUNALISM

Into this theoretical vacuum steps Huey P. Newton's theoretical contributions, which he developed as the co-founder, Minister of Defense and chief theoretician of the original Black Panther Party (BPP). Under his leadership, the BPP began as a nationalist organization, following the older Black Nationalist teachings of Malcolm X.[3] However, it then quickly evolved through the Marxian[4] theories of Revolutionary Nationalism, then Revolutionary Internationalism.

By applying each of these theories in turn to the day-to-day struggles of New Afrikans/Blacks in Amerika, Huey realized they were insufficient to explain the world order as it was then, and furthermore, as it was developing under imperialism, and therefore proved ill-suited to base strategies on to defeat modern capitalist-imperialism. He therefore gave the problem deeper study and ended in developing a 'new' theory calling it "Revolutionary Intercommunalism."

Huey's theory never gained popularity nor traction within 'traditional' Marxian "Leftist" and nationalist circles, because it departed sharply from their assessments of things. Also, many just didn't get it. The theory has also been largely forgotten, because of the demise of the BPP and also of Huey P. Newton as an important revolutionary leader, due to the U.S. Government's unrelenting campaign to destroy both. Also, the 'movement' lost its understanding and appreciation of the vital need of a guiding revolutionary theory, because over the years, many so-called revolutionary lines have proved impotent and many leaders fell by the wayside (were destroyed, corrupted, imprisoned, burned out, etc.).

However, there have been exceptions, who remember, grasp, and have given positive credit to Huey's theory. Most notably, is Mumia Abu-Jamal, in his 2004 political memoir of his life and work in the BPP, titled *We Want Freedom*. [5] In fact, when correctly understood, Huey's Intercommunalism has proven correct, withstood the test of time, and precisely predicted world conditions under imperialism as they have developed over four decades later.

His theory, Huey explained, was the product of his analysis of and experiences with the capitalist system as it actually existed in correlation to the work of the BPP in its active struggle against it. He also studied Marx, Lenin and Mao.

The Party first based itself on nationalism because, he said, he believed, as did many, that a subjugated people could gain their freedom by forming their own independent nation states. But this proved inadequate; even for socialist nations, because Amerika had grown to become a literal world 'empire' and so effectively integrated and dominated the world's economy, lands and peoples, that none could truly break away from that system to exist or develop as free and independent states.

The condition of colonialism had evolved to such a level that Amerika fed off the wealth and resources of the entire world, but without need of maintaining its own administration or settler presence inside the foreign domains, as the old colonial system had. But the concept of neo-colonialism did not adequately define this relationship either, he said, because all the old colonies were not merely ruled over by local lackeys, but rather the entire societies had been integrated into a globally interconnected system like that of so many communities, instead of as an arrangement of separate sovereign nations. He called this system "Reactionary Intercommunalism."

Because they could not decolonize, (become independent and free nation states with control over their own economic development and institutions), nationalism and internationalism made no sense. As he noted the basis of decolonization or national independence is that a colonized people be able to reclaim or return to their previously existing stages of development or otherwise develop their own productive forces.

But he saw this world system with its interconnected technologies, cultures and communication systems as able, if

brought under collective control of the masses rather than that of a small circle of super-rich administrators, to provide for everyone's needs, solve all the world's problems, and create a communal culture that could end the prevalence of perpetual war and social chaos. This new social order he called Revolutionary Intercommunalism, or World Socialism, and a precursor to the Communist World (a world free of oppression and exploitation) which Marxists aspire to.

Huey also recognized and predicted that the rapid development in automation and technical advances would create a declining need and consequent shrinking of the industrial proletariat, and an attendant growth of its unemployed lumpen ("broken") section, who would soon come to outnumber the working proletariat. He saw this desperate and marginalized mass as the force that would replace the proletariat to lead the struggles against imperialism. He also focused his theory and work on the lumpen; based upon his understanding that if revolutionary elements didn't win the lumpen over to the revolutionary cause, the bourgeoisie would co-opt and use them against the revolutionary movement. As Bobby Seale, Huey's co-founder and Chairman of the BPP, observed:

"Huey understood... that if you didn't organize the lumpen proletariat and give a base for organizing the brother who's pimping, the brother who's hustling, the unemployed, the downtrodden, the brother who's robbing banks, who's not politically conscious—that's what lumpen means—that if you didn't relate to these cats, the power structure would organize these cats against you." [6]

What gave Huey's line such great practical and theoretical credibility is the urban unemployables and lumpen were the very people the BPP was based within, effectively organizing and politically educating. Few can deny—and the unprecedented destructive effort the U.S. Government directed at the BPP demonstrates—that the Panthers proved to be the most advanced and influential revolutionary organization on the U.S. Left, and it focused on organizing not the proletariat but rather the lumpen—no easy task.

It furthermore proved the most resilient, and catalyzed the creation and growth of similar groups across all 'racial' and national groups in Amerika, including a new Communist movement, and inspired imitators in many other countries. And many groups have since modeled themselves after the BPP, although few have understood or built upon its theory.

Before the BPP, no other Leftists had, with Huey's strategic clarity, organized the lumpen nor ever aspired to. *But* if his predictions about the imminent growth of masses of unemployables and lumpen proved true (and it has!), it would *have* to be an essential component of any credible future struggle against imperialism.

THE NEW IMPERIALIST WORLD ORDER

In answer to the anti-colonial national liberation struggles that swept the Third World under communist leadership, especially following World War II, Amerika and its European allies dismantled and replaced the old Third World colonial system with one that propped up local puppets and sham liberation leaders. Under the pretence of aiding these countries' development, U.S.-based international lenders (the World Bank and International Monetary Fund) granted them high interest loans conditioned on purchases being made from 'friendly' imperialist corporations, and imposing 'structural adjustments' within the borrowing countries that devalue local currencies, deprive the local population of basic subsidies, preclude industrial development, and overall ensures the impoverishment of the country and export of its national wealth and produce, etc.. These and other schemes were and are used to bring societies the world over to heel within a U.S. dollar-dominated world market.

They also fomented internal subversion and coups against non-compliant regimes, assassinated leaders, or imposed 'regime changes' by direct military intervention. They also nurtured the development of bourgeois elements and counter-revolutionary movements within socialist or 'non-aligned' societies, and subjected hold-outs to severe economic isolation and blockades, stifling needed trade and development, and forcing their populations to suffer under inhumane and increasingly harsh conditions, which the imperialists blamed

on the policies of their leaders and the claimed 'failures' of socialism.

Amerika also uses its stolen opulence to appeal to poor populations, (typically the very populations it steals the wealth of and are impoverished for this very reason), to aspire to the capitalist model, while preventing them from ever developing industrially whereby they might become economic competitors, forcing them to accept uneven and grossly unfair terms of trade and debts that see them perpetually robbed of their wealth and labor.

None of the former colonies have achieved freedom from imperialism, but instead have *all* been subdued by a new neo-liberal world order jealously ruled over by the U.S. Huey was right! Not a single national liberation struggle produced a free and independent state.

Furthermore, today, the majority of people who need work to survive can't find it. Just as Huey predicted, rapid advances in technology and automation over the past several decades have caused the ranks of the unemployed to grow exponentially, and it continues to grow. Many of them are lumpen, but here we should make a distinction—although, many lumpen are unemployed, not all unemployed proletarians are lumpen. As Marx pointed out, capitalism inevitably produces a perpetual mass of unemployed proletarians, from which the bourgeoisie can always find workers and use to keep wages down. This group is called the "Reserve Army of Labor."

The lumpen, however, is a sub-class of the proletariat who live by means of parasitism, opportunism and exploitation; such as for example, hustlers, pimps, drug peddlers, thieves, numbers runners, gang members and so on. As a result of their lifestyle of social predation, they have lost the collective social mores and values of the proletariat, and like the bourgeoisie aspire to quick fixes and acquisition of great wealth by preying on others.

Today, the lumpen are largely concentrated in and around impoverished urban areas—the slums, shantytowns, ghettos, barrios, refugee camps and so on—and of course prisons. But, also amassed in these areas are throngs of unemployed proletarians and marginalized people (the poor, mentally ill, squatters, the homeless, etc.). These urban multitudes cannot find work simply because the bourgeoisie cannot profitably exploit them. So they are left to suffer a desperate and marginalized existence.

This is in contrast to times past, when the urban centers were where the major industries were concentrated, and therefore were the areas where the employed proletarians lived. But, still they were places of concentrated poverty. Things have changed vastly since then. Especially since the 1970's, when the U.S. began de-industrializing and relocating its major industries to suburban areas and the Third World.

Alongside these conditions, have been huge population shifts from rural to urban areas in the densely populated Third World. This has occurred and continues for several reasons:

One reason is because of the imperialist system's insatiable drive for new sources of raw materials to feed its industries. This prompts them to ravenously gobble up vast expanses of rural land for mineral extraction and cash crop production. To acquire this land, millions upon millions of peasants and small farmers are driven off their land. Since it is usually their ancestral land and homes they are losing, they are typically pushed off by force of local governments and militaries, mercenaries, warlord armies, rival ethnic groups and/or so-called terrorist groups—all at the prompting of imperialist governments and corporations, (almost always operating behind the scenes to conceal their roles in fomenting bloodshed). This is the *actual* root of much of the violence raging in impoverished Third World regions, especially across Afrika, and has served to disperse with the old colonial system's need of settlers and its own militaries to expel native peoples from resource-rich and arable land.

Another reason for large population shifts is that vast numbers of poor farming people cannot afford to hold onto their land, because they cannot profitably sell their produce on the local markets, which are flooded with produce coming from high-volume agribusiness enterprises and thus is sold much cheaper than the small local farmers can afford to sell

their produce. These dislocated people are driven or flee into crowded urban slums, refugee camps, shantytowns and the like in desperate search of shelter, safety and work. Many undertake perilous migrations to First World countries, where, if they are not caught and deported, are crowded into city slums.

Instead of finding security and work, most of these displaced people are marginalized and must struggle to survive by any possible means. This is the main impetus for many becoming lumpen. Hence, the high prevalence of crime (especially in and around impoverished urban areas) is a consequence of the dysfunctional imperialist system. Moreover, these social dislocations fall heaviest on the youth, who are often orphaned in the process or otherwise fall by the wayside, and are in turn compelled to form or join gangs for survival and protection—being lumpenized at a young age.

As a result of these conditions, the peasantry (which long predominated in the Third World) is disappearing, the class of securely employed proletarians is shrinking, and the majority of the world's people are being pushed into an unemployable, lumpenized sub-class. Those who aren't lumpen are forced to live in intimate contact with them, and are thus continually exposed to the influence and pressure of the lumpen lifestyle and culture.

Because the lumpen's selfish, materialistic, and opportunistic values are wholly compatible with and actually reflect those of the capitalist class, the bourgeoisie promotes and glamorizes lumpen culture to the poor and disaffected via its 'entertainment' outlets, couching it in art forms that appeal to these groups (such as hip hop, street art, urban fashion, etc.). This, in addition to the need to survive, is another reason urban youth, (who might otherwise be drawn to organized struggle against their oppressed condition), are drawn to the lumpen lifestyle and its "get rich or die trying" ethic.

Over half the world now lives in and around urban areas; and there exists today the greatest polarization of social wealth between rich and poor seen in modern history. As Huey predicted, the unemployable and lumpen now outnumber the working proletariat, and their numbers continue to grow.

The one percent now own more wealth than 95% of the world's people, and some 1,000 billionaires own \$4.5 trillion. Nearly half the world's population have an annual net worth of \$10,000 each. Over half the world's people live on less than \$2.50 a day, 3 billion live on less than \$2.00 a day, and 1.2 billion live on less than \$1.50 a day.

Huey's theory foretold these developments almost exactly, and correctly and objectively identified their root causes at the time he elaborated it *in 1970*. Revolutionaries today must base their practice on equally accurate analyses. But fundamentally, we must master and apply the philosophical method with which he made his assessments, which, many Marxists might be surprised to learn, was none other than Marx's own philosophy of dialectical materialism.

HUEY'S THEORY VERSUS TRADITIONAL MARXISM

As we've noted, the Marxist line has always hailed the proletariat as the leading and only genuinely revolutionary class under capitalism. This remains true, because the fundamental contradiction and division which sustains this system *remains* that between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Additionally, the proletariat is the only class with nothing to gain by exploiting anyone else, (in fact, it is the only class that does not live by exploitation). It stands to gain everything by overthrowing the bourgeoisie and seizing control over the productive system and the wealth which its own collective labor produces, and ultimately abolishing all class relations.

But, by adhering mechanically to this line, many leftists have frowned on or otherwise failed to see any potential revolutionary role or value in the lumpen and unemployables in general. They've failed to recognize the need to win them over to prevent their being used by the bourgeoisie against them.

Under Huey's theoretical leadership, the BPP broke ranks with this mold, and developed both an organizational structure and strategy that gave a method to politically awakening and organizing the lumpen to play a revolutionary role.

He proved his theory with practice—basing the BPP and its socialistic 'Serve the People' programs within the very social forces he championed as destined to a future leading revolutionary role, namely, the lumpen and marginalized urban poor. In this, the BPP was breaking uncharted ground. Yet, so far, Huey's contributions to revolutionary theory and practice have gone unrecognized, unappreciated and, worse still, ignored and have not been built on in a significant way.

Huey proved to have a better grasp of Dialectical Materialism than the traditional Marxists, who rejected his concepts as so much theoretical muddle. Huey explained:

"The Black Panther Party is a Marxist-Leninist party because we follow the dialectical method and we also integrate theory with practice. We are not mechanical Marxists, and we are not Historical Materialists. Some people think they are Marxists, when actually they are following the thoughts of Hegel. Some people think they are Marxist-Leninists but they refuse to be creative, and are, therefore, tied to the past. They are tied to a rhetoric that does not apply to the present set of conditions. They are tied to a set of thoughts that approach dogma—which we call flunkysism."^[7]

OUR LINE ON INTERCOMMUNALISM

We in the New Afrikan Black Panther Party-Prison Chapter (NABPP-PC) find Huey's theory of Intercommunalism to be generally correct, and that it offers a valid conceptual framework to build a modern, global, revolutionary movement around. But, there are some idealistic, or incomplete aspects to his analysis that we'd like to address. We'd also like to show that his theory is overall confirmed by Marxist methodology.

Foremost, Huey saw the lumpen as displacing the proletariat as the new and final vanguard revolutionary class in the struggle against imperialism, because of its desperation and growing to outnumber the working proletariat, which is why he denounced Historical Materialism (HM). But, HM applies DM to the evolution of social productive systems from the most primitive to the most advanced, and places the proletariat as the class destined to overthrow imperialism and abolish all forms of exploitation, oppression and class divisions. Huey's line of replacing the proletariat with the lumpen in this role was clearly in error, for various reasons:

First, the lumpen is a sub-class of the proletariat, not an independent class. As such, it exists by merit of contradictory relations that exist between the proletariat and bourgeoisie. It is not a self-actualizing, self-sustaining, nor self-perpetuating class. In order to play a *sustainable* revolutionary role, the lumpen must maintain links to and accept leadership from the advanced layers of its parent class—the revolutionary proletariat and/or its line. It must embrace and practice this line to restore, (that is "fix" and sustain) its "broken" class identity and values.

Second, unlike the proletariat, the lumpen live by preying on others, including—and often *especially*—the proletariat. So it is innately corrupt and opportunistic, which makes it unsuited to becoming an independently "all-the-way revolutionary" sector.

Third, the lumpen exist outside of basic production, so it cannot organize resistance, nor expropriate and reorganize society at the point of production, which is fundamental to overthrowing the bourgeoisie and its control over the institutions of power, and building a cooperative political economy whereby the overall needs of the masses can be met.

Overall, to become revolutionary, the lumpen must embrace and practice the ideological and political line of the revolutionary proletariat, which is the only truly "all-the-way revolutionary" class. We have previously dealt with this matter at length as the guiding line of the NABPP-PC.^[8]

Because the BPP failed to recognize the predominant role of the revolutionary proletariat and its line, and that all other sectors must embrace this line, they didn't require Party members to develop a specifically proletarian consciousness. This allowed lumpen values to persist within the BPP, leading to many deviations in the Party and the moral degeneration of key leaders, like Huey, Eldridge Cleaver and others. Huey's demise was clearly because of his regression

into lumpen values and behavior prompted by the system's attacks on him and the BPP; which included extortion, robbery, drug addiction, even alleged murder—all directed at members of the oppressed communities he was charged with leading the struggle to liberate. Worse still, he began running the Party like a street gang. Ultimately, his reversion to the lumpen lifestyle cost him his life, in a street corner drug deal gone bad.

Similar behaviors have surfaced in the leadership and practices of groups today that have modeled themselves after the BPP, and who have also not required their members to develop a revolutionary proletarian morality, in order to purge their lumpen tendencies: This is a matter which cannot be glossed over nor dealt with lightly. In fact it reinforces the importance of revolutionaries remolding the lumpen and winning them away from bourgeois influences. Mao has explained the necessity of remolding the lumpen:

"Denied proper means of making a living, many of [the unemployed] are forced to resort to illegitimate ones, hence the robbers, gangsters, beggars and prostitutes and the numerous people who live on superstitious practices. This social stratum is unstable; while some are apt to be bought over by the reactionary forces, others may join the revolution. These people lack constructive qualities and are given to destruction rather than construction; after joining the revolution. They become a source of roving rebel and anarchist ideology in the revolutionary ranks. *Therefore we should know how to mold them and guard against their destructiveness.*"^[9]

But the lumpen cannot just be disregarded. As yet another Marxist and specific theorist on the lumpen, Franz Fanon, made clear, to do so is to imperil the revolutionary struggle. As the imperialists will definitely:

"find in the lumpen-proletariat a considerable space for maneuvering. For this reason any movement for freedom ought to give its fullest attention to this lumpen-proletariat. The peasant masses will always answer the call to rebellion, but if the rebellion's leaders think it will be able to develop without taking the masses into consideration, the lumpen-proletariat will throw itself into the battle and will take part in the conflict—but this time on the side of the oppressor. And the oppressor, who never loses a chance of setting the niggers against each other, will be extremely skillful in using that ignorance and incomprehension which are the weaknesses of the lumpen-proletariat. If this available reserve of human effort is not immediately organized by the forces of rebellion, it will find itself fighting as hired soldiers side by side with the colonial troops."^[10]

Next, Huey's analysis on why nationalist movements cannot achieve liberation for an oppressed people has been proven correct, as we've noted. But, we feel it is also theoretically confirmed by analysis of the national liberation struggle made by yet another Marxist; namely Amílcar Cabral, who has been almost universally appraised as one of Afrika's foremost revolutionary nationalist leaders and theorists. Amílcar led one of Afrika's most successful national liberation struggles, against overwhelming odds in Guinea Bissau (from 1956 until his assassination in 1973).

Applying a Marxist political-economic analysis, he demonstrated that any national liberation struggle is essentially a people's struggle to reclaim control over and freedom to develop their own productive forces and history. Anything short of this is *not* national liberation. Here's Cabral:

"Let us examine the nature of *national liberation*. We shall consider this historical phenomenon in its contemporary context, that is, national liberation in opposition to imperialist domination. The latter is, as we know, distinct both in form and in content from preceding types of foreign domination (tribal, military-aristocratic, feudal, and capitalist domination in the free competition era).

"The principal characteristic, common to every kind of imperialist domination, is the negation of the *historical process* of the dominated people by means of violently usurping the free operation of the

process of development of the productive forces and the system for social utilization of these forces (the ownership system) determine the *mode of production*. In our opinion, the mode of production whose contradictions are manifested with more or less intensity through the class struggle, is the principal factor in the history of any human group, the level of the productive forces being the true and permanent driving power of history.

"For every society, for every group of people, considered as an evolving entity, the level of the productive forces indicates the stage of development of the society and of each of its components in relation to nature, its capacity to act or react consciously in relation to nature. It indicates and conditions the type of material relationships (expressed objectively or subjectively) which exists among the various elements or groups and types of relationships between [people] and nature, between [people and their] environment. Relationships and types of relationships among the individual or collective components of society, to speak of these is to speak of history...."

"...The objective of national liberation is, therefore... the liberation of the process of development of the national productive forces. Therefore, *national liberation takes place when, and only when, national productive forces are completely free of all kinds of foreign domination.*"^[11]

Huey's position that there were *no* liberated nations was based upon his finding that *all* of the previously colonized societies who'd supposedly won national independence, still had their economic or productive forces dominated by the imperialists. Which is the *exact* criteria that Amílcar explained determines that national liberation has *not succeeded*. In this respect, Huey noted that because the imperialists had so completely integrated these societies' productive forces into its system of domination, it was not possible for any 'nation' to regain control over its productive forces. As he stated, "the people and the economy are so integrated into the imperialist empire that it's impossible to 'decolonize,' to return to the former conditions of existence. If colonies cannot decolonize and return to their original existence as nations, then nations no longer exist."^[12]

CONCLUSION

Many groups and movements today that oppose imperialism at various levels, recognize that the U.S. is in fact an empire that has integrated the productive forces of the world's societies into a global system that it dominates. Yet they still promote outmoded nationalist lines. Others promote class struggle, but have no concept of what roles the vast multitudes of unemployable poor, marginalized and lumpen might play pro or contra. More still promote outmoded or otherwise subjective forms of struggle that are unsuited or unresponsive to today's new world social-political-economic dynamics.

We must apply the line of Revolutionary Intercommunalism which promotes building unity between communities, and forging a worldwide culture of resistance to all oppression. The imperialists are waging a "War on the Poor" which we must counter with strategies of mutual assistance and survival programs, with the object of creating liberated areas and alternative institutions of dual power. The poor urban regions must be transformed into revolutionary base areas culturally, socially and politically. We must create "People's Power" at the grassroots level. And we must counter the imperialists' strategy of criminalizing and mass imprisoning the poor, while transforming the prisons and jails into "Schools of Liberation," to educate and politicize the lumpen and marginalized on the inside.

The oppressive system of imperialism is global in all aspects. Our struggle against it must be as well.

Dare to Struggle, Dare to Win!

All Power to the People!

NOTES

1. V.I. Lenin, "What Is to Be Done?" Selected Works, Vol. I (New York: International Publishers, 1967)
2. Initially Mao's contributions to M-L was called Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought, since it was his position that he only interpreted but had not actually advanced M-L. This was later repudiated since, despite his modesty, Mao indeed advanced M-L in all its key aspects, and made various 'new' contributions in its application such as in conducting people's war, continuing the class struggle under socialism and waging cultural revolution for this purpose, etc.
3. Malcolm X promoted Black Nationalism as a political strategy following his break with the Nation of Islam (NOI). He later rejected the concept as he moved closer to embracing a more socialist-oriented line, and disclaimed it as a terminology and concept that other revolutionaries around the world who weren't Black found alienating.
4. Throughout this paper, I use the terms "Marxist" and "Marxian" as general references to Marxist-oriented or based lines, including M-L and M-L-M.
5. Mumia Abu-Jamal, *We Want Freedom: A Life In the Black Panther Party*, (Boston, MA: South End Press, 2004) pp. 80-88. The New Panther Vanguard Movement, led by attorney B. Kwaku Duren promotes intercommunalism as a movement. Also the Black Riders Liberation Party, has used 'communal' terminology, but does not promote nor practice leading, organizing or developing alliances with 'white' anti-imperialists as the BPP did in applying Huey's Theory of Intercommunal Solidarity.
6. Bobby Seale, *Seize the Time: The Story of the Black Panther Party and Huey P. Newton*, (Baltimore, MD: Black Classics Press, 1991), p.30.
7. David Hilliard and Donald Weise, ed., *The Huey P. Newton Reader*, (N.Y.: Seven Stories Press, 2002), pp. 164-165.
8. Kevin "Rashid" Johnson, "The NABPP-PC Our Line," (2005), <http://rashidmod.com/?p=287>
9. Mao Tse-tung, "The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party," Dec. 1939.(emphasis added)
10. Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, (N.Y.: Grove Press, 1968), p.109.
11. Amílcar Cabral, "National Liberation and Culture," *Unity and Struggle: Speeches and Writings of Amílcar Cabral*, (N.Y.: Monthly Review, 1979), pp. 141-142.
12. David Hilliard and Donald Weise, ed., *The Huey P. Newton Reader*, (N.Y.: Seven Stories Press, 2002). p. 187.

The Lost Vision: NABPP-PC and the People's Struggle Towards Revolutionary Intercommunalism (2015)

By Jason Walker, NABPP-CC

Understanding revolutionary intercommunalism in the New Afrikan Black Panther Party Prison Chapter is not only a necessity, but its practical application is a requirement. As comrade Huey P. Newton once said, "If we do nothing we are accepting the situation and allowing ourselves to die." Well our party refuses to let the people or ourselves die off, so revolutionary intercommunalism has to be effectively applied in order to even look towards a communist world.

This isn't something that Huey just came up with. It actually took doing away with several different theories before he came to the conclusion of intercommunalism.

After trying to be a Black Nationalist party thinking nationhood was the answer, he switched to revolutionary nationalism. (Which is nationalism plus socialism.) After seeing the contradictions and it being impractical, he realized that in order for his vision to work they had to get rid of the ruling class and unite with people all over the world, so they came to call themselves internationalists.

The only problem with this was due to the United States being an imperial empire and the ruling class having an economic effect on other countries pretty much contradicted his "internationalism," since the U.S. was not a nation and no nation existed.

After further analysis of the constant state of transformations, it was realized that these nations had actually changed

to communities. The difference between the two (as Huey notes) is how a community is a small unit with a comprehensive collection of institutions that serve the people who

live there as opposed to a nation which is a country that has one race or culture with sole possession of their wealth and territory while acting under one government.

Due to the imperial U.S. swindling and controlling the wealth of other countries, a nation is unable to exist. This brought Huey to the conclusion to call this theory intercommunalism which didn't sit right with orthodox Marxist-Leninists who looked at him as trying to fix something that wasn't broke.

Revolutionary nationalists didn't like this as well since this theory required understanding things on a global scale while taking the party away from its nationalist roots.

Nevertheless after decades of this theory being ignored, the New Afrikan Black Panther Party Prison Chapter recognizes its accuracy and relevance in today's struggle and takes on the challenge of continuing the old party's legacy and Huey's vision of intercommunalism.

In order to understand revolutionary intercommunalism you have to understand its contradiction "reactionary intercommunalism," which is the product of the imperialist tendencies of the ruling reactionary class who took hold of, and controlled, all the communities of the world dominating the institutions to such an extent that the people were not served by the institutions in their own land.

This transformation took place when it was expected by Marx and Lenin that the opposite would occur whenever the non-state became a reality. Due to all the communities in the world having little difference in function, this transition away from a non-state actually brought us to a non-state, but it's of the reactionary type which makes revolutionary intercommunalism through the negation of the negation inevitable.

Just because inevitable means impossible to avoid or guaranteed doesn't mean we can sit back and wait for it. Our efforts are what make this possible. Through our concrete analysis of Dialectical Materialism (which analyzes the conditions and constant state of changes in motion) explains this, we just have to apply the practice.

All in all, intercommunalism is basically the application to bring all the communities in the world together in an effort to seize power from the ruling class who only do so because they control wealth, technology, mass media and power.

Intercommunalism counters this and requires the people to unite in determining their own destiny to have the power in their hands so everything is shared and distributed properly. Since the ruling circle thrives off control through the means of technology, we are pretty much being aligned to have revolutionary intercommunalism.

I say this because the more the ruling class exploits and advances technology, the more the people will become unemployed and decline into the ranks of the lumpen proletariat since advanced technology will do the work they once did. As this decline continues the working class will get smaller and smaller, and the reason for this is because of the qualifications required to fill these positions.

Since very few people will have the experience it takes, a great many people all over will be unemployed creating the manpower base for revolutionary intercommunalism.

We understand this, so it is our duty to inform, educate and prepare the people. It is only they that can successfully get us to the promised land, so we must anchor and steer them in the right direction while teaching them to do this on their own.

At this point in time the imperialists have already created the platform and have developed reactionary intercommunalism tendencies. We can see this by how technology has brought together the world as one big community. Through the domination of the U.S. empire, people all over the world are affected by this same power, it just varies in degree depending on the country.

The only way to change this is through revolutionary intercommunalism where we the people share all the wealth we generate and live as one. This path is ready and waiting since the technological and control bases are present.

This task won't be easy. Once we have made that transition, the lingering traits of racism, sexism and counter-productivity

will still be around. Since we will have control of our own societies, we can make the correct adjustments.

Making this transition is not the final task but the road to Communism. With this stage being a filter to weed out everything that's counter to producing, surviving, and controlling wealth through the means of the people.

Not only will this leap change the way we live and think, but the way we live and think will change the way we live today.

We the people of the world already share a common interest of being oppressed, so now it's time for the people of the world to share a common interest of struggling for a change through revolutionary intercommunalism. The only thing we have to lose is our chains.

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

Revolutionary Intercommunalism: Not Some Cool Idea (2016)

Tom "Big Warrior" Watts

"We develop new principles for the world out of the world's own principles. We do not say to the world: Cease your struggles, they are foolish; we will give you the true slogan of struggle. We merely show the world what it is really fighting for, and consciousness is something that it has to acquire, even if it does not want to."

—Karl Marx, Letter from the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher* to Ruge (1843)

Revolutionary Intercommunalism is not just some cool idea Huey P. Newton had as in a utopian pipe dream. It is in fact the logical and necessary next step in human social evolution/revolution. Huey, and the central committee of the original Black Panther Party (BPP), arrived at this theory by applying Marxism (Dialectical Materialism) to make a fresh analysis of how the world was hooked up at that time (1970) and the trajectory of its development. This was necessary, because they were serious revolutionaries, and as Marx explained:

"Men make their own history, but they do not make it as they please; they do not make it under self-selected circumstances, but under circumstances existing already, given and transmitted from the past. The tradition of all dead generations weighs like a nightmare on the brains of the living. And just as they seem to be occupied with revolutionizing themselves and things, creating something that did not exist before, precisely in such epochs of revolutionary crisis they anxiously conjure up the spirits of the past to their service, borrowing from them names, battle slogans, and costumes in order to present this new scene in world history in time-honored disguise and borrowed language."

— Karl Marx,

18th Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte (1852)

To be dialectical means to see the duality in things, that everything exists as a unity of opposites and that there is both unity and struggle between the opposing aspects of a thing. This struggle determines the development of the thing, and one aspect is always principal. When the secondary aspect of a thing becomes the principal aspect, a revolution takes place that changes the character of the thing. Things exist in relation to other things and are affected by them, but the principal cause of change is internal to the thing. Plants grow to reach for the sunlight because internally they need the sunlight to live and to grow healthy. The struggle to survive drives the internal contradiction within the plant.

In any complex set of contradictions, there is always one that is principal influencing the development of the other contradictions in a major way. In the United Panther Movement (UPM) led by the New Afrikan Black Panther Party Prison Chapter (NABPP-PC), we say the principal contradiction in the world at this time is between the need of the monopoly capitalist ruling class to consolidate their global capitalist-imperialist hegemony and the chaos and anarchy they are unleashing by attempting to do so, including the danger of instigating nuclear war.

This is manifesting itself all over the world—and particularly in the Middle East and the Ukraine, and increasingly in

Afrika, Latin America and Asia—and also here in the U.S., and we can see it in how the Presidential election is unfolding. Hillary Clinton appears to be the monopoly capitalist oligarchy's choice to replace Obama, but as his Secretary of State, she is closely tied to his legacy of unleashing chaos in the Middle East, and particularly the debacle in Libya and the ongoing proxy war in Syria. She's got a lot of blood on her hands.

Bernie Sanders appears to have been tapped to pull younger, more progressive, voters back into the Democratic Party and then to close ranks with Hillary after she wins the nomination to defeat the Republican Party candidate. This seems likely to be Donald Trump, who seems to have been tapped to play the role of racist-populist demagogue to rally the party's chaotic right-wing base and alienate the moderates to switch tickets and support Hillary. After eight years of working to undermine the Obama administration and fanning the flames of racism, Trump is releasing the pent up frustration of the white middle and working class base Agnew dubbed the "silent majority." But they are no longer the majority and if Trump is defeated, they are unlikely to be silent. If he should win, they would be empowered and able to give rein to their hate against Blacks, Mexicans, Muslims, Gays, Jews, immigrants, leftists, atheists, disabled and so on. Trump is unleashing forces he cannot control and playing with a polarization that could unleash serious anarchy and civil war.

Bernie Sanders, a Jew and self-styled "Socialist," would seem to be the logical target for their hate, but they seem to be too focused on hating Hillary and the political class of insiders she represents. Many of Trump's supporters also consider voting for Sanders if he gets the Democrat Party nomination. Even if Sander's supporters vote for Hillary to block Trump, they are unlikely to support her foreign and domestic policies. In any event, the polarization of the masses into "left" and right camps is likely to continue and intensify no matter who gets elected. In other words, the two party system that has stabilized the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie (*bush-wah-zee*), or capitalist-imperialism, is pulling apart and will likely continue to do so.

THE WEAPON OF THEORY

"The weapon of criticism cannot, of course, replace criticism of the weapon, material force must be overthrown by material force; but theory also becomes a material force as soon as it has gripped the masses. Theory is capable of gripping the masses as soon as it demonstrates *ad hominem*, and it demonstrates *ad hominem* as soon as it becomes radical. To be radical is to grasp the root of the matter. But, for man, the root is man himself."

—Karl Marx, Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right. Introduction (1843)

The Theory of Revolutionary Intercommunalism recognizes that the World Proletarian Socialist Revolution, which began in Marx's time, has entered a new phase as Mao Tse-tung predicted. As Mao pointed out:

"At present, the world revolution has entered a great new era. The struggle of the Black people in the United States for emancipation is a component part of the general struggle of all the people of the world against U.S. imperialism, a component part of the contemporary world revolution. I call on the workers, peasants, and revolutionary intellectuals of all countries and all who are willing to fight against U.S. imperialism to take action and extend strong support to the struggle of the Black people in the United States! People of the whole world, unite still more closely and launch a sustained and vigorous offensive against our common enemy, U.S. imperialism, and its accomplices! It can be said with certainty that the complete collapse of colonialism, imperialism, and all systems of exploitation, and the complete emancipation of all the oppressed peoples and nations of the world are not far off."

—Mao Tse-tung, "A New Storm Against Imperialism" (1968)

The principal aspect of this "new era" is the global hegemony of U.S.-centered capitalist-imperialism, which makes the existence of independent national economies and political autonomy impossible. Like it or not, the only way to escape the clutches of empire is to end it. As Mao explained:

"Racial discrimination in the United States is a product of the colonialist and imperialist system. The contradiction between the Black masses in the United States and the U.S. ruling circles is a class contradiction. Only by overthrowing the reactionary rule of the U.S. monopoly capitalist class and destroying the colonialist and imperialist system can the Black people in the United States win complete emancipation. The Black masses and the masses of white working people in the United States have common interests and common objectives to struggle for. Therefore, the Afro-American struggle is winning sympathy and support from increasing numbers of white working people and progressives in the United States. The struggle of the Black people in the United States is bound to merge with the American workers' movement, and this will eventually end the criminal rule of the U.S. monopoly capitalist class."—Ibid.

In other words, Mao saw that the principal contradiction had shifted away from that between the colonial and semi-colonial countries and the imperialist countries. In summarizing Huey's theory, Comrade Kevin "Rashid" Johnson, the Minister of Defense of NABPP-PC, pointed out:

"The Party [BPP] first based itself on nationalism because, he [Huey] said, he believed, as did many, that a subjugated people could gain their freedom by forming their own independent nation states. But this proved inadequate; even for socialist nations, because Amerika had grown to become a literal world 'empire' and so effectively integrated and dominated the world's economy, lands and peoples, that none could truly break away from that system to exist or develop as free and independent states.

"The condition of colonialism had evolved to such a level that Amerika fed off the wealth and resources of the entire world, but without need of maintaining its own administration or settler presence inside the foreign domains, as the old colonial system had. But the concept of neo-colonialism did not adequately define this relationship either, he said, because all the old colonies were not merely ruled over by local lackeys, but rather the entire societies had been integrated into a globally interconnected system like that of so many communities, instead of as an arrangement of separate sovereign nations. He called this system "Reactionary Intercommunalism."

"Because they could not decolonize, (become independent and free nation states with control over their own economic development and institutions), nationalism and internationalism made no sense. As he noted the basis of decolonization or national independence is that a colonized people be able to reclaim or return to their previously existing stages of development or otherwise develop their own productive forces.

"But he saw this world system with its interconnected technologies, cultures and communication systems as able, if brought under collective control of the masses rather than that of a small circle of super-rich administrators, to provide for everyone's needs, solve all the world's problems, and create a communal culture that could end the prevalence of perpetual war and social chaos. This new social order he called Revolutionary Intercommunalism, or World Socialism, and a precursor to the Communist World (a world free of oppression and exploitation) which Marxists aspire to."

—Kevin "Rashid" Johnson, "In Search of the Right Theory for Today's Struggles: Revisiting Huey P. Newton's Theory of Revolutionary Intercommunalism" (2015)

With some 900 U.S. military bases in some 153 out of 257 countries in the world, not to mention military alliances, overthrowing the U.S. empire must necessarily be a world revolution fought on many fronts. Having achieved victory and defeated the ruling class, and seized control of the basic means of production and expropriated the assets of the big bourgeoisie, it would be necessary to establish a world proletarian dictatorship to carry out socialist reconstruction of the world economy. Global people's war must necessarily unite the world proletariat under a common banner and revolutionary headquarters. Speaking to a conference of non-aligned nations and movements in Havana in 1966, the great Afrikan revolutionary leader Amilcar Cabral stated:

"It is with the intention of making a contribution, however modest, to this debate that we present here our opinion of *the foundations and objectives of national liberation in relation to the social structure*. This opinion is the result of our own experiences of the struggle and of a critical appreciation of the experiences of others. To those who see in it a theoretical character, we would recall that every practice produces a theory, and that if it is true that a revolution can fail even though it be based on perfectly conceived theories, nobody has yet made a successful revolution without a revolutionary theory.

"Those who affirm—in our case correctly—that the motive force of history is the class struggle would certainly agree to a revision of this affirmation to make it more precise and give it an even wider field of application if they had a better knowledge of the essential characteristics of certain colonized peoples, that is to say peoples dominated by imperialism. In fact in the general evolution of humanity and of each of the peoples of which it is composed, classes appear neither as a generalized and simultaneous phenomenon throughout the totality of these groups, nor as a finished, perfect, uniform and spontaneous whole. The definition of classes within one or several human groups is a fundamental consequence of the progressive development of the productive forces and of the characteristics of the distribution of the wealth produced by the group or usurped from others. That is to say that the socio-economic phenomenon 'class' is created and develops as a function of at least two essential and interdependent variables—the level of productive forces and the pattern of ownership of the means of production. This development takes place slowly, gradually and unevenly, by quantitative and generally imperceptible variations in the fundamental components; once a certain degree of accumulation is reached, this process then leads to a *qualitative jump*, characterized by the appearance of classes and of conflict between them.

"Factors external to the socio-economic whole can influence, more or less significantly, the process of development of classes, accelerating it, slowing it down and even causing regressions. When, for whatever reason, the influence of these factors ceases, the process reassumes its independence and its rhythm is then determined not only by the specific internal characteristics of the whole, but also by the resultant of the effect produced in it by the temporary action of the external factors. On a strictly internal level the rhythm of the process may vary, but it remains continuous and progressive. Sudden progress is only possible as a function of violent alterations—mutations—in the level of productive forces or in the pattern of ownership. These violent transformations carried out within the process of development of classes, as a result of mutations in the level of productive forces or in the pattern of ownership, are generally called, in economic and political language, *revolutions*."

—Amilcar Cabral, "The Weapon of Theory" (1966)

What Comrade Cabral was getting at here is the unevenness in development of classes and class struggle in the different countries and communities in the colonial and

neo-colonial countries, and in contrast to the imperialist countries. He stated:

“Another important distinction between the colonial and neo-colonial situations is in the prospects for the struggle. The colonial situation (in which the nation class fights the repressive forces of the bourgeoisie of the colonizing country) can lead, apparently at least, to a nationalist solution (national revolution); the nation gains its independence and theoretically adopts the economic structure which best suits it. The neo-colonial situation (in which the working classes and their allies struggle simultaneously against the imperialist bourgeoisie and the native ruling class) is not resolved by a nationalist solution; it demands the destruction of the capitalist structure implanted in the national territory by imperialism, and correctly postulates a socialist solution.”—Ibid

Fifty years later, colonialism has almost everywhere been replaced by neo-colonialism and integration into the global economy dominated by capitalist-imperialism. “Dollar Diplomacy” and IMF “structural readjustments” have subordinated the newly “independent” countries of the “Third World” to neo-liberal policies and corporate penetration of the countries’ basic institutions. In many cases the U.S. has replaced the former colonial powers in training their military establishment as well as arming and equipping them. A national solution becomes ever more unlikely and a socialist solution ever more necessary. By developing struggle and the revolutionary movement inside the U.S., we will create more favorable conditions for anti-imperialist struggle and revolution in the neo-colonial countries and every country under the yoke of capitalist-imperialism. Building a global United Panther Movement to lead the struggle of the urban poor will have a “blow-back” effect here that will empower our struggle.

WHOSE LIVES MATTER?

“Black Lives Matter” is a correct slogan but not necessarily the best one. With the exception of the movement led by the original Black Panther Party (BPP), the Black movement against racial discrimination and oppression in the U.S. has historically been aimed at appealing to the rich ruling class whites, the 1%, to make concessions, whether it be integration, affirmative action, reparations or self-determination. Whether humbly begging or militantly demanding, the thrust is attempting to reform the capitalist system without altering the foundation of class exploitation and global imperialism.

When the Panthers put forward the slogan “Power to the People,” they unleashed a whirlwind that resonated well beyond the Black movement. They were aiming at and appealing to all the oppressed people—in Amerika and around the world—not begging for reforms but uniting for fundamental and revolutionary change. As Fred Hampton said:

“Power anywhere where there’s people. Power anywhere where there’s people. Let me give you an example of teaching people. Basically, the way they learn is observation and participation. You know a lot of us go around and joke ourselves and believe that the masses have PhDs, but that’s not true. And even if they did, it wouldn’t make any difference. Because with some things, you have to learn by seeing it or either participating in it. And you know yourselves that there are people walking around your community today that have all types of degrees that should be at this meeting but are not here. Right? Because you can have as many degrees as a thermometer, if you don’t have any practice, then you can’t walk across the street and chew gum at the same time...

“We got to face some facts. That the masses are poor, that the masses belong to what you call the lower class, and when I talk about the masses, I’m talking about the white masses, I’m talking about the black masses, and the brown masses, and the yellow masses, too. We’ve got to face the fact that some people say you fight fire best with fire, but we say you put fire out best with water. We say you don’t fight racism with racism. We’re gonna fight racism with solidarity. We say you don’t fight

capitalism with no black capitalism; you fight capitalism with socialism.

“We ain’t gonna fight no reactionary pigs who run up and down the street being reactionary; we’re gonna organize and dedicate ourselves to revolutionary political power and teach ourselves the specific needs of resisting the power structure, arm ourselves, and we’re gonna fight reactionary pigs with INTERNATIONAL PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION. That’s what it has to be. The people have to have the power: it belongs to the people.”

—Fred Hampton, “Power Anywhere Where There’s People” (1969)

Comrade Fred didn’t get killed in his sleep because he was some Black racist terrorist or gangster, but because he was “Speaking Truth to Power!” The greatest fear the exploiter has is the masses of the oppressed and exploited people coming together to take back what is rightfully ours—power over our lives. Liberation is not slavery without shackles and leg irons, it is not the opportunity to become a Black capitalist or a Brown capitalist or whatever, and perpetuate this rotten system of class privilege and oppression. Liberation is getting free of all that and ending it for future generations. Liberation is revolution to achieve ALL POWER TO THE PEOPLE!

CREATE PUBLIC OPINION SEIZE POWER

Mao summed up revolution as “create public opinion seize power.” Our first and primary duty is to create public opinion in favor of overthrowing the capitalist-imperialist system, racism and police state repression. As Malcolm X summed up, “You can’t have capitalism without racism.” In combating racism, we must confront the lie that there is anything normal about racism and expose that the very idea of separate races and racial superiority was the invention of the capitalists to excuse their many crimes against humanity, and particularly chattel slavery in the Americas.

“We have to understand very clearly that there’s a man in our community called a capitalist. Sometimes he’s black and sometimes he’s white. But that man has to be driven out of our community, because anybody who comes into the community to make profit off the people by exploiting them can be defined as a capitalist. And we don’t care how many programs they have, how long a dashiki they have. Because political power does not flow from the sleeve of a dashiki; political power flows from the barrel of a gun!”—Ibid

We have to be conscious that the enemy sends his agents among us and their job is to mislead the people, misdirect the people, and play one section of the people against another. They do it in the white community, the Black community and every other community. These so called “community leaders” job is to “dumb down” the masses and feed them racist, nationalist and in general reactionary ideology. They do on a small scale what Donald Trump is doing on a big scale right now, and we have to expose that shit for what it is. As Fred Hampton said:

“So what did we do? We were out there educating the people. How did we educate them? Basically, the way people learn, by observation and participation. And that’s what we’re trying to do. That’s what we got to do here in this community. And a lot of people don’t understand, but there’s three basic things that you got to do anytime you intend to have yourself a successful revolution.

“A lot of people get the word revolution mixed up and they think revolution’s a bad word. Revolution is nothing but like having a sore on your body and then you put something on that sore to cure that infection. And I’m telling you that were living in an infectious society right now. I’m telling you that were living in a sick society. And anybody that endorses integrating into this sick society before its cleaned up is a man who’s committing a crime against the people.

“If you walk past a hospital room and see a sign that says “Contaminated” and then you try to lead people into that room, either those people are mighty dumb, you understand me, cause if they weren’t, they’d tell you that you are an unfair, unjust leader that does not have your followers’ interests in mind. And what we’re saying is simply that leaders have got to become, we’ve got to start making them accountable for what they do. They’re goin’ around talking about so-and-so’s an Uncle Tom so we’re gonna open up a cultural center and teach him what blackness is. And this n****r is more aware than you and me and Malcolm and Martin Luther King and everybody else put together. That’s right. They’re the ones that are most aware. They’re most aware, cause they’re the ones that are gonna open up the center. They’re gonna tell you where bones come from in Africa that you can’t even pronounce the names. That’s right. They’ll be telling you about Chaka, the leader of the Bantu freedom fighters, and Jomo Kenyatta, those dingo-dingas. They’ll be running all of that down to you. They know about it all. But the point is they do what they’re doing because it is beneficial and it is profitable for them.

“You see, people get involved in a lot of things that’s profitable to them, and we’ve got to make it less profitable. We’ve got to make it less beneficial. I’m saying that any program that’s brought into our community should be analyzed by the people of that community. It should be analyzed to see that it meets the relevant needs of that community. We don’t need no n****s coming into our community to be having no company to open business for the n****s. There’s too many n****s in our community that can’t get crackers out of the business that they’re gonna open.”—Ibid

Revolutionary intercommunalism provides a theoretical basis, based on the practice of the original BPP, to unite all the oppressed—both within the U.S. and around the world—with the common objective and strategy to overthrow capitalist-imperialism and socialize ownership of the basic means of production in the global economy. There are different forces out there calling themselves “revolutionary” or claiming to be “Black Panthers” who are promoting an ideological-political line that is opposed to Pantherism. In this period, making revolution requires a higher level of political consciousness. Nationalism doesn’t cut it. At best it is insufficient and at worst it is deliberate misdirection in the service of capitalist-imperialism.

ONE DIVIDES INTO TWO

“The splitting of a single whole and the cognition of its contradictory parts ... is the essence ... of dialectics.”

—Vladimir Lenin in his *Philosophical Notebooks*

Revolutionary Nationalism is a combination of the *nationalism of the oppressed* with socialism and proletarian internationalism, but at a certain point this ideological-political orientation must make a qualitative leap into *revolutionary intercommunalism* to become “all-the-way revolutionary” in this time period. In doing so it must cast off nationalism and embrace a globalized revolutionary proletarian world view. Who *we* are and who *our* enemies are can only be answered in terms of the *class struggle*, and the World Proletarian Socialist Revolution which is its highest form.

“Revolutionary leadership is explicitly addressed in Lenin’s masterpiece, What is to be done?. He starts from the description of a trade union leader: ‘The ideal leader, as the majority of the members of such circles picture him, is something far more in the nature of a trade union secretary than a socialist political leader. For the secretary of any, say English, trade union always helps the workers to carry on the economic struggle, he helps them to expose factory abuses, explains the injustice of the laws and of measures that hamper the freedom to strike and to picket (i.e., to warn all and sundry that a strike is proceeding at a certain factory), explains

the partiality of arbitration court judges who belong to the bourgeois classes, etc., etc.'

"But, as Lenin continues, that is not enough. The revolutionary leader must be 'the tribune of the people, who is able to react to every manifestation of tyranny and oppression, no matter where it appears, no matter what stratum or class of the people it affects; who is able to generalise all these manifestations and produce a single picture of police violence and capitalist exploitation; who is able to take advantage of every event, however small, in order to set forth before all his socialist convictions and his democratic demands, in order to clarify for all and everyone the world-historic significance of the struggle for the emancipation of the proletariat.'

"For Lenin, revolutionary leadership is not just a matter of individuals but of the revolutionary party. He emphasizes that they must be in touch with and serve as a leader for all oppositional strata of the society, not just the working class: 'We must take upon ourselves the task of organising an all-round political struggle under the leadership of our Party in such a manner as to make it possible for all oppositional strata to render their fullest support to the struggle and to our Party. We must train our Social-Democratic practical workers to become political leaders, able to guide all the manifestations of this all-round struggle, able at the right time to "dictate a positive programme of action" for the aroused students, the discontented Zemstvo people, the incensed religious sects, the offended elementary schoolteachers, etc., etc.'—Strategy for Revolution in the 21st Century

We must amplify this to a global scale and consciously carry out our tasks of agitation, education and organizing of the masses and building people's power in the oppressed communities in the context of building a worldwide united front against capitalist-imperialism, racism and police state repression. We must recognize that we must play a vanguard role in relation to all the oppressed and unite to fight and overthrow the whole capitalist-imperialist system.

DARE TO STRUGGLE DARE TO WIN.... ALL POWER TO THE PEOPLE!

LINE STRUGGLE

Please note that the person who formatted Main Line #2 made an error, and inadvertently included the wrong letter by Xinachtli in the "Line Struggle" section. We regret this error; the correct letter is being included here, along with the reply that was written to it

Xinachtli's Letter (2017)

As to Kevin "Rashid" Johnson's statement in defense of Azzurra [1], it is based on his "incomplete" knowledge of Azzurra's persistent history of her unprincipled positions she has taken on many of these issues that has caused groups, like the **Denver ABC conference** attendees, to expel her from the conference and not give her "voice" or "influence" in the Anarchist Black Cross movement for her ideas and positions are **antagonistic, irreconcilable and antithetical** (being in direct and unequivocal opposition) to her professed, self-righteous pronouncement that she is an **anarchist** in relation to the capitalist system, and its social and human relations derived from wage-theft slavery, and the **very historical and dialectical foundations of what white racist Amerikkka was originally built on—the ideology of white supremacy and the violence and terror it has used to maintain the status quo. Rashid is a good comrade** and I agree with all of his revolutionary theories and quotes, some taken out of context (for example, his quoting George Jackson that we must work with white prisoners although they may express some racism in their viewpoints, while George was not referring to hard-core racists, Rashid makes exception to). Rashid's statement in defense of Azzurra contradicts what he said in his **eulogy on Hugo "Yogi" Pinell** after his death at the hands of these hard-core white supremacists, who used the politics of deception

and trickery (**Agreement to End All Racial Hostilities**, see 23/7, Pelican Bay Prison and the Rise of Long-term Solitary Confinement, by Keramet Reiter, 2016, Yale Univ. Press) to mislead our prison movement, to draw Pinell into general population, only to be murdered by white supremacists, after "we" let our guard down and by the "politics of rhetoric" we lost a very important soldier of the prison movement and the liberation movement on the outside. Rashid's practice of using "revolutionary theory" as dogmas and not guides to serious action, such as we must distance ourselves from these conniving pig snakes and not allow them any "voice" or other influence in our movement, is the correct position to take; instead of Rashid losing sight of such realities by his "attempt to force" such revolutionary theories to conditions and situations that do not fit. **It would be the same blinded faith in dogmatic theories, if we cannot be able to apply those sound and historical lessons and theories to the conditions and the race and class enemies we face today**, that includes reactionary, racist hard-core white supremacists Azzurra wants to "convert" so that we let our guard down and allow such slithering snakes to come within our midst "proclaiming they are "new converts"" **by the grace of God!!! Por Favor!! Please!!**

As to Azzurra... I have never heard her say before that she "subscribed" to the Gandhian principles on absolute persuasion in combination with her "pacifist" and "anarchist" views that, for all practical pragmatic and realistic matters, **are irreconcilable and contradictory** topped off with her "religious moral compass" and her **blinded, fanatical devotion to her religious zealotry**, that together only serve to confuse communities, instead of bringing the **clarity we now need to unify, mobilize and bring together the very poor, and oppressed for prolonged struggles focusing in on the realities we face today and guided by dialectics of history, reality and knowing our "true enemies."** Azzurra draws from selected theories and doctrines in an **eclectical fashion**—drawing from pieces of different doctrines, principles, to form her views, or positions, glued together by her **religious fanatical devotion, or "calling" from God** to try and "convert", hard-core, violent, reactionary racist pig snakes like Weev, and other "white supremacists." **Such a "practice" does more harm and damage to any prison and social liberationist movement** because it is a "belief" not grounded on realities, and the irreconcilable differences that have historically existed between liberationist groups (including the prison movement) and the government use of "white supremacist" groups to not only infiltrate the liberation movement(s), but to conspire to use racist terror and violence against militant groups, and its core leadership they see as "threats" to the existing capitalist status quo. **Seems like Azzurra has not learned anything from history.** For these reasons, **I totally agree with the IWW/IWOC** in their decision to expel Azzurra from such a position, because of her "soft" and delusional "positions" **confused and guided by her blind faith in religious conversion calling from God**, that places all other participants in a vulnerable position of danger and weakness. **The brutal murder of Comrade Hugo "Yogi" Pinell by white supremacists on August 15, 2015 at the New Folsom Prison near Sacramento, with the aid of prison guards**, after all these rival groups had signed the **agreement to end all racial hostilities**, and the release of Yogi to general population after 45 years in solitary, shows that these pig snakes are never to be trusted. **Because of her persistent stubbornness, and her blind faith "politics"** and her "history" of unprincipled actions, statements, and positions she has taken on serious issues since I have known her in the past 5 years, she can no longer **speak for me, nor have any major part in my freedom struggles, nor activities I am involved in**, period. If my position will result in me "losing support" of others that have supported me to this day, then so be it. **I refuse to jump into this "mud puddle of ideas"** that do great damage to any serious prison and social liberationist movement(s), especially in critical times such as the current ones we face by the election of this racist, fascist "white supremacist" and "evangelical fanatic" surrounded by his "team" of **ghouls, theocrats, and war criminals, brought to political power as a result of the same ineptness and bankruptcy of the "left"** in this country, and their "politics of complacency" until it was too late.

NOTES

1. See, Kevin "Rashid" Johnson, "The Revolutionary Response to Racism: Reply to A Communiqué By Azzurra Crispino" (2017), Main Line #2, <http://rashidmod.com/?p=2376>

Remolding Racist Brainwash: A Guide to Revolutionary Practice or Revolutionary Theory as Dogma (A Response to Comrade Xinachtli) (2017)

Kevin "Rashid" Johnson

ISAID NO SUCH THINGS

Earlier this year I replied to Azzurra Crispino's communiqué concerning her being criticized in various circles for corresponding with an alleged white supremacist while he was imprisoned, and using his harrowing account of living in solitary confinement to refute some misguided views of this condition in U.S. prisons. (1)

She was also asked to resign her position as media cochair of the Incarcerated Workers Organizing Committee (IWOC). I belatedly learned that shortly before my reply to Azzurra was published she was removed because of these allegations from her *elected* position by the IWOC's steering committee.

While I heard nothing formal from any of her original critics, I have received a response by political prisoner, Comrade Xinachtli (aka Alvaro Luna Hernandez) that I'd like to answer here in the spirit of unity-struggle-unity.

Xinachtli harshly criticizes Azzurra, who was until recently co-coordinator of his own freedom campaign, and he charges me with defending her without having a complete picture of her "history" of "unprincipled positions". He also charges her with embracing a hodgepodge of inherently contradictory doctrines and theories that serve only to confuse and mislead.

The principal problem with Xinachtli's response to me is that he largely answers things he read into my reply to Azzurra, instead of what I actually wrote.

First, I didn't *defend* Azzurra anywhere in that reply, in fact I never passed judgment on her period. What I specifically addressed, and as to her I did so hypothetically, was the question of engaging and struggling to remold and win over people brainwashed on race. I agreed with her *stated* position that we should try to win such people over when we can. I did not, however, conclude that she was interacting with such people for the actual purpose of remolding their views and winning them over politically, but said "to the extent" that she was then I felt "her position is exactly right." What's more I specifically distinguished my own ideological and political views from hers.

So not only did I not defend her (I defended a necessary strategy for political organizing), but I also, contrary to Xinachtli's contentions did *not* promote dealing complacently with and embracing "hard core racists." I'm not sure how he overlooked the distinction I made between struggling to remold and reeducate people who harbor racial supremacist views, and those "die hard racist reactionaries [who] must be dealt with by isolating them and mobilizing revolutionary forces to minimize their influence on others, and to repress them by force where they present a genuine threat of violence."

Given that Xinachtli argues against positions I never took, everything else he adds to bolster these arguments is meaningless. But I would like to address some of his positions -- several being mechanically recited stereotypes projected against Communists by Anarchists -- like that I was supposedly "using 'revolutionary theory' as dogma and not guides to serious action."

If he'd read what I *actually* wrote, he'd have seen the *numerous* examples I gave of the effectiveness of the approach I was promoting, which I *have applied myself*, as very "serious action" when thrust by the pigs into environments where I was literally surrounded by racial supremacists ("white" and Chicano/Mexican), with intentions of seeing me dealt with much as Comrade Hugo was. And not only did my approach spoil their plans, but it led to winning over quite a number of them and also bringing many on board with the

2013 hunger strike (and agreement to end racial hostilities) led by the Cali prisoners.

A GUIDE TO REVOLUTIONARY ACTION

In fact that hunger strike which involved over 30,000 prisoners, and the two that preceded it in 2011, were the products of work by Ed Mead (another Communist), who struggled for years through his writings in various periodicals he published and/or edited going into Cali's prisons (such as *Prison Focus*, *Prison Art*, *Basta Ya!*, *Rock!* and others), to win racists, ultra-nationalists, homophobes and other reactionaries within the prison population over to a united struggle against the system.

No one expected every prisoner or faction to come fully into accord with or not deviate from the hunger strike or agreement to end hostilities, (there *were* those hardcore elements I spoke of who must be isolated and repressed), hence the targeting of Comrade Hugo. But what was achieved in this protracted struggle, was historical, inspirational, standard-setting and monumental. To the extent that Xinachtli opposes work like Ed's and the NABPP-PC to remold and win over folks brainwashed on race, then his line is no less reactionary than that of the hardcore racists who would have us all remain polarized according to the designs of the pigs and imperialist system.

Clearly our revolutionary line on race has *proven* a genuine guide to not only serious action, but effective and historical action, and is anything but dogmatic.

Indeed, this line and practice was brought to Texas prisons by NABPP-PC comrades and led to two prison work strikes (again historic and inspirational events), first in April 2016 then September 2016. The planned strike of September prompted Texas officials to lock down at least eleven prisons to counter or prevent the work strike. Has Comrade Xinachtli's doctrines or theories provided a guide to any such "serious action" during his over two decades in the Texas prison system?

Then too there are definite historic revolutionary examples that validate the work by Communists of remolding and re-educating reactionary chauvinists. Two examples suggest themselves. One being, again, the revolutionary struggle in China under Mao Tse-tung's leadership, the other being the revolutionary anticolonial struggle in Guinea Bissau led by Amilcar Cabral.

In the Chinese case there was an open civil war between the nationalists on one side who were backed and supplied by the U.S. and other imperialist powers, and Mao's Reds on the other side. The nationalists were particularly brutal in their treatment of the Reds and anyone suspected of supporting them. The Reds, however, used such violence as necessary to suppress the enemy on the battlefield but cared for, treated like brothers and released captured nationalist soldiers. Their method proved so effective that the nationalists in turn routinely surrendered in vast numbers to join the Reds with entire supply and weapon convoys.

The Reds actually fought and ultimately won the Civil War using these captured supplies and weapons -- billions of dollars worth provided by the imperialists to the nationalist army.

The same occurred in the Reds' response to China's invasion by Japan who carried out a barbaric "kill all, burn all, loot all" campaign. Despite Japan's brutality, captured Japanese soldiers were also treated as brothers, cared for and released, with the result that many were converted and returned to their side and Japan to espouse the Communist line. The Reds' rag-tag peasant army was thus able to hold its own against one of the day's most advanced and powerful imperialist militaries, and ultimately repelled it from China, while also countering treacherous attacks by the nationalists. Upon Japan's retreat from China, the Civil War was resumed and the Reds decidedly defeated the nationalists within four years.

In the case of Guinea Bissau, Cabral refused to play the racial game or the game of tribal or national divisiveness. He united various previously divided tribes and nationalities of Guineans into Afrika's most effective anticolonial struggle. He emphasized that they would not allow the struggle to descend into a racial one as against their 'white' Portuguese

colonizers, who'd dealt with them quite savagely. As he stated, "I do not confuse oppression with the color of people's skins."

Like the Chinese Reds, his forces related to captured Portuguese soldiers as brothers, and through published speeches and articles he struggled to remold and awaken the consciousness of the Portuguese people as against the oppression and exploitation of Guinea. His methods proved so effective that, even though he was assassinated before the struggle's successful end, it prompted a near revolutionary overthrow by the Portuguese people of their government, compelling the army to quit Guinea and rush home to Portugal to suppress the uprising there.

KEEPING POLITICS NOT POSTURING IN COMMAND

As noted I did not "defend" as Azzurra. I defended a political strategy -- and *not* the one Xinachtli accused me of. As for her claimed "history" of "unprincipled positions" and such that has led to her estrangement from Anarchist circles, I have no knowledge of any of that. But I *do now* take issue *in her defense* with the IWOC's steering committee's independently overriding and revoking her *elected* position as media co-chair which Xinachtli endorses.

To my understanding the steering committee is composed of Anarchists. And Anarchists almost by reflex accuse and denounce Communists as "authoritarians" who reject democratic practices, and rather supposedly concentrate power within a small circle of people operating above and independent of the overall body of their organizations and the masses.

Not only is this projection untrue, especially of Maoists, but we have right now it being practiced by those who traditionally criticize it as the worst sort of political evil... which it *is*. Azzurra was *elected* through popular ballot by the overall Industrial Workers of the World (IWW) membership. As such it is the exclusive right and duty of this same body to hear and decide any case that might warrant her removal from that position. And it is her democratic right to present her defenses and be heard in refutation of such a case before that body.

A steering committee of a few IWW members that overrides the will and decision of a general election without the knowledge and participation of the electorate is "authoritarianism" and "elitism" of the purest sort.

What genuine Communists practice is democratic centralism (DC). In the context of selecting leaders, this involves publicizing their work and qualifications pro and con to the broad electorate and allowing them to elect or reject the candidate by majority vote. If elected then everyone accepts them into the elected position. Democratic choice, centralized enforcement thereof. Likewise when the elected party runs afoul of the organization's or people's interests, their case is presented for a recall vote, with any decision to revoke their position turning on majority vote, after hearing evidence in the case pro and con. *This* was the overall IWW membership's right and duty and Azzurra's right (to be heard and have her fate decided by those who elected her). The steering committee should have no such dictatorial power to override the electoral will of the overall IWW membership.

The reason I never passed judgment on Azzurra's situation or her, and emphasized in the very opening paragraph of my reply to her that her IWOC position was an *elected* one, was because I was looking at the matter from a democratic perspective. I recognized it was the role of the overall IWW membership to hear and decide the matter not mine.

In this respect the undemocratic action against Azzurra comes off more as political posturing against the judgments of outsiders, much like Xinachtli's critiques, than genuine commitment to political principles. Take for example the critiques and rejection of Azzurra because of her interaction with the alleged white supremacist. Remember, Xinachtli stated he supports Comrade George Jackson's position that "we must work with white prisoners although they may express some racism in their viewpoints." Well, neither he nor the steering committee presents evidence to show that the guy Azzurra was corresponding with was a "hardcore racist" as opposed to a guy with "some racist viewpoints." And of course the question and evidence was never presented to

or decided by the IWW membership who elected Azzurra.

Then Xinachtli rejects Azzurra for embracing contradictory doctrines and theories. Well, the same can be charged of many other folks on the 'Left', including Xinachtli himself. By his own representations he is a proponent of Anarchism and Chicano nationalism -- inherently contradictory doctrines. Anarchists reject the exercise of state power whereas Chicano liberationists aspire to achieve a separate state in the SW territory of the U.S. that was stolen from Mexico, which they call Aztlan. And wasn't the steering committee's peremptory revocation of Azzurra's elected position a contradiction of principles?

The U.S. 'Left' has more than its share of groups and people who embrace and espouse contradictory ideological and political lines. This is especially true of the petty bourgeoisie and the lumpen proletariat, who daily experience an admixture of social-economic conditions which conditions them to assume contradictory class lines, doctrines and theories. Even the working class (proletariat) experiences this under bourgeois cultural indoctrination and brainwash. We often see it reflected in the tenacity with which many of the most oppressed and insecure adopt and cling to racist doctrines, to compensate for a sense of lack of social worth and purpose. Should we be relating to them as enemies or working to show them that they are victims of systematic oppression and manipulation?

And while our political prisoners like Xinachtli deserve the greatest support and respect, this doesn't mean their views and opinions are to be given a presumption of correctness or are entitled to automatic deference. We must uphold *correct* ideas, which come from and are proven through practice. Has Comrade Xinachtli's theories and practice proven to counter racist brainwash and produce serious and effective mass action across "racial" lines?

It's not our opinions that matter in this struggle against this capitalist imperialist monster, but our practice that informs it and the resultant impact it has on organizing the masses to take up and carry the struggle to its victorious conclusion.

Dare to struggle Dare to Win!

All Power to the People!

NOTES

1. See, Kevin "Rashid" Johnson, "The Revolutionary Response to Racism: Reply to A Communique By Azzurra Crispino" (2017), <http://rashidmod.com/?p=2376>