

Defeat U.S. imperialism for the proletariat and all oppressed nations: clarification and reaffirmation on the Chicano national question

Recently we were made aware of an online French left-leaning blogger who wrote a criticism of our updated line on the Chicano Nation. In that blog – [Servir le Peuple](#)¹ – the author made an impressive amount of ignorant interpretations, stated outright falsehoods and asserted an overall typical and standard cowardly line on indigenous national liberation for the internal colonies of the U.S.

We know this person is only an individual blogger with little influence so therefore holds a low priority for engaging in criticism. However, an opportunity has presented itself and we would like to use it to clarify and reaffirm several points within our updated Chicano Nation [position paper](#)².

Colony and internal colony: two distinct treatments

Our edgy blogger, which we are told is the French version of our very own Christopher Winston and his lonely island of phony Maoism (which actually is an eclectic mixture of Third-Worldism, identity politics and nationalism dotted with Marxist slogans making a coherent, yet cataclysmic, line), attempts to show the incorrectness of our updated line on the Chicano Nation by comparing our "faulty" position to that of Vietnam and their heroic anti-imperialist national liberation war. In this comparison, they go on to show the complete ridiculousness of opposing the Vietnamese national liberation war in favor of a "revolution in the whole empire" (where this quote originates from is not explained by our edgy and mysterious blogger) and abandoning the other French colonies in Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean.

They are either dishonest or ignorant as they attempt to apply the logic in our position paper. Never mind that we don't say that, that we don't oppose national liberation anywhere on the earth, including the U.S., but rather uphold the right to self-determination which includes the right to secede from the parasitic oppressor nation; we unite with Red Guards Austin's "Sunbelt Thesis" which argues for a countrywide, multinational Maoist Communist Party initiating in the Sunbelt region. We add that while this is done, there will be special attention to the Chicano, Black and indigenous nations that make up the region – those actual nations. In theorizing possible outcomes, the two theses in our paper, we do not rob the Chicano Nation of its right to develop and steer its own course toward national liberation, even including secession – we only warn against its dangerous vulnerable position within U.S. imperialism. We, additionally, theorize a political-military method to guarantee victory – for the proletariat and all internal colonies in the U.S.: Protracted People's War.

¹ <http://servirlepeupleservirlepeuple.eklablog.com/pour-celles-et-ceux-qui-lisent-l-anglais-critique-d-une-position-terri-a145778684>

² <https://redguardsla.org/2018/06/29/updated-position-on-the-chicano-nation/>

The continental U.S. has internal colonies, which are oppressed nations, inside its belly; we cannot imagine a completely independent oppressed nation nearly surrounded by U.S. imperialism, even more so aggravated like a fallen wasp nest, not constantly attacking and threatening the very existence of the independent nation. So we say, why not coordinate all internal national liberation wars under a highly centralized, hierarchical political-military proletarian machinery? We must surround the enemy, and not the other way around!

Our French blogger also says it's not wrong to focus solely on Chicano national liberation first over other oppressed nations, indigenous and Black – a self-criticism and subsequent change we made in the updated Chicano Nation paper. The blogger correctly says that history has shown through the Vietnamese national liberation war that other oppressed nations, including the French colonies like Algeria, will subsequently rise up. When the torrent of national liberation opens up, it is impossible to dam it back up. Much like socialist revolution. This is a universal truth.

But the comparison between the French colonies and the internal colonies of the U.S. isn't the same. It is similar but not the same. The internal continental, geographical aspect will factor in significantly how the revolutionary war will develop. Methods for offshore colonies and internal colonies deserve two distinct approaches because geography – or national territory – plays a decisive role in the survivability of the nation. Still, we assert, victory for the oppressed nations is more guaranteed through a coordinated and highly-centralized political-military organization, the militarized Maoist Communist Party.

But this point also is perhaps the most fascinating part of our author's blog because it actually serves to reinforce our position, even though that was not their obvious intention.

Yes, Vietnam continued fanning the flames of national liberation wars across the world. National liberation wars were being waged worldwide from the 1950s to the 1980s. In fact, we are still seeing national liberation movements being waged around the world, but infused with communist leadership. Many were successful in their violent severing of their ties to colonialism and imperialism. But U.S. imperialism was still left intact, only missing a few inches from some of its tentacles. We need more mortal blows to the multi-tentacle beast of U.S. imperialism! And where better to start and end it all than inside the belly of the beast itself, to tear it up from the inside, gutting it by the revindicating colonized.

It is evident that our blogger has exposed their erroneous premise that a colony is the same thing as an internal colony and should therefore be resolved in the same manner, everywhere, anywhere, forgetting about distinct objective concrete national conditions, especially geographical (territorial) conditions – a vital aspect to the Marxist criteria of nationhood.

But as Marxists, we must be against dogmatism, of lazily treating all things as the same. That is mechanical and anti-Marxist.

As we have illustrated, a colony like formerly Vietnam to French imperialism is different than an internal colony like Palestine to Israeli settler-colonialism. An internal colony is a type, or form, of a colony. The French colonies were trading and military posts for the French colonial, and then imperialist, empire. These colonies – Most overseas (Africa, Southern Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean, etc.) – were not, however internal colonies. Not even Northern African Algeria. Internal colonies hold a distinct characteristic: they are settler colonies where an indigenous population has been displaced, and often genocided, by the settler population as part of long-term occupation. We've precisely seen this with the conquest of Turtle Island – of the U.S. – by British, French and Dutch settler-colonialism.

However, there are universal truths present in all colonies, which of course include internal colonies. Many are oppressed nations, but not all - such as the original thirteen colonies of the European settlers in New England, although they would later go on to form the White Nation with further expansion, genocide and conquest. All colonies have restrained and oppressed economies due precisely to the fact that a parasitic mother country, or empire, maintains a direct steady stream of exported capital back home from the colony. And all social classes of colonies that are oppressed nations are oppressed, even the bourgeoisie.

Nonetheless, an internal colony requires a specific and distinct analysis. In the U.S. we maintain that the internal colonies, which are also oppressed nations as laid out in our Chicano Nation position paper, include: the Black Nation, the continental indigenous nations and the Chicano Nation. Outside of the continental U.S., other colonies include Puerto Rico, Guam, Virgin Islands, Hawaii, Mariana Islands and American Samoa.

We assert this while knowing there is much more work needed to be done in fully theorizing precisely which indigenous groups constitute nations and which do not – some nations have historically been destroyed by the violent horrors of settler-colonialism. We also assert that in our above-naming of the indigenous nations, on or off the continental U.S., not all indigenous groups are nations. This is not indigenous erasure; it is a sober acknowledgement of the permanent effects of colonization. This will perhaps be the most controversial point, but one that needs to be grappled with by all genuine Maoists authentically interested in indigenous national liberation. We must seriously tackle the national question and cease parroting slogans without arriving at conclusions using revolutionary Marxism.

Maoists are brave and daring, not cowardly and unquestioning

At the first moment of taking on the historic and heavy title of Maoist, of announcing an ideological commitment to PPW anywhere on the earth, on mastering revolutionary violence as the proletariat's heart beat, you must find yourself brave and daring for you have surrendered your life in revolutionary service to the people and the Party. There is no room for refusing to struggle due to fear – of anything! Communists, Maoists, are not cowards. We also question everything. The national question is no different, even though some supposed Maoists don't dare theorize on indigenous nations out of fear of being labeled as chauvinistic, racist or insensitive.

North American Maoists in particular have a lot of work to do – ourselves notwithstanding – in more fully theorizing the national question in their respective countries on the continent. But Red Guards – Los Angeles at the very least has taken a small step in the direction of saying not all indigenous groups are automatically nations in the Marxist sense. But nonetheless all indigenous groups deserve revindication and a place in the destruction of U.S. imperialism. This isn't a revelation. But absent in the canon of the U.S. and Canadian Maoist movements is a coherent and detailed theorization and handling of the native/indigenous/First Nations through a Marxist analysis. Why is that? Are we afraid of the very act of venturing into an area highly controversial and sensitive? Never mind that those carrying out the investigations are themselves, ourselves, indigenous.

But don't dare say a word of that to our French blogger, who asserts: “This is, above all, nothing but [a basic] attempt to drive the US Maoist movement, whose internal [colonies’] CENTRALITY is obvious, under White leadership by using these fallacious arguments.”

So the non-white Maoist investigators of the national question are driving the U.S. Maoist movement into the arms of white leadership? How exactly? Why is it automatically assumed the countrywide multinational Maoist Communist Party will be white-led? Can it not be fathomed, stretching the brinks of our imagination, that the U.S. Maoist movement may in fact retain oppressed nationality leadership? Or could it be that in these criticisms there comes to surface a strange and subtle white supremacist notion that we are mostly victims and not revolutionary agents?

Even still, identity and all backgrounds are subordinate to mastery of a political line and mastery of two-line struggle. Leadership emerges through class struggle and revolutionary war. White or not, great leaders will emerge and we would be unforgivable to turn them away for a lack of melanin. Nonetheless, the country's Maoist theoreticians are made up of white and non-white revolutionaries.

This earth-shattering revelation destroys the little worlds of the Third-Worldist escapist, the anticommunist pork chop nationalists and edgy French bloggers.

Recently a good and useful article titled "[Interrogating Social Media](https://struggle-sessions.com/2018/07/03/interrogating-social-media/)"³ appeared on the new website struggle-sessions.com. In it, the author spells out this parroting syndrome popular in the left:

Inversely there is the example of the often repeated mantra in the revisionist left "RG (A, LA, KC, C, PGH) are all white" no matter how many times reality contradicts this claim it is repeated and repeated. The people who already detest the political lines of these organizations and this movement come to re-center their gripes along the lines of identity and away from any coherent political critique. They repeat the essence of "antifa is the real fascists" but insisting that these multinational organizations with a high percentage of people who are not white are really all white. Proof is not needed for fascist type propaganda which builds on a basal resentment no matter how deep down it resides. Again the more people repeat the unfounded lie the more people come to believe it—this is only a superficial belief which lends to the instability of this method of propaganda. Here this mythical "whiteness" is only used to whip up guilty emotions and cannot stand as an actual critique, since race does not determine political viewpoint and race science is denounced by Marxists. What is insinuated is far more devious, charges of "all white" implicitly claim that these organizations either bar people who are not white from joining (making them white supremacist organizations) or that they just consciously refuse struggle alongside the most oppressed sections of the masses, and focus exclusively on white struggles (again white supremacy)—in both cases this translates to arguing that an anti-fascist movement is the real fascist movement. The so-called internet left has come around again to agree with the internet right. Since repeating lies is the argumentation of the internet personalities, we find ourselves having to repeat the truth, a truth which is not always in line with the controversial Jerry Springer type entertainment which these people want to consume—the RG movement across the country is diverse, and with a consideration for the population diversity in this country if anything has a higher representation of people who are not white than the per-capita demographics of the country, not that this is a particularly crucial point when evaluating a political line or the quality of work exemplified by a movement.

As detailed in our paper, and elaborated more in the upcoming book "Colonization and Vengeance: Toward a Maoist Analysis of the Chicano Nation," three lines exist on the Chicano national question: Socialist reunification, national minority (or the Chicano Nation liquidationist line) and Chicano national liberation line.

Our blogger ends their short criticism with a call for the socialist reunification of the Chicano Nation with Mexico, as well as a multinational indigenous republic

³ <https://struggle-sessions.com/2018/07/03/interrogating-social-media/>

hurriedly lumping in all 500-plus indigenous nations (Never mind that they offer no Marxist analysis for a single one of these nations). These are massive assertions with a gaping chasm of theoretical backing. They are empty claims. This is sloganeering and repeating what the nationalists, Third-Worldists and revisionists say.

But we owe it to the oppressed, to the natives – the native nations and groups, the Chicano Nation, the Black Nation, all U.S.-occupied native land – to apply Marxism as the science it is to investigate and analyze the concrete national conditions and to move toward a revolutionary war against U.S. imperialism. After all, we are in the third epoch of worldwide strategic offensive – having been initiated by the Communist Party of Peru and Presidente Gonzalo in 1980 at the start of the People's War and the synthesizing of Maoism as the weapon of the international proletariat. Despite bends in the road, retreats, restorations, the proletariat and oppressed nations victory over capitalism and imperialism is guaranteed.

Chicanos make up a distinct nationality, apart from Mexico. Historically, ever since the robbing of nearly half of Mexico's territory at the end of the Mexican-American War in 1848, Chicanos have been rounded up by the White Nation, brutalized, displaced from their land, tortured and killed. In Mexico, people of Mexican descent did not and do not experience Mexican national oppression. They are the majority and in power. Our culture, economy, language and territory are vastly different from that of Mexico, and of course the U.S. We don't belong anywhere except here in the Chicano Nation, in our home. Our population has called this land home for thousands of years. Many of our indigenous lineages can be traced to the Aztecs, who are native to the Southwest, as well as Yaquis, Pueblos, etc. Chicanos, like the Canadian Métis, only became a nation through settler-colonialism, war and struggle. To be Chicano is to acknowledge your indigeneity forever altered by colonization, understanding that often for many of us there is no home tribe or nation we can name. But our families go back generations to the Southwest, before and after 1848. We therefore are not immigrants. We are natives.

We have to quote a summary of this line from our position paper. It is unavoidable. It is baffling that our blogger upholds socialist reunification but it is apparent they did not bother to even read this section! So here it is – we want to force this down the throat of any revisionist who dares assert socialist reunification is viable:

It is a thoroughly revisionist and even racist position, despite its militant posturing. It is revisionist because it liquidates the Marxist conception and position on nationhood. The Southwest region, regardless of one's thoughts or opinions, is a vastly different area culturally, politically, economically and linguistically from Mexico – and even from the rest of the U.S. Union del Barrio and the other pan-nationalists claim the Chicano

Nation belongs to Mexico, that it is undeserving of independent nationhood, for in their ultimate flat analysis all of Latin America, including the U.S. in it – which they dub Nuestra America – is one, vaguely, ignorantly and proudly.

A reunification of the Chicano Nation with Mexico would be disastrous. There is nothing progressive of integrating into a narco-fascist corrupt capitalist empire. How would this reunification strengthen or advance the proletarian struggle? It wouldn't. It would devastate the Southwest, sending it backwards, not forwards.

Even the socialist part of their reunification line is inconceivable. They advocate for a reverse national liberation revolution while also simultaneously defeating capitalism and establishing a pan-American socialist republic. Why not just launch a Global People's War to build immediate communism too while they're at it?

Two contradictions cannot exist at the same time, occupying the same exact place; one has to overcome the other; one is primary, the other secondary. So, which is it? Does the Chicano Nation need to be returned to Mexico first? Or does it and the rest of Mexico need to launch a socialist revolution first? To advocate for both at the same time is, at best, an idealist death wish, or, at worst, a treacherous death wish.

You cannot uphold the existence of the Chicano Nation, defend its right for national liberation, while also saying that nation should be returned to Mexico. Returning a nation to a nation-state liquidates said nation. Aztlán is its own nation. It is not, like our French blogger says, "Northern Mexico."

Why we changed our line from separatism to countrywide PPW

To uphold national liberation one must uphold the nation as a whole, including the social classes of said nation. After all, national liberation is not about the proletariat emancipating itself but the nation freeing itself. The Chicano Nation – as a nation – has the two fundamentally and diametrically opposed classes, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. But the bourgeoisie is small, and even smaller is the national bourgeoisie – the most progressive sector of the bourgeoisie. The Chicano bourgeoisie is mainly comprador and cannot be united with for they are the lapdogs of U.S. imperialism.

The Chicano proletariat is the revolutionary subject in the Chicano Nation and is part of the countrywide and international proletariat, the harbingers of revolution and death to capitalism.

As stated in our updated Chicano Nation position paper, we changed our line supporting the establishment of an indigenous republic of the southwest

governed by a Joint Dictatorship of the Proletariat of the Indigenous and Chicano Nations because of the inevitable and unavoidable risks and dangers to the survivability of the liberated nation and all other oppressed nations, in particular the Black Nation.

A revolution – a Protracted People’s War – on the continental U.S. land base would have to apply the most advanced strategy and method of warfare to guarantee victory and lasting liberation. The only proletarian method of war is PPW. Applying this method in the U.S. must involve a countrywide PPW, not an isolated (be it national or sectional) PPW, and encircling the enemy from the edges of the continental U.S., jointly working with indigenous nations and the Black Nation – primarily focusing on their proletariat. PPW has to start somewhere. And for the U.S., we reaffirm RGA’s thesis that the revolution will start in the Sunbelt region, most likely in the Black Nation, and sweep up and around the entire country like a crescent eclipse, closing in on the final phases of a fading moribund U.S. imperialism.

This by no means is the final chapter in theorizing PPW in the U.S. prison house of nations. More articles, not only from RGLA and other Red Guards formations, will be published in the near future elaborating more on how PPW must be a culmination of correct Maoist conclusions, bringing the correct development of the militarization of the Party and the masses, the concentric construction of the Maoist Three Instruments, the Party, the People’s Army and the United Front, and of bringing the correct understanding of our country’s national question into the fore.

Critics like the French blogger would, without a sound analysis (let alone a publicized position), posture for Chicano, indigenous and Black national liberation but only parroting the words of others and doing no independent investigation – how do we know this? Because they offer no Marxist basis and explanation of how their theory is correct. They are scared revisionists. This is the trend of contemporary revisionists who claim to uphold the banner of Maoism. They say all the right things; PPW is universal; Revolutionary violence is the universal law to conquer political power; the mass line incorporates the sea of masses into the People’s Army; we must militarize the party and the masses. They repeat everything without fully knowing what they are saying. They are cowards, afraid of being found alone and interrogated as to why they are Maoist. They’ll cower and capitulate to postmodernist identity politics when confronted by paper tigers of color. They are cowards and undeserving of compassion.

Throw away petite-bourgeoisie phrase-mongering and posturing! Investigate, apply Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, principally Maoism! Uphold the three components of Marxism: dialectical and historical materialism, Marxist political economy and scientific socialism. Investigate and question everything. Formulate correct lines on the national question, particularly in the U.S. The colonized subjects in the U.S. do not deserve paternalism, pity or tokenism; we deserve to

be the masters of revolutionary warfare against U.S. imperialism. Nothing else will suffice.

To be a Maoist in the U.S., especially belonging to one of the oppressed nations, means to be brave and daring and firm on the universal truth of rupture as the basis for transformation and unity. As Maoists, as the PCP affirms, we are condemned to win!